

Case Study: The Closing of the Arizona Interfaith Alliance

for Worker Justice and Implications on

Barriers to Civic Engagement in its Wake

by

Shawn Sickler

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved November 2016 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Ilana Luna, Chair
Jennifer Keahey
Mark Hager

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2016

ABSTRACT

The Arizona Interfaith Alliance for Worker Justice (AIAWJ) was a mediating structure for those who wanted to be civically engaged in the labor movement and other coalitions in Phoenix, Arizona. It not only served its constituents, but it integrated, educated, and empowered them. Due to lack of funding the AIAWJ closed in the summer of 2016. Many community members from marginalized neighborhoods, other concerned citizens, students, myself, and others participated in their first and only civic engagement opportunities through this organization and were subsequently left with no connections, a barrier to being civically engaged. Through interviews and secondary data research, the relationship between people, mediating structures, and civic engagement activity are examined. The key findings support existing research that emphasizes the importance of mediating structures when it comes to civic engagement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Luna for putting up with me always being 15-20 minutes late. To my wife for putting up with me in general. To my cohort who they motivated with their ambition and intellect. Finally if wasn't for Pennywise I wouldn't be who I am and where I am today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	6
Overview	8
The Problem	11
The Arizona Interfaith Alliance for Worker Justice	12
Theoretical Framework	17
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	20
Wage Theft: An Issue we need to Organize Around	20
Why Nonprofit Organizations?	22
Nonprofits as Mediating Structures	23
Civic Engagement as Social Capital.....	25
Who is More Civically Engaged?.....	27
Civic Engagement Online?	28
What are Barriers Some Face to Civic Engagement.....	29
Historical Context, the Creation of the Department of Labor	33
The U.S. was Built on Civic Engagement, Thrives with Deliberation...35	
Shaping Contemporary Context	38
How Civic Engagement Can Work In Contemporary United States	39
Mission Creep	42
Is There a Downside?.....	43
Success Stories	44

CHAPTER	Page
3 METHODOLOGY	46
Research Design.....	46
Role of Researcher	47
Participants	48
Informed Consent.....	48
Data Gathering	49
Interview Structure.....	49
Interviews	50
Transcription	51
Analysis Method	51
Limitations.....	52
4 KEY FINDINGS	54
Prior Civic Engagement.....	54
Civic Engagement Climate in Contemporary Arizona	56
The Social Network	59
The Government is Missing from the Local Social Network.....	61
Over-engagement?	65
How the Search for Funding Hurts Organizations Like the AIAWJ	66
Civic Engagement Activity Since the AIAWJ	69
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	72
Social Network Matters	72

CHAPTER	Page
Different People, Different Barriers	73
Going Forward	75
REFERENCES.....	75
APPENDIX	
A IRB EXEMPTION GRANTED	83
B INFORMED CONCENT	86
C INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	89
D INTERVIEW: JUAN (PSEUDONYM)	92
E INTERVIEW: MARIA (PSEUDONYM).....	97
F INTERVIEW: ROBERT (PSEUDONYM)	104
G INTERVIEW: ANA (PSEUDONYM).....	110

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Chants of “arrest Arpaio not the people” echoed throughout the streets of downtown Phoenix one afternoon as activists from all backgrounds came together during the Netroots Nation 2015 conference to march against Sheriff Joe Arpaio and his anti-immigrant policies. The Phoenix New Times (2016) narrates:

The self-described ‘Toughest Sheriff in America’ has fostered horrendous jail conditions, reckless police operations, and carried out personal vendettas against political rivals and members of the press. In the past year or more, he has also appointed himself enforcer of the nation's immigration laws in Arizona, and a whole new series of problems has emerged. Foremost, he and his deputies have violated the Constitutional rights of brown-skinned U.S. citizens and have committed outright cruelty against the undocumented.

Citizens from all over Metro Phoenix had gathered in the summer heat to tell him that the community had had enough. The activist organization Puente Human Rights Movement from Phoenix organized the march and with the help of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) were able to provide shirts to give out to everyone that read “Arpaio Free AZ.” The diversity of the protestors was amazing, just from observing I could see the members of the march ranged in ethnicity from Latino, white, black (to include the Black Lives Matter campaign), Asian, Pacific Islander, and included community who were: LGBT and “undocumented and unafraid” coming together to raise their voices and say, as the mature black gentleman next to me, wearing a Vietnam veteran hat, sounded off, “Lock his ass up!”

To my dismay there were counter-protesters who had come out to meet us, few in numbers and much less diverse, all white over the age of fifty. Many of the counter-protesters had signs as cruel as “death to illegals.” One sign in particular that struck me the most read “veterans over illegals.” As a veteran myself, I feel the opposite; I want to share resources not hoard them. I feel the richest country in the world can surely afford to assist both veterans and immigrants; there should be no need to compete. I grew angry with their narrative that I feel dragged part of my identity into it. I overheard two Latino teenagers address a counter-protester’s hateful slurs with, “If you’d support our cause, we’d support yours.” Here were two youth directly affected by the policies we were marching against and they still replied in a more calm and collected manner than I was about too. That validated to me the importance of my participation in the march and my stance on the topic. I was with the majority who were voicing a collective and positive narrative, even in the face of adversity.

This culminated at the steps of the county sheriff’s office with Spanish music playing loudly over speakers and the protester dancing a bachata right on the door step to show Sheriff Joe Arpaio, “we are not afraid.” As of October 2016, Sheriff Joe Arpaio has been charged by a federal court for violating a federal court’s orders in a racial-profiling case and charged with criminal contempt of court. This is a true success story of local organizations putting continued attention on the topic and organizing around it. This was all made possible because of participation in local organizations by many, including myself. What if these organizations were too close? Would this story have been possible?

Overview

Nonprofit organizations are necessary for people to become socially and civically engaged because they create healthy environments for public deliberation and provide connections to social capital as well as social networks. They do this by maintaining services, creating changes, and raising a collective consciousness across whatever cause is important to them. Keeling (2013) explains that all organizations have a mission statement, clearly explaining the nature, purpose, and role of the organization. The mission statement guides strategic and resource planning:

Mission statements serve two purposes in communication. First, the act of crafting a mission statement brings people together to negotiate and clarify roles and responsibilities. Second, the mission statement communicates an intent to serve the community by defining an understanding of the needs of its members; the skills, resources, and capacity needed to fulfill those needs; and an expected outcome that will benefit the community. (Keeling, 2013, 32)

With over 1.6 million nonprofit organizations in the United States, most citizens are bound to find an organization with a mission that aligns with their personal values that they want to get involved with.

Frumkin (2002, 3) provides us with three features that all the organizations across the nonprofit and voluntary sector possess, “(1) They do not coerce participation; (2) they operate without distributing profits to stakeholders; and (3) they exist without simple clear lines of ownership and accountability.” Frumkin (2002) explains further that these three features make nonprofit and voluntary organizations seem weak and inefficient. However they fulfill certain needs for society that government and the market cannot,

such as providing assistance filing complaints and seeking justice for workplace violations including wage theft.

My first experience in civic engagement was through a nonprofit during my internship with the Arizona Interfaith Alliance for Worker Justice (AIAWJ). This small organization is a worker rights center which helps those who experience wage theft recover their lost wages. Interfaith Worker Justice (2015) describes worker rights centers as places that, “Help workers build their own power to recover wages and organize improvements in smaller workplaces. More than 200 workers centers across the country have been organized in the last decade to help workers facing wage theft and workplace injuries.” The way worker rights centers help workers build their own power is by being a resource that assists them in their fight for justice from employers who violated their rights. By becoming a member of the center, the hope is that members receive assistance in recovering their wages and then stay active and support social movements and future members who are in need of help.

During this internship I was provided different ways to become active in supporting other important causes and movements that mattered to the organization, our members, and the community, but were not in our mission. I attended my first protest in support of the Fight for \$15 effort. This is the national campaign to raise the minimum wage nationally to \$15. I had support Fight for \$15 in my academic work previously and tried to convince friends, family, and acquaintances why the minimum wage should be \$15, so it was fitting to finally join the cause in protest. I also protested in support of the Stop Stealing from Our Kids movement aimed at the Arizona State Government and the

governor for shirking the budget for public schools while growing the budget for detention centers and prisons.

I also attended a press conference held at Phoenix City Hall, only my second time ever being in a city hall, aimed at putting pressure on the city council and the mayor to vote on the ONE Phoenix ID initiative. When asked to leave the premises, the group instead directed a stand-in in the mayor's office until a representative came out to hear our demands. ONE Phoenix ID is a proposed identification card that provides proof of residency in the city of Phoenix for those who do not or cannot obtain any other form of identification. It would allow the card holders to use public transportation, the library, community centers, and other civic services. As ONEPHXID (2016) states, "Fostering civic pride, helping all residents feel welcome and encouraged to participate in Phoenix's civic affairs makes a stronger community for us all." I have also attended follow up protests to continue to put pressure on the City Council to vote. Finally after many months the ONE Phoenix ID was voted on and passed, but it is still far from being put into practice suggesting that the fight is not over yet. The ONEPHXID organization will be the watchdog and will pass on information about progress and updates on the campaign and future actions to other local organizations within its network, which will then be passed on to their members.

I was also able to attend the Netroots Nation conference, an event for socially progressive-minded thinkers. At Netroots I attended training sessions such as: (1) This is What Happens in a Congressional Office When You Write Your Rep, (2) Fed up: The Economy Still Isn't working for Us and Why You Should Care about the Federal Reserve, (3) To Change Everything, It Takes Everyone: Lessons from the People's

Climate March, and (4) and Facebook and Twitter Ads: Using Paid Ads to Organize on a Budget. These trainings would be useful for all citizens to attend in order to become assimilated into the civic and political spheres, learn how to operate within them, and be more productive members of these spheres.

At the event, I was lucky enough to see Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders. It is important for citizens to congregate when their elected representatives speak. Elizabeth Warren is a leader in the fight on income inequality and the corporation's role in government. Bernie Sanders at the time of this conference was running for president and was spreading his message of legislating for the working family over billionaires when it comes to making public policy. Both speakers brought great attention to the current revolving door of corporate executive to government cabinet back to corporate executive again.

The AIAWJ serves as an example of the importance of mediating structures in the United States Democratic System. None of the civic activities described above would have been possible without mediating structures, such as the AIAWJ, that provide citizens and elected officials knowledge and access to the social network of local movements, campaigns, and actions. How else does one discover times and locations of large activist conferences, public meetings, down to small protests or demonstrations? It is the mediating structure, or community organization, that disseminates information and organizes gatherings that make civic engagement possible.

The Problem

Due to a lack in funding the AIAWJ has ceased operation permanently after ten years of service to the community.

For me, I am losing my only connection to the activist community and the civic and political engagement that comes with it. Losing involvement with an organization that promotes civic engagement and is connected to the activists' social network has become my barrier to civic engagement. This led me to wonder about consequences for other members of the organization and their civic engagement. What are the connections between people and mediating structures in relation to civic engagement? What barriers to civic engagement do mediating structures help overcome? What happens if mediating structures go away?

The Arizona Interfaith Alliance for Worker Justice

Tellez (2011) tells us the AIAWJ was started in 2006 as a faith-labor alliance, supporting local political campaigns and resourcing low income communities in civic engagement. The workers right center officially opened its doors as a stand-alone organization in 2008. It became a standalone entity in 2010, gaining 501(c)(3) status July of 2011. The community they served were generally from lower income brackets with lower educational attainment levels. 99% of the members served spoke Spanish, 80% being Mexican, and 70% being undocumented immigrants. The AIAWJ has assisted in over 300 cases and documented over a million dollars of stolen wages and assisted in recovering over \$300,000 of it.

In the 2013 filing of their form 990EZ shows they has gross receipts of \$96,441 with a surplus left of \$32,278, financially stable. The Catholic Campaign for Human Development pulled the \$60,000 grant it awarded because of the centers involvement with those with non-Catholic beliefs. That was when the financial troubles started for the AIAWJ. Harsh penalty, however their website states:

To qualify for CCHD funds, applicant organizations must not promote, in any way, activities that work against Catholic values. CCHD's grants to local anti-poverty efforts are screened, awarded and monitored in close partnership with local Catholic dioceses. CCHD grants to groups in a local community require the explicit approval of the bishop of that diocese. (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2016).

This truly paints the picture of how strict, fickle, and unreliable funding is and how it can cripple small nonprofits to have just one funder change their mind. It also gives an example of how funders try to control how the money they donate gets used exactly, many times preventing nonprofits from using it in ways they truly need.

The AIAWJ's mission statement was:

AZWRC challenges workplace injustice by collaborating with, educating, and mobilizing working people, providing direct services and assistance, developing leadership, and advocating for just labor policy and practice. Through strategic collaborative efforts, we strive to develop political consciousness and civic engagement for a worker friendly Arizona. (Reference)

Nonprofits such as the Interfaith Worker Justice (IWJ) allow leaders and other community supporters to meet with elected officials at the national, state, or local level to pursue them to champion, or at least co-sponsor legislation to stop wage theft. Bobo (2011) informs us that the IWJ is the largest faith based organization focused on worker issues and the second largest network of workers centers in the United States. Bobo (2011, 108) continues, "The core mission and work of workers' centers is to help workers

improve conditions in their workplace. They address both what is legal in the workplace and what is just.”

Bobo (2011) informs us how workers’ centers accomplish their mission, by educating workers about their rights and organizing skills, confronting employers who have stolen wages, filing complaints with government agencies, holding government agencies accountable, linking workers with ethical attorneys, encouraging workers to organize, challenging sectors with rampant wage violations, passing pro-worker legislation, encouraging allies in supporting workers, providing other social services, and creating worker-owned cooperatives.

The AIAWJ followed the blueprint laid out by Bobo as Tellez (2011) informs us of the three main components of the AIAWJ: “(1) community education on civil and workplace rights, (2) services such as translation or assistance with filing unpaid wage claims, and (3) campaigns both against target employers and policy change.” Beyond wage theft, the AIAWJ assisted with other employment violations such as worker injury, hazardous working conditions or employer non-compliance with safety and health standards, and discrimination, and unemployment fraud. When prospective new patrons came to the center before they could receive any assistance it was mandatory they attend a “Know Your Rights” course. They were also informed the AIAWJ would not do their fight for them but rather be their resource for fighting; essentially putting into practice the popular saying “you can give a person a fish and feed them one time or you can teach them to fish and feed them a lifetime.” Tellez (2011) concludes, “Being community-based and worker-led is instrumental to the effectiveness of the Workers’ Rights Center in meeting immediate needs for individuals and groups of workers...it is also essential

for creating long-term change to improve standards in the workplace.” In addition, they would also share their knowledge with their neighbors helping empower themselves and their community. On top of being a resource the AIAWJ gave members some solid ground to stand on in unfamiliar territory providing a safety net they may not have previously had, until SB1070.

In 2010 The Arizona State Senate Passed Senate Bill 1070, known as SB 1070. It was the most strict immigration law in the whole country. In fact, it was one of the topics that put Sheriff Joe in the National Spotlight. Section E of SB 1070 left cause for concern, “a law enforcement officer, without a warrant, may arrest a person if the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed 39 any public offense that makes the person removable from the United States” (*AZ SB1070*). While the law did not include race, it did not exclude it. It was up to police discretion on who, when, and where they wanted. As a result other than going to work people stayed home all the time, scared.

The AIAWJ had a fee-based membership policy of \$25 to join, many if not most organizations do. Some critics might argue that it should have been waived for those receiving services and volunteers and board members should definitely have a membership fees. It is important to remember the AIAWJ was not a pure service division it requires self-investment and willingness to part with what little money is available is the best way to secure commitment.

Interviews from the documentary *Workers on the Rise* (2013) provides us with some good secondary data from those who have been served by the AIAWJ:

I worked with a lady cleaning houses, this woman owed me 200 hours, and she told me that we had gotten to a point where she could no longer pay me that money. She said that I ruined an oven. She said I was crazy. She said that she was not going to pay me. She said she was going to take me to Arpaio and that she was going to send Arpaio to my job and home. And so I said I don't care.

(Evangelina, *Workers on the Rise*, 2013)

Often employers in Arizona tell their workers that they have no right or fewer rights than other workers. Too often vulnerable workers are taken advantage of simply because they are not familiar with the culture, norms, or laws inside the United States workforce.

There is a strong need in the United States to incorporate some form of migrant worker integration program. Teaching workers the layout of the system will prevent employers from taking advantage of the unknowing. The employees knowing and understanding how workforce culture and regulations work and what to do when they are not followed will alleviate the barrier of fear they face currently. Evangelina in *Workers on the Rise* (2013) shows us why the AIAWJ was important to its members

Some wouldn't even say their full names...we have seen with the leadership classes that people are starting to open up one starts losing shame and starts building confidence. When you are able to speak in public, and can be any kind of meeting, well, it may not be a big deal for someone but for us, or at least for me it has benefitted me a lot. (Evangelina, *Workers on the Rise*, 2013)

Don Jose was someone who was helped by the center then stayed active in it, joining the board. He is a living example of what the organization was trying to accomplish, turning education and assistance into recruitment and participation. He remained active all the

way until the final event. He says, “I learned to communicate more with people, I learned to develop my conversations. I came here to the Workers Rights Center to get help to, because before I was asleep, here they help me wake up more” (Don Jose, Workers on the Rise, 2013). Right now there is a new center being developed that will be part of the before-mentioned Puente Human Rights Movement, but right now this community has no mediating structure to fight labor violations.

The services the AIAWJ provided benefited those working low wage industries most vulnerable to wage theft. The programs were centered on workers’ rights and justice, wage recovery, and awareness training of safety laws and legal rights. Without its services, its members and the surrounding community are more vulnerable to wage theft and other employment violations and are left with no assistance for seeking justice, recovering lost wages, or accessing the social network of movements to create change that can permanently address the issue. Many have no access to public social services because of their immigration status or employment status, and fear of law enforcement. The potential loss of housing and their ability to pay bills such as electricity, water, health care, clothing, and food can all compound quickly causing them to be victims of emotional and psychological distress, as well as having their socio-economic status and upward mobility compromised.

Theoretical framework

Hope, no matter how grim social and civic life may be, most critical theorists have hope. This is because from a critical theorist paradigm the system is bound for collapse and radical change will then occur. Max Weber coined the term Iron Cage; Weber could see how social forces and social structures were organized with the clarity

few others have had and he eventually felt trapped, hopeless, and even useless. Marxists, to include myself however believe the relations between workers and capitalists will eventually reach a tipping point due to polarization of classes due to income inequality, the drive for continual profits, accumulation of wealth, overproduction of commodities, and alienation from their labor.

Box (2005) contends, “Critical theory provides an opening for conceptualization and practice that acknowledges the value-based normative character of public administration.” Critical theory measures community participation in public administration along a continuum, on one end no involvement and on the other ideal complete involvement. Those who wish to remain neutral need to be warned that critical theory views neutrality as a value-laden decision to consciously not participate in the public realm while voluntarily sacrificing autonomy. It is quite a large spectrum however the research design narrowed the scope and scale of data measurement and evaluations.

Critical theory requires researchers to include historical context on their research topic or question. Behaviors, attitudes, and interactions of those in the past, especially on a materialistic and economic level, shape contemporary and values, culture, social structure, and myths. In order to address research questions critical theorists must first understand the past and how it contributed to the current narrative.

Box (2005) informs us if and when capitalists have enough money at their disposal to buy raw materials and pay wages, they can start to organize production on a capitalist basis. Using wage labor to transform the raw materials which they buy, with the tools they own, into finished products which they then automatically own too. Workers cannot withdraw from the labor market in protest, workers cannot wait. But the capitalist,

who has money reserves, can temporarily withdraw from the labor market. He can lay his workers off and can even close or sell his enterprise and wait a couple of years before starting again in business.

Box (2005) introduce us to discourse theory which examines institutional arrangements, both historical and contemporary and how they produced the current discourse settings. Box (2005) identifies the themes: more than one single explanation or theory to describe something, a belief that reality is a product of human thoughts and interactions, and a search for free uncoerced communication in open discourse settings. In sum, Box (2005, 95) tells us, “the purpose of discourse theory is to introduce to the public discussion ideas from outside current understanding of institutional structures and practices rather than to accept them as normative grounding.” Deliberation is best used when new ways of thinking are explored. Ethnocentrism in the United States acts in direct conflict to systems of interaction that would generate more public participation through civic engagement and thus a more efficient and representative democracy.

The rights approach is predicated on the notion that humans have the right to choose paths which affect them and are justified in their expectation that their rights should be respected. These rights include the right to the truth, the right of privacy, the right to not be injured, and the right to fulfillment of promises. I would personally add many of the rights listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights established by the United Nations. This approach allows for other concept to be more acceptable such as the Fairness or Justice Approach, that people should be treated equally regardless of their station in life, that is, they should not be subject to discrimination, suggesting that ethical actions are those that benefit all members of the community.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Wage Theft: An Issue we need to Organize Around

Wage theft is a growing problem in the United States today. Bobo (2011) defines wage theft as when workers are not paid a portion or all of their wages or the overtime hours worked. An employer violates the law when wage theft occurs; workers are due legally mandated wages for hours worked. Bernhardt et al (2009, 27) informs us of how widespread the problem has become, “In fact, more than two-thirds (68 percent) of the workers in our sample experienced at least one type of pay-related workplace violation in their previous week of work.” Meixell & Eisenbrey (2014) illustrate how large scale wage theft is a consequence of the lack of attention towards the issue:

The researchers estimated that the average loss per worker over the course of a year was \$2,634, out of total earnings of \$17,616. The total annual wage theft from front-line workers in low-wage industries in the three cities approached \$3 billion. If these findings in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles are generalizable to the rest of the U.S. low-wage workforce of 30 million, wage theft is costing workers more than \$50 billion a year.

Bobo (2011) informs us that most wage theft is done intentionally in what he calls “sins of commission and omission” (Bobo, 2011, 23). Sins of commission are when hours are maliciously not counted and wages not paid. Sins of omission come from pressure from senior management to cut cost. Different ways employers commit wage theft include: paying less than minimum wage, not paying workers for hours they worked, not paying

for overtime or misclassification of being exempt, paying by the day or by the job, taking illegal deductions, stealing worker's tips, and denying workers compensation.

Morales and Murillo (2011) educate us on a tactic that is becoming increasingly popular: classifying workers as independent contractors. Morales and Murillo (2011) inform us "by misclassifying these workers, employers attempt to avoid paying minimum wage, unemployment compensation, and health insurance benefits; and they push the entire tax burden of the work relationship onto the employee." The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), National Labor Relation Board (NLRB), and State of Arizona have different tests to determine if a worker is an employee and thus owed certain rights. The test in Arizona consists of: degree of supervision and control over work, nature of the work, required specializations, provider of materials, duration of employment, method of payment, and relationship of work done compared to employer's normal business, and belief of the parties. It can be quite complicated and long process that prevents groups like the AIAWJ from accepting contractor's cases because of time and resources.

According to Planchich, Neil, and McIntos (2014), since 2007, 600 wage and hour cases have been settled averaging about \$2,576 per person. Planchich, Neil, and McIntos (2014) determined 40% of all cases are overtime violations. On every level of the spectrum from municipal to federal governments, legislators and administrators have failed to address the issue. Getting people what they earned is important, but the process of monitoring and enforcing workplace violations by the Department of Labor currently does not attack the issue at its source. This is where campaigns and movements organized by nonprofits are crucial; where service provision ends, activism begins.

Why Nonprofit Organizations?

If the Department of Labor is only scratching the surface of employment violations taking place then where do we turn to for justice? Frumkin (2002) provides the answer: nonprofit and voluntary organization. Some organizations form to act as extra-governmental providers when the government cannot meet the needs of the public. “The sector is able to respond to unmet demands by bringing together funds, including private contributions, government grants, and by offering services that are not otherwise available or that are different from those that the market and government offer” (Frumkin, 2002, 64). Depending on the service provided consumers prefer and trust nonprofits because of the nondistribution constraint which Frumkin (2002, 4) explains, “While corporations are able to distribute earnings to shareholders, nonprofit and voluntary organizations cannot make such distributions to outside parties. Rather, they must use all residual funds for the advancement of the organization’s mission.” Consumers trust that their purchase or donation will be put to good use and not into someone’s pocket.

Uniquely, many times the organization re-composes itself with staff or volunteers that were once themselves served by it. Boris and Steuerle (2006) break down the service provision nonprofits into three kinds according to their relation and service with the government: supplementary, complementary, and adversarial. Supplementary nonprofits fill the demand for public goods not filled by the government. Complementary nonprofits partner with the government to help deliver public good. Adversarial nonprofit try to get policy passed and serve as a watchdog organizations. Usually organizations will fill or switch between two traits, mostly supplementing and complementing. “Nonprofits can

provide unity with diversity, enhance goodwill in society, and encourage ‘civil society’ in which social interaction more easily transpires among individuals with their government.” (Boris & Steuerle, 2006). As Frumkin (2002) explains, it is not the creativity or quality of the service provided that makes their production by nonprofits possible but the inability of the government to meet citizen’s needs and the failure of the market to meet consumer needs.

Frumkin (2002, 74) tells us of some potential problems with service delivery activities by nonprofits: “(1) loss of nonprofit autonomy and independence; (2) ‘vendorism,’ or distortion of the agency mission in pursuit of available government funding; and (3) bureaucratization or over professionalization, leading to the loss of flexibility and diversity in program design.” Frumkin (2002) warns that if there is no value or expressive dimension to the nonprofit organization it will become vulnerable to the competitive threat of for-profits working in the same fields. Once competition within a field starts, nonprofits lose sight of their purpose and their mission.

Nonprofits as Mediating Structures

Berger and Neuhaus (1996) tell us that as we continue to modernize we are seeing a dichotomy form between the private and public spheres. As such they claim there is a need for what they call mediating structures to help maintain political orders attachment to the values and realities of the individual citizens. Berger and Neuhaus (1996, 158) provide the definition of mediating structures, “those organizations standing between the individual in his private life and the large institution of public life.” Mediating structures fill the void caused by polarization of this dichotomy, they connect the left to the right and the bottom to the top.

Couto and Guthrie (1999, 67) insist, “Democracy requires mediating structures because they embody explicit or implicit protest against reducing community to the narrow economic base of market capitalism.” Couto and Guthrie (1999) explains the mediation role of nonprofit organizations in terms of engagement between organized groups and the state to promote an interest that preserves or strengthens the social position of those from the community, whether they belong to the group or not. Couto and Guthrie (1999) go on to explain that both the civil rights movement and the women's movements for equality were mediated by nonprofit organizations. It makes sense that workers rights movement would follow the same strategy. However Berger and Neuhaus (1996) conclude and provide warning that if the mediating structure loses connection with these communities then they will not be represented in the public policy making process.

The three main tasks community-based mediating structures seek to accomplish are provided by Couto and Guthrie (1999, 207):

- (1) To impart to their members a renewed and expanded sense of community that embraces new and unfamiliar people, (2) to embody in their operations, and (3) embrace the moral resources of trust, caring, other expressions valued by the community, and to assert a sense of solidarity to friends and foes.

No more everyone for themselves in a winner takes all system. Mediating structures just need to use the rights approach and that paradigm will led them to naturally complete their objective.

Berger and Neuhaus (1996) insist that professionalization of voluntary associations (nonprofit organizations) hurts small organizations that serve marginalized

communities like the AIAWJ did, because staffing a field of experts further alienates the dichotomy of private from public life, especially for those from marginalized and oppressed groups. “Lower income people are most effectively disenfranchised by the successful establishment of expert monopolies” (Berger and Neuhaus, 1996, 196). Experts are known to think they already know about what patrons are trying to portray and sometimes do not listen well; and when it comes to service provision the only experts on people are themselves.

Couto and Guthrie (1999, 42) explain, “The voluntary sector continues to liberate individuals and permits them to achieve a fuller measure of their potential, but the restraints against which they struggle include the social environment as well as the government.” The mediating structures allow the actors to interact with one another within the social atmosphere. Mediating structures provide the norms and values of the political climate and other advice along the way acting as a safety net. Mediating structures provide people with space to exist and gives them a voice.

Community based mediating structures, such as the AIAWJ, “sustain hope and vision of human worth that exceeds market or labor value and the bonds of community that exceed market relations of exchange” (Couto and Guthrie 1999, 72). In the modern world where it seems all decisions made with monetary motivations, it is refreshing there is still something that guides itself based on concepts of good and bad, right and wrong.

Civic Engagement as Social Capital

Putnam (2000, 19) defines social capital as, “connections among individuals-social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them.” The old saying of “it is not what you know but who you know” rings true even in social

and civic networks. Putnam (2000) informs us that networks exist not for contacts and sources but that networks exist for mutual obligations, providing support or assistance with the assurance it will be reciprocated in the future. Putnam (2000) tells us the good side of social capital is that it builds mutual support, cooperation, trust, and institutional effectiveness as well as the negatives of social capital including sectarianism, ethnocentrism, and corruption.

Putnam (2000) introduces us to the two types of social capital, bridging and bonding. Bonding social capital is exclusive and is good within a network for identifying specific reciprocity and mobilizing solidarity. Bridging social capital is inclusive and are for links to external assets and diffusion of information. Putnam (2000, 23) continues, “the ‘weak’ ties that link me to distant acquaintances who move in different circles from mine are actually more valuable than the ‘strong’ ties that link me to relatives and intimate friends whose sociological niche is very like my own.” Bonding social capital has a narrow scope compared to bridging social capital which builds identities and can generate more reciprocity. Schneider (2007) reminds us, “unless volunteer activities bring those served and those providing service together in ways that equalize the relationship, service activities are likely to reinforce preexisting divisions between those served and volunteers.”

Putnam (2000) says that membership in an organization is only a part of building social capital, however it is how we gauge community involvement. Portney and Berry (2007, 24) conclude: “neighborhoods offer the opportunity for the development of complex webs of affect-laden interactions...and commitment to shared values and identity not easily constructed elsewhere.” Portney and Berry (2007) contend that social

capital is not only built through social interactions but also by the amount of commitment and involvement in community life. It is not enough to simply be a member or to show up to meetings, but rather being active in the organization or community are the true building blocks of social capital.

Who is more Civically Engaged?

Corporation for National and Community Service (2015) report that in 2014, 23.1% of Arizonian citizens reported volunteering, 4.2% of that was in civic engagement, 13.4% was in social services, while 6.4% of Arizonian citizens reported being active in their neighborhood. In the city of Phoenix 22.3% of citizen reported volunteering, 5.3% in civic engagement and 13.5% in social services, as well as 5.2% that were active in their neighborhood. Of the volunteers in the state 24.3% were white, 19.6% were black, 19.3% were Asian, 9.3% were Native American; no demographics were provided for Latin Americans. Tisch (2015) provides insight on why “variations in civic participation vary widely according to factors such as age, ethnicity, and education.”

The Center for the Future of Arizona (2015) concludes that one of the biggest indicators of civic participation is age. Corporation for National and Community Service (2015) reports that the most active age cohort in the State of Arizona and the city of Phoenix was those aged 38-44 at 28.8% for the state and 32.8% in the city. The Center for the Future of Arizona (2015) report that in 2012 those ages 18 to 29 4.7% contacted public official, 18% discuss politics frequently, 4.9% work with a neighbor to fix something, 19.7% volunteer in their community, 2.7% attend public meetings, 25% belong to a community organization. Those over the age 30 report that 13.5% contacted public officials, 31.5% discuss politics frequently, 9.8% work with a neighbor to fix

something, 9.4% attend public meetings, 26% volunteer in their community, and 37.5% belong to a community organization.

Civic Engagement Online?

Putnam (2000, 173) implies “the high speed, low cost, and broad scope of mobilization that is possible on the internet can be an advantage for political organizers, by reducing transaction cost, particularly for widely scattered groups of like-minded citizens.” Putnam’s (2000) research shows that online deliberation is less hierarchical, everyone’s opinion weighs the same. However discussion online tends to be frank and egalitarian in comparison with face-to-face meetings which tend to be more in-depth.

Jennings and Zeitner (2003) tell us the two contrasting beliefs about civic engagement and the internet. The first is that it strengthens civil society and increases opportunities for communication and mobilization. The other is that it is a depoliticizing medium much like Robert Putnam believed that television was. Brown (2014) informs us about the digital divide and how it hurts low income and immigrant families alienating them from access to civic engagement opportunities. Brown (2014) also finds a positive side stating “Latino Justice, the New York-based rights organization, used Twitter and Facebook in 2012 to “push viewers to the website” where more information could be found about policy, advocacy, and the election (based on interview with Tasha Moro, June, 2012).” Brown 2014 informs us that many small immigrant-serving nonprofits do not adapt to social media with the top three reasons being expertise, expense, and equipment; nonprofits with limited resources are getting left behind. The AIAWJ followed this narrative; it lacked an online presence while also serving members who are also less connected.

Smith (2013) tells us that 34% of adults have contacted a government official online and that 39% do political or civic activities on networking sites. 33% of social networking sites repost information on social and political issues compared to 19% who share information offline. 21% of social networking site users belong to a group working to advance a cause compared to 12% of offline users. When accounting for online activity, the generational gap in political and civic engagement nearly vanishes. The gaps in online civic engagement are found in the education and income demographics. 53% of college graduates that are politically active on social networking sites while 22% of high school dropouts are politically active on social networking sites. 43% of social networking site users decided to learn about a topic because of a post they saw and 18% decided to take action based on post they saw.

Putnam (2000,76), concludes that “computer based groups are quicker to reach an intellectual understanding of their shared problems...but are much worse at generating the trust and reciprocity necessary to implement that understanding.” While the internet is a great tool for recruitment, spreading information, and organizing it does not take the place of civic engagement within the community through organizations.

What are barriers Some Face to Civic Engagement?

Macedo et al. (2015, 78) explains that “Stratification is especially harmful to those who live amid concentrated disadvantage. Although many poorer neighborhoods exhibit impressive levels of civic activity, people’s capacity to become involved in civic affairs is diminished greatly where inequalities are ‘cumulative rather than offsetting.’” Those living across the metropolitan area are interacting less with each other which leads

to less understanding of that specific community's shared values, interests, and issues faced, consequently leading them from being neighbors to being the "other."

Macedo et al. (2015) inform us of the inequalities that lead to civic engagement barriers to include: health problems, transportation issues, safety concerns, fewer effective models of civic engagement to imitate, lack critical civic skills, and local public institutions that lack resources to address the public's needs. Macedo et al. (2015, 165) conclude "The polarization of places in America is constituted by continuing racial segregation, especially in areas of concentrated disadvantage, and ever-worsening class stratification across separate political communities that compose the metropolitan region." As a whole the metropolitan area never comes together to deliberate, trade perspectives, and gain understanding of each other's positions and ways to go forward both groups can agree on. Box (2005) identifies a barrier commonly faced by marginalized citizens: fear. There is a fear of conformity, many view assimilation as oppressive. The other fear is discourse turning into conflict; especially in the modern political atmosphere of the United States.

Putnam (2000) finds that "it is not low income per se, but the financial worry that it engenders, that inhibits social engagement. Even among the well-to-do, a sense of financial vulnerability dampens community involvement." People who feel financial anxiety, feel like they do not have enough or make enough money, are much less engaged in all forms of social and community life than those who do not. Benenson (2015) explains:

Civic engagement broke down some barriers, but not all. Some participants described the ways civic engagement strengthened access to bonding social

capital... participants bonded through shared life experiences, and were able to access a loan or transportation to church through a close connection. Formerly incarcerated individuals connected with others in their civic role to secure employment. In addition, participants also received information about childcare or free meals through their civic experiences, which influenced whether they could take a particular job or return to school.

Other barriers related to income Benenson (2015) introduces to us are organizational resources and the structure and alignment between civic engagement and goals. The nonprofits serving marginalized patrons are usually small, understaffed, and underfunded. Even those active in low income areas might not have access to the best information or social networks. Macedo et al. (2015) tells us many nonprofits with disadvantaged constituents lack a professional member that represents them in their own advocacy network.

Zukin et al. (2006) inform us that people who grow up in household that discuss political and social matters are more likely to be civically engaged. “34 percent of those who reported watching an hour or television or less on an average day say they regularly volunteer for a nonpolitical organization, compared to 10 percent who said they watch more than 6 hours per day” Zukin et al (2006). Box (2005, 127) reports, “voting rates are low, antigovernment attitudes are frequently expressed in the media, bureaucrat bashing is commonplace, and the public service is regarded by many with disdain.”

Hakim et al (2016) introduces other barriers encountered, lack of time, knowledge, or accessibility. Both students and fulltime workers as well as the growing part of the population that do both hesitate to get involved because of their schedule.

Many times finding information about local events happens at the last minute. The second barrier is viewing oneself as a temporary citizen. This is fairly common among those who commute. Commuter is just a status used to rationalize, to justify lack of involvement. Above all Hakim et al (2016) report that many people claimed it was a “lot of work just to get involved.”

Tisch (2015, 19) contends “regardless of other factors, the more educated an individual is, the more likely he or she is to be civically active...However, for Latinos, other characteristics such as citizenship status, English-language proficiency, and home ownership all have a positive effect.”

A lesser known barrier is trust. Portney and Berry (2007) tell us that a key feature of a strong, stable, and productive polity is citizens having trust in their government. Often people assume that local politics and national politics are always the same narrative so they do not bother to get involved at the neighborhood level. Putnam (2000) points out there is also a social trust between neighbors that must also be maintained. According to the Center for the Future of Arizona in 2013, 54.4% of Arizonians said they trust all neighbors with only 5.3% of Arizonians reporting working with their neighbor to fix something. Trust and collaboration lead to social connectedness.

Gastil and Levine (2005, 193) conclude a major barrier is “citizen alienation and moving people out of their individual comfort zone to share their perspectives in a public dialogue.” They recommend expanding the forum program to address this issue. The next barrier Gastil and Levine (2005, 193) identified was “educating the public about how citizen voices can influence public decisions about their future. Most people feel powerless against well-organized lobbies, and many are currently disconnected from

representative government.” Box (2005, 137) concludes, “because of apathy, lack of information, manipulation of information through public relations programs and depression of discussion of controversial issues, indoctrinated by the elite, and the effects of the one-dimensional society that obscures knowledge of alternatives.”

Historical Context, the creation of the Department of Labor

Breen (1997) reminds us that industrial America has always faced employment issues, largely unemployment and high turnover. The 1900 Census reported that six and a half million people experienced unemployment at least three months of a year, 40% of those being unemployed four to six months. Employment issues at that time were considered matters that were handled by the state. However Breen (1997) informs us, “The state employment offices were poorly funded, staffed by untrained personnel, badly administered, and served relatively few workers or employers.” Instead there were a multitude of private employment offices that most workers used that operated throughout many of the industrialized states with no centralized regulation to follow.

In 1906 a group of journalists, academics, and government officials formed the American Association for Labor Legislation. Initially established for studying labor conditions they soon became some of the leading advocates for legislation to include “the use of public works to alleviate unemployment, the regularization of the industry, unemployment insurance, and the development of public employment exchanges” (Breen, 1997, p. 7). MacLaury (1998) concludes:

A Federal Department of Labor was the direct product of a half-century campaign by organized labor for a ‘Voice in the Cabinet,’ and an indirect product of the Progressive Movement. In the words of the organic act, the Department's purpose

is to foster, promote and develop the welfare of working people, to improve their working conditions, and to enhance their opportunities for profitable employment.

The Department of Labor was formed in 1913, and William Wilson was appointed as its first secretary. Breen (1997) tells us that Wilson was unhappy with the supervisory role the federal government wanted his new office to fill. Secretary Wilson warned that the Department of Labor did not have the funds to develop a centralized national system. As a solution the Department of Labor was willing to cooperate with the state office. However, the Department of Labor maintains right to bypass the state and local authorities.

In 1938 Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act in which the Department of Labor (2014) recently boasted:

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) is a cornerstone of U.S. labor policy. The Fair Labor Standards Act sets national standards for a minimum hourly wage, maximum hours worked per week at worker's' regular rate of pay, the wage premium if the maximum number of hours is exceeded (overtime pay), and limitations on jobs performed and hours worked by those under the age of 18. The Fair Labor Standards Act also sets recordkeeping requirements for employers. States may enact minimum wage laws that operate in parallel, and the effective minimum wage rate is established by whichever law is more protective of workers.

To enforce the Fair Labor Standards Act the Department of Labor created the Wage and Hour Division. According to the Department of Labor (2016), the division is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the FLSA in both private

and government employment. The Division is staffed by investigators, supervisors, and technical and clerical employees.

The U.S. was Built on Civic Engagement, Thrives with Deliberation

Gastil and Levine (2005) provide the history of participatory democracy in the United States. In the 1830's Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States and wrote the well-known book *Democracy in America*. In it he describes what he called a populist democracy, which requires inclusion of as many citizens as possible in the voting process. M. Kweit and R. Kweit (1981) explain that deliberation involves reasoned argument. The objective of deliberation is to map out issues being faced and to identify feasible solutions to them. This means having no ego, no stubbornness, no verbal attacks, no interruptions, having the mindfulness to not think about rebuttals but instead thoughtfully listen, and bringing a willingness to compromise. Criticisms are only permitted with reasonable arguments. The idea is to use reasoned discussion to persuade others to agree or to compromise in order to make public policy that benefits everyone. This is in contrast from reality where the current strategies in political and civic discourse are to prove that you are right and others are wrong (and the stubbornness to stand by bad choices and incorrect decisions), take the politically correct centrists route (which serves no one), and the famous tool of the U.S. Senate the filibuster (lots of talking but no deliberation).

M. Kweit and R. Kweit (1981) inform us that de Tocqueville was amazed at what he saw; he referred to Americans joiners. From then up until now the United States has had a fairly high percentage of its population, up to a third of the population are involved with an organization or political party. Vanbiezen, Mair, and Poguntke (2012) concluded

that in the years 2007 to 2009 the average organizational and party membership rates for twenty-seven of the European democracies was 4.7%. Austria was the highest with 17.27% and Latvia the lowest with 0.74%. Although it is important to recognize that not all democracies are organized in the same manner as the United States.

According to Gastil and Levine (2005) Teddy Roosevelt and John Studebaker were the true believers in a participatory democracy in the early 1900s. Teddy Roosevelt did not like that universities were only teaching students, many of who were likely to become government officials someday, debate techniques in their public speaking classes. He was concerned that they were not learning proper problem solving skills and the ability to compromise. From 1915 to 1930 Teddy Roosevelt succeeded at persuading almost every university across the country to start teaching discussion-based public speaking. He did this, “explicitly grounded in the writings of John Dewey, they aimed at equipping students to participate in forums. And they emphasized techniques of reasoned exchange, mutual respect, and equal participation.” (Gastil & Levine, 2005, 11). John Studebaker developed forums that would bring neighbors and legislators together and by 1935 the Federal Forum Project was started. Unfortunately World War II and the ensuing Cold War shifted the Federal budget and mindset.

Gastil and Levine (2005) tell us that it wasn't until the 1990s before civic engagement and deliberation received national attention again. “Clinton's reference to dialogue rather than deliberation emphasized that in addition to encompassing reasoned policy analysis, talk about race must confront differences in experiences and perspectives, requiring as much emotional as intellectual labor.” (Gastil & Levine, 2005, 8). In 1996 the National Issue Convention was held. It was a deliberative poll program

that was aired on PBS. Meant to be the recommending voice of the public, it was not put on again until 2003 and received such little attention that it was never again done. Out of the framework of the convention there is now a standalone group named the National Issues Forum through which communities can organize forums for deliberation. On the National Issues Forum's website they state that forums are the place democracy come alive following a timeline of: video, two or three hours of deliberation, then solutions examined. Then the community knows how much each group is willing to compromise to find actual solutions to issues they face.

Gastil and Levine (2005, 6) explain, "Rather than see the history of democracy in America as a linear story of either progress or decline...view it as a succession of experiments in different places on a continuum ranging from populist democracy to modest republicanism to elite republicanism." Flash forward to contemporary United States; we have seen approval rating for the United States government hit all-time lows. This is reflected in our voter turnout. According to (McDonald, 2003) 36.6% of voters turned out for the 2014 general election. In Arizona voter turnout was 34.1%. Globally (Desilver 2015) tells us the U.S. ranks thirty-first amongst democratic nations in percent of voting age population that turnout to vote. Gastil and Levine (2005) conclude that the United States does not have the required citizen participation that would allow our government to operate at maximum efficiency, instead it is more vulnerable to oligarchy, plutocracy, and corruption.

Shaping Contemporary Context

Seyfarth Shaw LLP (2013) reports that from 1990 to 2013 Fair Labor Standards Act Cases grew from 1257 to 7764. In 2014 U.S. Department of Labor (2014) recovered

\$280 million from wage and hour violations. The problem is widespread throughout multiple industries in the economy, but is most common in clothing, farming, construction, and restaurant industries. The Industrial Commission of Arizona 2014 Annual Report (2015) tells us that in 2013 and 2014 combined, there were 1,035 compliance inspections conducted and 731 violations were issued with total of \$1,277,612 in fines. There were also 2,896 wage disputes of \$5,000 or less and 33 minimum wage complaints filed. In 2012 the industries with the most lost workday claims due to injury were retail trade (1,656), construction (1,142), and transportation and warehousing (953). Passantino (2015) gives us the data for the full year of 2015. There were 21,902 complaints, a twenty-year low. However 240,000 employees total were involved which was only lowest since 2010. A total of \$247 million in owed wages were repaid, up \$6 million from the year before.

Bobo (2011) reports that there are about 130 million workers spread out among seven million workplaces that the Wage and Hour Division is responsible for overseeing the application and enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. There are an estimated 148,000 children working illegally in the United States every week, but the Department of Labor only has the resources to hire twenty-three full time investigators. Bobo (2011) issues an alarming report:

No wonder we have a crisis of wage theft and payroll fraud in the nation with so few cops on the job and so few investigators focused on industry commonly known to steal wages from poor workers and revenues from public charities. As one current Wage and Hour investigator told me, 'We're just doing triage with cases.'

From the day the Department of Labor was created they have never had enough employees, proper funding, or adequate resources.

How Civic Engagement Can Work In Contemporary United States

Zukin et al. (2006) define civic engagement as participation aimed at achieving a public good, usually through direct, hands-on work in cooperation with others. Civic engagement normally takes place within nongovernmental organizations, the nonprofit sector, and is not usually a part of the electoral process. Macedo et al. (2005) contend, “Some evidence suggests that higher levels of civic engagement, especially active membership in groups and involvement in social networks, are associated with greater individual satisfaction with the quality of community life and, indeed, one’s own life.”

Benenson (2015) determined that lower income earners are usually less engaged in multiple areas. “Five forms of civic engagement – volunteering, speaking with a political official, speaking with a religious officer, giving money to family or friends, and overall civic engagement – were significantly related to income.” According to Rawlings (2012), “civic engagement can take many forms, from individual volunteerism in neighborhoods to organizational involvement...it includes efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem, or interact with the institutions of representative democracy.” Prescott-Smith (2012) reminds us that that we are all talking but no one is being heard. We are at the point as a society where we are more concerned about being correct, shutting the other person down, and winning the argument than actually trying to find the best solution. That is the example being set for us by our officials. People get tired of not having their voices heard and losing faith in the system.

Welch and Rajakovich (2012) inform us that civic education is no longer a priority, and in many schools is not even in the curriculum. Communities throughout Arizona have experienced declines in traditional service clubs, engagement by business in civic life, and a reduction in venues for dialogue among those with different perspectives; civic and political discourse are not taking place. An environment where individuals are focused on campaign and social issues they are aligned with creating a mismatch when it comes to solving complex, complicated, large scale problems that require community mobilization. Welch and Rajakovich (2012) deduce that sparking civic engagement is crucial, especially when only four out of every ten inhabitants are Arizona natives, and every one in five live in poverty.

Grier and Olivas (2012) suggest public discourse and civic engagement must be fostered so citizens feel empowered as decision-makers. Then they can engage in considering multiple points of view and perspectives, have meaningful dialogue, widening perspectives, and thinking critically to help the process of deliberative democracy take place so Arizonans can gain trust in the citizen-driven government once again. Prescott-Smith (2012) introduces us to the idea of civil discourse, when people are willing to explain their reasoning behind their opinions while others listen and try to understand their stance. It is a valuable tool for communication for political polarization. Prescott-Smith (2012) calls for more nonpartisan efforts to promote and encourage civil discourse which would lead to a more informed electorate. Without a well informed electorate, democracy cannot be successful. John Boehner (Former Speaker of the United States House of Representatives from 2011 to 2015) provides us an example of when

civil discourse not happening at our highest government levels, according to Pilkington (2015),

Boehner used the last time a shutdown happened, in 2013, as an example of rightwing conservatives acting as ‘false prophets’. ‘The whole idea that we were going to shut down the government to get rid of Obamacare in 2013, this plan never had a chance,’ he said, adding that it was a ‘fool’s errand.’

Grier and Olivas (2012) outline of the three tenets of deliberative democracy: representativeness, deliberation, and influence. The best practices to foster public discourse, civic engagement, and deliberative democracy are: bringing everyone to the table; helping people see themselves as actors; making listening as important as speaking; connecting personal experiences with public issues; welcoming and exploring a wide range of views about the issue; encouraging reasoned argument; connecting government and policy making with governance; and finally creating an ongoing process, not an isolated event. With these practices being fostered and encouraged, any community can adapt to confront any issues it is facing, including wage theft.

Macedo et al. (2015) conclude that communities with higher civic engagement rates possess three features: (1) citizens are asked to participate, (2) citizens feel like they matter and make a difference because they see their activism influences decisions and policies made, (3) citizens have opportunities to work directly with elected officials and agency staff. In order to promote these features, local governments need to create opportunities for citizens to become involved in issues that matter to them and community organizations need to be structured in ways to encourage civic engagement.

Mission Creep

Machado et al. (2005) conclude that nonprofits are increasingly becoming financially accountable. As a result nonprofits are running themselves with a businesslike model made for efficiency. More likely than not, many nonprofits have funders that want to maximize their investment and require measures, deliverables, and benchmarks.

Young (2006, 39) explains “nonprofit organizations have become more competitive and market-oriented in their quest to remain financially viable and to address growing social needs, and at the same time more aware of their need to be accountable to the public for their performance and behavior.” Boris (2006) informs us “a pervasive bottom-line orientation may inadvertently affect even nonprofits that do not have government contracts or commercial revenues; it may increase efficiency but could also undermine charitable service missions.” Frumkin (2002) adds that financial pressures within the sector has led to an increased emphasis on performance evaluations. Pressures to produce successful returns on evaluations hurt the nonprofit sector’s ability to provide services for the most needy. The AIAWJ had a grant through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration that restricted how the money could be used, required conducting ongoing workplace safety trainings, and had rigorous reporting standards, too much for an organization with one paid staff member.

Frumkin (2002) tells us that when comparing funding sources including, government, individual donations, corporate and foundation grants, federated gifts, and service fees, that government grants while being the most difficult to administer and account for were the least flexible to mission and program priorities. Government grants

were also found to be the least reliable over time, making long-term financial planning difficult.

Steuerle and Hodgkinson (2006, 102) informs us of the dominance of large organizations, “organizations with more than \$10 million in expenses make up a mere 4.2 percent of total organizations but have 80 percent of the total assets and 82 percent of the expenses. Correspondingly, 79 percent of organizations (those with less than \$500,000 in expenses) have only 2.5 percent of total expenses and 4.5 percent of the total assets.”

Major donors and foundations are directing their funding philanthropy to bigger organizations that will show some sort of return, leaving the majority of organizations to fight for the left over scraps, taking away from their mission, service provision, and civic engagement activities.

Is there a downside?

Macedo et al. (2015) informs us that under the IRS regulation 501(c)(3) nonprofits, or charitable organizations, have limited ability on legislative lobbying and grassroots mobilization. “One problem is a simple lack of clarity. The law governing public charities says that nonprofits may not lobby to any ‘substantial’ degree, but what constitutes ‘substantial’ lobbying in this context” (Macedo et al., 2015, 133). A vast majority of nonprofit executive directors believe the lobbying law is much more restrictive than in actuality and thus limit their advocacy.

M. Kweit and R. Kweit. (1981) argue that there are some problems with citizen participation. To begin with, the structure of our government is not set up for high amounts of public participation. This is why we have elected officials and the bureaucrats to administer their decisions; our job is in the polling booth. Regulations that guide the

bureaucratic decision making process may also limit any impact the public may be able to have. Another issue is that citizens usually start out with too-lofty expectations which are not met. There is also a lack of consensus on what citizen participation is and what type of activities it comprises. There are two models of citizen participation, collectivist and individual. Collectivist believe the government has the public's best interest in mind, everyone chooses common good over individual or group needs. The individualist model believe the public best interest is arrived at from what the aggregate want. Individualist also demand a decision making process to decide on or notify the government what their demands are. Individualist want everyone to be part of all the decision making while collectivists feel that perhaps input from the public on every decision is not the best policy to follow. However, both models are actually poorly suited for effective participation of the public.

Success Stories

Roberts (2012) provides a narrative from Houston, TX explaining that a coalition named Down with Wage Theft consisting of 29 organizations, most notably the Houston Interfaith Worker Justice Center, otherwise known as Fe y Justicia (translated “faith and justice”) Worker Center, gathered to give testimony and demand action from the Houston City Council during its open session. They proposed an ordinance, developed through by the coalition and spearheaded by the Interfaith Workers Justice Organization and submitted it to the city’s legal department in early February 2012. In the proposal are provisions for an administrative hearing process to be conducted by the Office of Business Opportunities. This same office is where the proposal suggests a worker could bring forth a claim. A ban for companies found guilty of wage theft from getting city

contracts and businesses licenses and permits needed to continue operating in the city was also a part of this proposal.

Valdez (2015) reports that a wage theft ordinance recently passed in El Paso, TX and is the second city in our country to do so after Houston. In similar fashion it was championed by the Lift El Paso Up Alliance. Cases will no longer take over a year to process, but now the city hear cases in civil court. Valdez (2015) says “the ordinance will enable the city to penalize employers who have court convictions or civil judgments ruled against them by courts or the Texas Workforce Commission.” Violators will no longer get city contracts and they will be recorded in a database for 3 to 5 years. This process was started when a campaign of organized labor worked with the local Catholic Diocese and the El Paso Office of Peace and Justice to organize an annual Labor Day Mass called Blue Mass which is based on Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (1891), which was further developed by Saint Pope John Paul II in his encyclical *Laborem Exercens* (1981). The event highlighted and elaborated upon parts of Saint Pope John Paul II’s (1981) encyclical including: dignity of work (work is more than a commodity, it is an expression and part of our identity), labor and capital (the worker who turns raw materials into goods should have part ownership), full employment (anyone who wants to work can find work), wage and benefits (workers should be able to support their family at a minimum), unions (all jobs should have collective bargaining), and lastly emigration and work (countries should have laws to protect immigrant workers to ensure equal treatment). All were values that the AIAWJ embraced and organized civic engagement around. Although as time passed and funding became more difficult to secure the AIAWJ lost sight of the interfaith part of their social network.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This is a qualitative research project aimed at evaluating organizational membership and its relation to civic engagement. I utilized a single case study geared towards an in-depth analysis of members of the AIAWJ and their civic engagement activity both before, during, and after their involvement with the organization. This is a participant observation study as well as a descriptive case study seeking explanatory causal relationships. I accomplished this by conducting semi-structured interviews. Knowledge and experience gained from interviews helped guide modifications and adjustments to the research design, hypothesis, and conclusions. Data from the interviews were cross analyzed with research conducted as well as compared and contrasted with the other interviews to identify relationships with the narrative.

A case study is the best option for this project because it guided the researcher to identify the sample population to interview. A case study allowed the researcher to vary data collection via interview using different tactics or methods as needed to gather information on attitudes and behaviors on civic engagement. Sullivan and Rassel (1999) help us understand a case study will allow three points of analysis, (1) the extent which social relationships are significant which allows a distinction made in social theory between behaviors and actions, (2) provide notion of social order, and (3) interpret social structures.

Interviews allowed the researcher to find connections between data collected and the research conducted. This case study is not exclusive to the AIAWJ, data is also

gathered from agencies and organizations with which the AIAWJ collaborated. The research design offers the best method of obtaining a realistic view of the lived world that cannot be explained solely by analysis of numerical data.

When I began, the research question was, what are the consequences for other members of the organization and their civic engagement; what barriers do they face to civic engagement and how does the loss of the AIAWJ add to the lack of resources that make up the barriers of civic engagement already being faced? But as I further investigated, carrying out the interviews, and analyzing them, it shifted to ask: What are the connections between people and mediating structures in relation to civic engagement? What barriers to civic engagement do mediating structures help overcome? What happens if mediating structures go away? The new research question ~~I feel~~ guides the analysis towards an inclusive narrative that can be used to address questions going forward that apply to more than just the AIAWJ.

Role of Researcher

The researcher was a member of the AIAWJ, having been an intern during the summer of 2015 followed by continued volunteerism until its closing. On a hierarchical scale all interviewees would have been above the researcher within the organization, such as executive directors and board members. The researcher represented himself as an Arizona State University Graduate Student and not as a past intern.

Because the research question was came from the researcher own personal experience and because the researcher was also a part of the AIAWJ, there is a potential to be biased. This could lead to overlooking small details because the researcher thinks

they know everything already. There is also a potential to analyze and translate data in a manner that is favorable to the AIAWJ and the research question.

Participants

I interviewed executive directors and board members from the AIAWJ from its founding members through the members during its swan song. The ultimate goal was to obtain interviews that provided me with multiple perspectives that lead to a causal relationship between organizational activity or inactivity and civic engagement. In order to ensure their identity is not revealed the participant names will not be used or presented anywhere in the data or thesis, rather pseudonyms are assigned.

Informed Consent

It was determined that informed consent was needed in order to conduct ethical research. Possible risks that were identified were, possible emotional discomfort reflecting on the decline of the AIAWJ. Participants were also informed that there was no promise of any benefits to them or others from your taking part in this research. Participants were informed of the research question and objectives, why they were being recruited for an interview, and what was being done with information gathered. Interviewees were informed of their voluntary participation and were given the option of stopping the interview, leaving at any time, and the right to decide to have the data gathered to be omitted. Informed consent was obtained for each interviewee before the interview was conducted.

Data Gathering

Information and statistics used from secondary sources for cross analysis was gathered from preexisting sources to include: academic books, academic journals,

organizational publications, and government publications. I used archival data to gather statistics on civic engagement in Arizona, more specifically in Metro Phoenix from within the last five years. This included which demographics are most active and most excluded. I gathered information from recent current events to provide a narrative of the atmosphere in Phoenix around civic engagement. I drew upon publications and legislation put out by the city, county, and state, as needed to address questions that arose around civic engagement in Arizona and Phoenix, the local nonprofit sector, and what barriers exist between them. Academic journals were utilized to help understand concepts such as mission creep and other theories applied to provide framework and support for the research.

Interview Structure

Interviews were semi-structured. The researcher had sixteen questions prepared to guide the interview. The interview consisted of open-ended questions, there were not any yes or no questions. Most questions were tiered with follow up questions such as challenges faced and lessons learned in the case that the interviewee has more to share on one question than the other. The interviewees was encouraged to describe thoughts in more detail and to share things that perhaps they felt were neglected by the researcher. After the conclusion of interviews, questions were updated and modified to allow future interviews to flow more smoothly.

Interviews

Interviews provided answers to the how much, how often, and why questions. Interviews were all conducted face to face. According to O'Sullivan and Rassel (1999, 187-195) interviewing in person yields better conversation and thus data. One-on-

one interviews gather in depth, detailed, complicated, and sensitive data. Interviews were recorded for later transcription, however it is important to remember that while tape recording cannot record mannerisms or other non-verbal cues during the interview so the researcher also took notes when necessary. The interview questions were emailed to interviewees ahead of time so they had a chance to review them and prepare if they desired. This also helped to keep the interviews to about thirty to forty minutes and avoiding the interview from becoming long, drawn out, and cumbersome. It was important to remember to find a balance between colloquialism and professionalism during the interview.

Interview locations varied. Interviewees were given the choice of meeting me at a study room in the Burton Barr Central Library in Downtown Phoenix or any meeting place that was convenient for them. This was to ease the recruiting aspect or convenience, time, and travel that may have acted as a deterrent. Two interviewees did take the offer of the study room. Appropriately, the first interview was conducted at the AIAWJ's old office. I also met an interviewee at the Puente Human Rights Movement headquarters. One interview required that I drive down to Tucson, a ninety minute drive, but worth it for the face-to-face interaction. Unfortunately one of the audio recording files became unusable so I was unable to finish the transcription. Data from that interview was omitted.

Transcription

There is no standard formatting procedure to follow for transcription of interviews. The transcription method used was designed to make analysis easier. It was decided that partial transcription would meet the needs for this case study. The

transcriptions are considered partial due to a few omissions of when we got off track and discussed nothing related to the topic. Essentially the select omissions serve the same purpose as if I paused the audio recording. Code names are used instead of actual names to protect identity.

There are three principles that guided the transcription process were provided by Mclellan, Macqueen & Neidig (2003) “[(1) preserve the morphologic naturalness, (2) preserve natural transcript structure, and (3) transcripts are an exact reproduction of the conversation.]” It is important to keep the word form as well as the sentence structure of the interviewee. This allows for better analysis understanding of the data gathered. It is ethical that the participant should be represented with accuracy to not only maintain their trust but to also improve the credibility and reliability of results and conclusions.

Analysis Method

Kuckartz (2014) suggest using the hermeneutical approach for conducting qualitative analysis. The hermeneutical approach is a four step process, the first step being to reflect on own assumption, preconceptions, and bias in regards to the research question. The second step is to be aware of and avoid the hermeneutic circle, without understanding any topic as a whole the individual parts cannot be understood. For example if someone is unfamiliar with a certain culture or community they will not understand the actions, behaviors, values, and traditions of that culture or community. The third step is to be aware of the hermeneutical difference. That is, we all generally interpret text and communication differently depending on our own understanding of the world and lived experience. The fourth step is accuracy and suitability of text, data,

pictures, and other sources. It is important to make sure that all information used is important to the research question.

Limitations

The biggest limitation was inexperience and unfamiliarity with conducting interviews for an academic purpose. Greater familiarity with what questions to ask, data to gather, and how to analyze it could have resulted in a more efficient research design. Another limitation is the researcher only spoke English, preventing the likelihood of interviewing Spanish-speaking only members of the AIAWJ. Even for those participants that were bilingual, especially those with English as a second language, an interview in Spanish could have yielded better reactions, body language, as well as more detailed answers.

When it comes to establishing a causal relationship more interviews would have been preferred. Unfortunately 6 potential interviewees did not respond at all despite multiple attempts at contact, and one person declined. The willingness of potential participants to take part in the study was overestimated.

Values are subjective and ambiguous. They are hard to quantify into solid data for analysis. Because of different participants have different values the results from this study would be difficult to recreate having interviewed different participants.

Most of the limitations faced were overcome by advice from the Thesis Committee Chair. One such piece of advice was to accept the number of interviews I was able to get and find more ways to engage in analysis with them. It was also suggested I cull data from the published documentary on the center, especially to gain access to anecdotal data from community members with whom I didn't have contact due to

language barriers. The very structure of the thesis process helped me to overcome my biggest limitation, inexperience.

CHAPTER 4

KEY FINDINGS

Analysis will be done by taking major concepts from the literature and cross analyzing them with the interviews in order to find themes, keeping in mind the research question: how does the loss of the AIAWJ add to the lack of resources that make up the barriers of civic engagement already being faced? Does the closure of the AIAWJ reproduce the narrative of how the nonprofit system undermines the social justice mission and consequently, the stability of workers' rights organizations, like the AIAWJ?

Concepts that will be discussed include: prior civic engagement, civic engagement climate in contemporary Arizona, social network, over-engagement, how the search for funding hurts organizations like the AIAWJ, and civic engagement activity since the AIAWJ.

Prior Civic Engagement

All participants were well versed and had prior labor organizing, civic engagement, or nonprofit sector experience. Recalling Zukin et al. told us those who grow up in households that discuss political and social matters are more likely to be civically engaged. I believe this is also true for those who already have a long history of civic engagement even if it was not spawned from their childhood home. Robert reported having a community oriented upbringing that has given him a civic engagement paradigm, and guided him from being a volunteer to being president of the board in short period of time:

For me personally I have a long tradition of civic engagement I think I grew up being taught civic engagement as part of my family's culture and principle always

be community involved, give to your community, um so it is something I grew up with and is kind of how I became involved with the Worker Rights Center. I met some of the former directors at school and when I found out they were involved at the workers right center it caught my attention and connected me to stuff I was always kind of involved in civic engagement and participation so I gravitated over to see what they were doing at the Worker Rights Center and like you said I quickly became a big part of it joining the board and then becoming the board president. (Appendix F)

Juan was a union organizer before his time as executive director stating:

I was part of the organizing plan when we were creating the organizing plan I was suggesting a lot of stuff. And you know in that time I was working with the Union, I was still the gate to get the union support for the worker enter. I was very involved with what they were doing with that. (Appendix D)

And he eventually became president of the board of directors after he was the executive director. He is also the person who is setting up the new worker rights center.

Ana is a nonprofit professional. Being that her employment history and future plans for employment are in the nonprofit sector, civic engagement for one cause or another is bound to happen. Ana points out the nature of the work:

A little bit of everything as well from protesting, being on different committees, going to the state capital, being recognized by state legislators for the work the center had done. Um being named on the floor that was really exciting that was one of the best things. Um protesting, getting paid to protest as I always jokingly

said. Um forming different committees, being on different boards of directors.

(Appendix G)

Whether they exits for workers, children, animals, the environment, or the town fair involvement of patrons, volunteers, and professionals is likely to lead to civic engagement

Civic Engagement Climate in Contemporary Arizona

The civic engagement climate is a barrier not mentioned in the literature but mentioned throughout the interviews. Arizona is not a labor friendly state and SB 1070 made matters even worse, people were too scared to leave their house, too scared to engage. How friendly and inviting the organizing environment may or may not be is a barrier not found in any literature reviewed and was something not truly considered. Maria provided me with the perfect example of how unfriendly the environment is in Arizona:

SB1070 and more specifically the neighborhood raids that were happening when Sheriff Arpaio would block off sections of Hispanic neighborhoods um and do patrols. People did not want to leave their homes, they were scared, and participation in the workers right center dropped significantly. Like we could not get anyone to come. (Appendix B)

She further alluded to the idea that participation rates never truly recovered after that. Even though I did not conduct any interviews with regular members of the organization, my observations as an intern and data from research suggest that the political climate being inviting or not is a major barrier faced by this particular community.

Robert presents us with the climate around the kinds of civic engagement the AIAWJ was active in:

I mean Arizona um is not a union friendly state it is not a labor friendly state um you go to Nevada or other nearby states you can see the government locally and federally and different counties are very supportive of unions, very supportive of labor rights, um increases in minimum wage, all these kinds of things. And here in Arizona that climate just doesn't exist. It is exactly the opposite. There are very powerful people, lobbies, and interest trying to keep wages down, union busting, just trying to squash any kind of organizing right labor organizing. It is not a labor friendly state. (Appendix F)

Is the local and state governments with or against the labor movement? Are government officials and administrators easy to contact or are they distant and hard to reach? How much discrimination do the lower classes and marginalized face? How does intersectionality of issues play a role? These are things when addressing barriers to civic engagement that are important to keep in mind.

When discussing learning from successes of other Worker Rights Center in the surrounding states Juan laid out the contrast between them and Arizona, "I don't know but there are some workers centers that are funded by the municipalities or someone else. That's the biggest difference about Arizona, nobody is gonna give us shit." (Appendix D)

Maria paints the picture of how the AIAWJ contributed to the community and civic engagement:

One thing I would mention about the civic engagement too is that um the Worker Rights Center was very unique because of who was leading it, especially when it

was being led by students in the master's program because we, our lens was really about intersectionality and so we brought so many different types of people together and it was a safe place um like there hadn't been anywhere else in Arizona. For example unions met at our...at our um center um there was a LGBT group that could not find a place to meet anywhere else so they met at the center. Um there was a planned parenthood meeting there once. I mean we were so open and that really increased exposure I think to the staff and to the workers to see how all of these things are part of who we are, part of our identities part of a larger identity. (Appendix E)

Exposure is good but this is the type of activity that, if not honed in on for a purpose related to the mission, may lead to over-engagement or risk exposing the organization to new adversaries. The organization did not appear to build the social capital and desired reciprocity that would truly have benefitted the AIAWJ, perhaps there is a way all parties could have benefited from the arrangement.

In the Corporation for National and Community Service's 2015 report on volunteering in Arizona and Phoenix, they did not provide rates for Latin American/Latino demographics. Knowing that there is a large population living and working in the state, the Corporation for National and Community Service (2015) said Latin American/Latino have more obstacles to overcome such as English speaking capability, immigration status, and home ownership, so they could not get a proper statistic to offer. That alone tells us what the political and civic climate is like; the AIAWJ was part of the solution because as part of its service it helped members overcome all three additional obstacles for those it served.

^The Social Network

We have all probably heard the expression “it is a small world.” When it comes to the activist community and network as well as the nonprofit sector of Phoenix it rings true. This same narrative was echoed in the interviews as Robert explained to me:

Phoenix while it’s a big city, it is a big community, but the nonprofit world is small enough that everybody knows each other so you start to run into the same people, start to get to know who is running all the different organizations, um and so um it becomes a word of mouth. Sometimes there is a sharing of memberships so members refer each other to the different services that the different nonprofits do. (Appendix F)

In going to protest, I always recognized the same faces. In fact I crossed paths with a member of my graduate cohort three times, two times in a collaboration attempt with Refugee Focus and once at a public meeting with Department of Homeland Security Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. Maria explains her experience integrating in the social network of organizations:

I’ll start with me. As a staff member I actually moved to Arizona to work for the worker rights center as a Jesuit volunteer. So it was my first introduction to Arizona, to the politics here um and it was how I got to meet the leaders of the other organizations and learns what the community is really focused on organizing around. Um so for me it was um it built exposure, awareness around the issues, the intersectionality of the issues, um and that's how I got connected with so many other groups. Once you have a personal connection with those other groups they will personally ask you to participate in their rallies and their forums

you know support their actions. Um so you know it becomes very personal, with a personal investment. (Appendix E)

Maria explains that the AIAWJ was created with civic engagement in mind:

For the workers that came through the center initially for services we eventually...we eventually kind of tried to plug them in if not try to have them create the opportunities. At least plug them into the opportunities with the things we were doing at the center and um for a lot of them that was the first time they had done anything like that. They felt safe because they were part of an organization they knew us, they knew what our messaging was, our objective was um so this was the first time they would go to a rally of something like that. And they would bring their families so it became you know a great opportunity for them. (Appendix E)

Not only would the AIAWJ empower members help them in their fight against wage theft and other employment violations it would also help them to build social capital.

Ana expressed why she felt civic engagement through the AIAWJ was unique:

I think it gives a window to people who might not know even what civic engagement is a taste of it. It gives an opportunity to people that might be afraid of going to bigger organizations. I always tried to make it a warm and friendly environment as I could in order to get those people engaged. (Appendix G)

Through the AIAWJ marginalized communities could find a bigger voice to empower themselves. If members were willing to put in the personal investment then they would for sure gain exposure to local social movements and build connections at

those events. Maria echoes much of what Robert Putnam concluded, people need to do more than just show up in order to build the necessary social capital

I think um it is not enough to just show up there has to be a lot of work around it and it has to be part of a larger strategy not something you just send people out to. There has to be some work done around it. Real organizing now reminding people first connecting with them, understanding their stories, why this is important to them and then showing them how what they are feeling what their vision is how it connects with this specific action. (Appendix E)

The activity around the engagement needs to be meaningful, er be. Through that meaningful work people will start to develop stronger ties to each other and to the organization.

The Government is Missing from the Local Social Network

Three of the four interviewees mentioned addressing issues with the system of connectedness in the social network between, neighborhoods, organizations, and the government. Recall Macedo et al. (2015) that concluded that communities with higher civic engagement rates possess three features. The first is that citizens are asked to participate; in Phoenix that is a no for most people. The second feature is that citizens feel like they matter and make a difference because they see that their activism influences decisions and policies that are made. It took over a year in addition to several protest before a coalition of nonprofits could get the PHXoneID voted on. One such protest went to the offices of the legislators that had yet to vote, calling them out and putting direct pressure on them; and this was just to get the Phoenix City Council to vote on it so there is a lot of work done for a little progress. The third feature is that citizens have

opportunities to work directly with elected officials and agency staff. In Phoenix however the opposite seems to be happening. Robert provides a narrative for the disconnection between the public and local governments:

The other thing I would say is that unfortunately a lot of the institutional organization in the city, county, and state government um they have good intention, good policies, good programs, they all exists kind of...of in the ivory tower. It all exists on paper, in theory, they are not connected to the people on the ground, they are not out in the community, and they are not out at events. They expect people to go to them and know all about them and to seek out their services but they are not at community functions, they are not at the health fair, not at the parks, so people don't know about them. That disconnect between what they do and the people they serve it is very hard to have any kind of relationship with them. Then people end up being mistrustful of them. (Appendix F)

The city administrators and elected officials are never present in the community or at neighborhood events. The absence of elected officials within the community, and the fact that most of the patrons from the AIAWJ fear going to the government due to their immigration status prevents them from seeking justice on many occasions. A majority of the regular members also faced language barriers as well. Maria pointed out to me the Wage and Hour Department in Phoenix has only one fluent Spanish speaker. Juan reminds us:

There is...there is a very important component in the workers center, most of the workers center but specific in Arizona have to do with immigration. Uh most of

the people who used to go to the center probably I want to say 80% to 90% are undocumented people and probably 75% didn't speak English. (Appendix D)

The prediction by the first secretary of the Department of Labor of not having the funds and the need and willingness to cooperate when and with who they want. Both the Wage and Hour Division and the Arizona Industrial Commission would pass on cases to the AIAWJ. As the research shows this is common for many service provision nonprofits to pick up the government slack. Juan discusses how helpful the local government offices and agencies were:

Well unfortunately you know bureaucracy is heavy and most of the time they didn't help us at all. I mean they helped us in a way where we start a public campaign and we could say yes we did do what the government said we were supposed to do. 10% of all the cases that...that...that the system helped us. You know most of the time the positive results were because we did put pressure, you know public pressure, and that was you know the only way.” (Appendix D)

Ana reported that there were weak ties between small organizations and its members, like the AIAWJ, and government departments:

I think just the disparity of it all. The distance. I don't know if you ever been to the wage and hour department that's on Central and Van Buren you have to go through security, it is a federal building. So you have to have ID and you have to get through security. Not a lot of our members wanted to get through security to begin with, knew where the wage and hour division was, or at the very basic level there is always a subgroup in this American culture that is not focused on, not listen too, not given the respect they deserve, but they are such an integral part of

what we do, they are the reason that in my hand I hold a cup that's clean, there is ice in it. It always astonishes me the lack of disparity and the distance between the worlds. I have no problem going to the Wage and Hour Division, I have an ID, I don't mind going through security, and yet I felt odd and weird even going through those same things because I knew a lot of our members weren't going to be able to do that. Didn't have the materials, didn't have the tools that we take for granted, that I take for granted. (Appendix G)

Despite multiple attempts at scheduling an interview with the Wage and Hour Division I only ever received back one response. In that single email, they agreed to interview with me, so I replied to set up an appointment. I never heard back from them after that, despite multiple follow ups? This suggest tring to reach the Wage and Hour Division to file a claim will be difficult and will be a task that is most likely not followed through.

The departments agencies created to assist people are too distant and hard to access creating another barrier to civic engagement. Additionally if Ana, felt uncomfortable and unwelcomed every time going to the Wage and Hour Division, how would a monolingual undocumented Spanish speaker feel? Maria echoed this narrative:

Um with the government agencies specifically I don't think they ever cared. Our partnership only became important like when the Wage and Hour Division for example or the state version of that they are so so underfunded and understaffed. They had one Spanish-speaking person and we have millions of Spanish speakers here. Um and so they would like turn over, they would send people that came there to us, to our nonprofit, and you know our workload was huge also. But um

they wanted to know enough about our services to refer people but I don't think they ever cared that much at all. (Appendix E)

The data, interviews, and observations all agree with each other: the local and state governments are not represented in the communities of Metro Phoenix.

Over-engagement?

Over-engagement was a topic not previously considered that came up during the interviews. Borrowing another popular phrase, "quality over quantity," we cannot do two things at once or be in two places at the same time. Filling up that time with insignificant engagement activities distracts from the mission and could possibly lead to disenfranchisement for those involved. The fact that at one time the AIAWJ had a community garden is very cool idea and can be justified because of the possibility that maintaining it could help build bonds within the organization. But could that time and money be used for more meaningful way by staff and volunteers? Maria recalled how easy it was to fall into patterns of over-engagement:

I think that if it is not done with purpose, I mean that was, civic engagement was part of our mission. Service...service was a big part of the mission, empowering workers, improving work conditions, bringing in faith communities so I think civic engagement is um is..is if it is done strategically, if you're going out into the faith communities, educating them about the issue, involving them in action um preparing workers at the same time to share their stories um helping them connect their personal issues to the larger issue. I mean that is a way of organizing that builds a community. But the way it was done because of the understaffing and

having so many things going on at once, so many services, so many priorities and not really prioritizing on one or two things, just always having so much going on.

Just another task. (Appendix E)

Not only does each activity take away a staff member from performing mission related duties, it must be considered in the organizations budget. She concluded during her time as an executive director at the AIAWJ that any engagement activity must have a purpose that relates to the organizations mission and it needs a strategy to keep it on track.

How the Search for Funding Hurts Small Organizations Like the AIAWJ.

The literature reflects that nonprofit organizations are being run more often with a for-profit business model that is market-oriented and focused on the bottom line. Frumkin (2002) also warned about the performance evaluations that have put pressure on organizations' ability to serve the marginalized because there are no returns in helping the needy. The story Maria provided about the Catholic Campaign for Human Development gives us context of how difficult and fickle the foundation and grant system is:

Here is a story as an example, we were funded by the Catholic Campaign for Human Development, that's where we got all the seed money for this. And Reverend Trina or executive director the first couple years also started the faith labor alliance and opened the Worker Rights Center. She is a Presbyterian minister and Presbyterians have um a more open view on health care, what I am trying to say is they are not pro-abortion but they are pro women getting health services they need. So when the Catholic Campaign for Human Development

found out she was going to be our coordinator they did not like that and said, they called her and told her you either um either we are going to drop all the funds or your quit immediately. She quit that day and I became executive director for about a week before we developed the 3 detector structure for the organization. Um then they still pulled the money that was \$60,000 of \$110,000, immediately we lost over half of our budget. So I mean point being when you rely too heavily on grants that can be pulled any time you can be screwed. (Appendix B)

We have to remember that the most of nonprofit organizations are those with budgets under \$500,000, majority of those under \$100,000. Losing such a big chunk of money seems impossible to recover from. It even allowed the Catholic Church to dictate their staff members.

Grant writing is now a full time position and expertise that is needed in the nonprofit sector. Applying for grants can be a difficult process that takes some trial-by-fire. Juan described to me the difficulty he and many other have when applying for grants:

I think it hurt to apply to grants. That's like a whole nother special trait. You have to know who and how to ask how to apply so the center that was a problem that we had all the time, that we were...we would say that we need just one person to focus on grants or money because sometime we would have a coordinator and he or she wouldn't know what to do, to apply for grants or to represent the worker. So unfortunately you could miss a lot. (Appendix D)

Not only does it take an expert with professional training in filing out grants to stand a chance at actually getting the grant; the field is more competitive and complicated than ever. Robert echoed that same sentiment:

That was ultimately kind of what was our downfall, funding. Very difficult. Take funding it is a small enough community of nonprofits and a smaller world of funders, whether foundations or different organizations all being asked for money from the same people so that money dries up quickly. It's not always spread out evenly. Competition for funds is huge and ultimately if you don't have the money to stay afloat, to keep things going and operating, then you do you have to close and that's what happened to us. (Appendix F)

Eventually the top priority becomes whatever is needed to secure funding. However obtaining too many grants also has its down side. Maria provided an example of how reporting requirements and performance evaluations related to grants and funding hurt the AIAWJ:

But when you rely on these big grants um I mean it's just uh, it is just time prohibitive. It takes so long to write them and like when you get them, especially if it is a federal grant, like we had a grant from OSHA and the reporting requirements were so ridiculous, they were ridiculous, they took up hours and hours of the director's time. Um and there were restrictions on how you use the money. What we really needed was money for to fund the director's position you know cause after I left it basically went down to just one director that lead the organization. (Appendix E)

In order to maintain a favorable grant status with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) a minimum number trainings had to be conducted to educate citizens on their rights when it comes to employee safety. A task such as the one OSHA required hurt the organizations ability and flexibility to address issues that may arise with funding. In the end Maria concluded, “Being a member driven fee organization is one way to work fundraising into the mission. The way we did it doesn't work” (Appendix E).

I was introduced to the struggle with my own personal experience of trying to secure funding during the internship. My time spent working on the SAM (System for Awards Management), the database for government grants, and the Wells Fargo grant I applied for made me understand how confusing and difficult funding an organization within the nonprofit sector is. It demands a trained, full time-professional.

I attempted to write my first grant through Wells Fargo. Even after a graduate level course on grant writing, I still feel like I am not nearly as proficient at it as I need to be. It is like writing a research paper, requiring a lot of time, for which I have nothing to show at the end. The search for funding did take members’ time away from civic engagement and service provision. The AIAWJ was the most successful when they had three executive directors and one was in charge of fundraising.

Civic Engagement Activity Since the AIAWJ

Since my civic engagement opportunities changed after the closure of the AIAWJ, the influencing factor behind my train of thought that led to the research question, I felt this was important to include. ??? Results on continued civic engagement activity since involvement with the AIAWJ were mixed. Juan enthusiastically stated:

ell as I said um that if we keep on the same page that civic engagement is about to educate workers and community, you know, that's what I do, that's my job, and that was my job until last month, you know, uh working with the union, uh working with companies negotiating agreements negotiating benefits for the workers, educating the community about the workers uh probably 90% of my time. (Appendix D)

An it is who I am, it is what I do attitude towards civic engagement is something that more people need to adopt in order for us to operate in our democracy efficiently. We need to be that nation of joiners Tocqueville talked about.

Robert has remained active in the Arizona Faith Network and with the Living Wage Coalition:

Yea so, there is um there is uh, when I was part of the Worker Rights Center I got involved with the living wage coalition which is very active, in fact they are...it is a coalition made up of different organizations that's lead by LUCHA. Um so then other organizations like CASE, Puente participates um different other advocacy groups are at that table and now it is actually trying or is proposing a uh actual amendment that is going on the ballot in November to increase the minimum wage and have a sick leave be part of the, you know work compensation.

(Appendix F)

Robert used the AIAWJ as a doorway into more activism and civic engagement while at the same time building his social network; when one door closed for him, two opened. As Putnam (2000) highlighted someone can't just show up and stand in the back.

While it shows engagement and support for a cause, it is not contributing to the growth of a social network or building any social capital.

Maria, who was active in the AIAWJ the longest stated:

I don't know if this is normal or not but I was burned out when I left. I didn't leave on bad terms I was just drained. I kind of fell out of the activist community for a while, my only personal connection to the movement was through my husband who is a union organizer and does a lot of immigration work. So if he personally invited me to something or the union was doing worker actions I would go but that been my primary involvement since I left the center. (Appendix E)

That same narrative was echoed by the last executive director, "Nothing. I don't know if it is recovery time, but sick and tired of it time, sadness time, yea it's a lot of things" (Appendix G). I believe that Maria and Ana do not suffer compassion fatigue. More so, they are worn out by trying to operate in this system that has been presented in this research.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Social Network Matters

The activist community is very inviting but once inside it was hard to shed the insider/outsider feeling. My time spent with the AIAWJ I did quite a bit of civic engagement activities. In reflection, I realized I did not leave a single event with a larger social network than I when I showed up. I was introduced to people, talked with people, even added them on facebook but never again interacted with them outside of social media or the internet and it is my belief that bond with others are built through experience together. I was never invited to regularly interact on a level that would develop meaning relationships with members connect to the social network, the Phoenix activist community.

For those already deeply involved and connected such as Juan and Robert they will have no issues continuing on with civic engagement and participation in the community. Others will experience a burn out phase that will create a barrier for them to becoming civically active again, eventually seeing their social capital dwindle within the activist network. Still others, the marginalized community, especially both domestic and international migrants will face a barrier of having that medium connect them to become an active in the local civic engagement campaigns. The AIAWJ introduced a lot of people including myself to civic engagement. It very much served as a doorways to greater community involvement. In the end the AIAWJ was what connected me to civic engagement opportunities that I, and I am sure others, have been alienated from ever since.

Different People, Different Barriers

The United States is a diverse country with people from hundreds of different backgrounds, touting a self-proclaimed ethnic and cultural melting pot. Sometimes travelling between states can feel like going to another country. Almost every major city in the U.S. has a Chinatown, Koreatown, Little Italy, and many other communes spread throughout metropolitan areas. Depending on the social forces surrounding a person's position in life, there could be a uniquely different barrier that is more significant than the rest they face so analysis will be done to show perspectives on barriers to civic engagement for the Executive Directors and Board Members, Community Members (Regular Members), as well as compare and contrast with my personal experience.

Executive Directors and Board Members

Normally when we think of executive positions and members of the board we typically think of those in higher social classes, well paid, and highly educated, our "boss's boss". However it is important to point out that in this case, they are made up of working and middle class members. Mediating structures provide regular members of society the opportunity to gain the social capital of sitting on boards of directors and experiencing decision-making roles. Because they are at the top of the nonprofit hierarchical scale, this signals that they were already well connected into the social network and have had time to build social capital. They have had time to learn the local hangouts frequented by the activist community, like the Fair Trade Café. They know which groups represent which community, they know which groups are connected to which coalitions, and also important they know which groups they don't want to be a part of.

When it was time to put the AIAWJ behind them and move forward with their nonprofit careers or find a new voluntary association to belong to, Robert and Juan were able to do so with minimal barriers. Even though Maria said she has not been politically or civically active in the AIAWJ's wake, from my observation she was still very connected to the social network and can choose to do become active again when she wants to. Her husband is a union organizer so she has access to the current worker-related issues and legislation. Ana had a different focus; she needed to find new work first and foremost. That is why we have to remember that everyone involved with the AIAWJ were workers and loss of employment is a big barrier not only to civic engagement but to all aspects of modern life.

Community Members (Regular Members)

I did not interview any regular members, with the patron base being primarily Spanish-speaking. But from gathering secondary data, analysis from interviews, as well as my observations, I would suggest that the biggest barrier faced by the regular member base is the political climate. Maria's example of membership activity rates sharply declining and never fully recovering after SB1070 was put into place supports this idea. At best this is an assumption based on the data from interviews and from previously researching the immigrant narrative, especially if they are undocumented, of living in constant fear. It is a confusing message for migrants that the same entity trying to arrest and deport them is the same one they need to go to for help in recovering wages.

Identification of my barrier

I came to the conclusion losing access to civic engagement was because I did not develop my social network outside of the AIAWJ, My time spent with the AIAWJ I did

quite a bit of civic engagement activities. In reflection, I realized I did not leave a single event with a larger social network than when I showed up. I was introduced to people, talked with people, even added them on facebook, but never again interacted with them outside of social media or the internet, and it is my belief that bonds with others are built through experiences together, in person, not through liking a post. I was never invited to regularly interact on a level that would develop meaningful relationships with members in order to connect to the social network, the Phoenix activist community.

Going Forward

For those already deeply involved and connected such as Juan and Robert they will have no issues continuing on with civic engagement and participation in the community. Others will experience a burn out phase that will create a barrier for them to becoming civically active again, eventually seeing their social capital dwindle within the activist network. Still others, the marginalized community, especially both domestic and international migrants will face a barrier of losing their mediating structure which connected them to the local civic engagement campaigns as well as teach them about the culture and workplace in the United States. The AIAWJ introduced a lot of people including myself to civic engagement. It very much served as a doorway to greater community involvement. In the end the AIAWJ was what connected me to civic engagement opportunities that I, and others, have been alienated from ever since.

REFERENCES

- Alder, L. H., Tapia, M., Turner, L. (2014). *Mobilizing against inequality unions, immigrant workers, and the crisis of capitalism*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Allen., A. L., Regan, M. C. (1998). *Debating Democracy's Discontent*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- AZ SB1070. (2013) | *Fifty-first Legislature 1st Regular*. (2013, January 22). *LegiScan*. Retrieved November 16, 2016, from <https://legiscan.com/AZ/bill/SB1070/2013>
- Berger, P., L. & Neuhaus, R., J. (1996). *To Empower People, From State to Civil Society*. M. Novak (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: The AEI Press.
- Bernhardt, A., Milkman, R., Theodore N., Heckathorn, D., Auer, M., DeFilippis J., Spiller, M. (2009). *Violations of employment and labor laws in America's cities. Broken laws, unprotected workers*. National Employment Law Project, Center for Urban Economic Development. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Institute for Research on Labor and Employment. Retrieved from <http://nelp.org/content/uploads/2015/03/BrokenLawsReport2009.pdf>.
- Bender, P. (2010). The Arizona Constitution. In Shelton, P., Jones, J., & Proctor, M. (Eds.), *Arizona's government: the next 100 years* (pp. 33-46). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Benenson, J. R. (2015). Civic engagement as a pathway toward economic opportunity: A multimethod study of low-income individuals (Order No. 3685484). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1666453336). Retrieved from <http://login.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1666453336?accountid=4485>.
- Bobo, K. (2011). *Wage theft in America, why millions of Americans are not getting paid and what we can do about it*. The New Press New York: NY.
- Bonner, G.,A. and Burns, E. 1951. *Theories of Surplus Value*. London, UK. Lawrence & Wisharts.
- Boris, E. T., & Steuerle, E. C. (2006). *Nonprofits and Government collaboration and conflict*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Box, R. C., (2005). *Critical Social Theory in Public Administration*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp.

- Breen, W. J., (1997). *Labor market politics and the Great War : the Department of Labor, the states, and the first U.S. Employment Service, 1907-1933*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Brown, H. (2014). The Institutional Digital Divide: *Immigrant-Serving Nonprofit Organization Adoption of Social Media*. *Social Science Computer Review* 2015, Vol. 33(6) 680-695. sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav DOI: 10.1177/0894439314563002.
- Corporation for National and Community Service. (2014). *Volunteering and Civic Engagement in Arizona*. National Conference on Citizenship. Retrieved October 3rd, 2016. <https://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/AZ>.
- Couto, R., A. & Guthrie, C. (1999). *Making Democracy Work Better, Mediating Structures, Social Capital, and Democratic Prospect*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Crouter, A. C., & Booth, A. (2004). *Work-family challenges for low income parents and their children*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Denning, L. S., (1999). *Finding Virtue's Place, examining America's civic life*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing.
- Desilver, D. (2016). *U.S. voter turnout trails most developed countries*. Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (August 2, 2016). Retrieved Sept 14, 2016. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/08/02/u-s-voter-turnout-trails-most-developed-countries/>.
- Fabes, R. (2014). *Family Dynamics*. In Koppel, J., Daugherty B. D., Garcia J., & Whitsett, A. (Eds.), *Arizona's vulnerable populations* (pp. 44-52). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- FLSA Cases in Federal Court, 1990, 1993–1999, 2000–2013. (2013). [Bar graph, by year and cases]. Seyfarth Shaw LLP. Retrieved from <http://www.wagehourlitigation.com/files/2013/07/FLSA-Cases-Filed-2013.pdf> .
- Freer, R. E., (1997). *Finding our roots, facing our future*. Lanham, MD: Madison Books.
- Frumkin, P. (2002). *On being nonprofit*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Garcia, J. (2015). *Human Capital*. In Koppel, J., Daugherty B. D., Garcia J., & Whitsett, A. (Eds.), *Arizona's economy* (pp.62-70). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.

- Grier, M., & Olivas, A. (2012). *Deliberative democracy*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 63-71). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Hart, B. (2015) *Concluding Thoughts*. In Koppel, J., Daugherty B. D., Garcia J., & Whitsett, A. (Eds.), *Arizona's economy* (pp.86). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Hauptmann, J. (2005). *Toward a Theory of Civic Engagement*. Park University International Center for Civic Engagement Center. Parkville, swKoppel, J., Daugherty B. D., Garcia J., & Whitsett, A. (Eds.), *Arizona's vulnerable populations* (pp. 7-26). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Holdaway, S. (2000). Theory and method in qualitative research. In Burton, D. (ed.). *Research training for social scientists*. pp156-166: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9780857028051.d20.
- Interfaith Worker Justice. 2015. "Wage Theft Primer"
<http://www.iwj.org/resources/wage-theft-an-introduction>.
- Jennings, M. and Vicki Zeitner. The Public Opinion Quarterly Vol. 67, No. 3 (Autumn, 2003), pp. 311-334. Internet Use and Civic Engagement: A Longitudinal Analysis
<http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/stable/3521642>.
- Johnson-Hakim, S., Kirk, C., Rowley, R., Lien, A., Greenleaf, J. & Burdsal, C., (2013). Exploring Civic Engagement at an Urban Commuter Campus: Pathways and Barriers. *Journal Of Prevention & Intervention In The Community*, 41(4), 279-290. DOI: 10.1080/10852352.2013.818493.
- Keeling, M. (2013). *Mission Statements: Rhetoric, Realty, or Road Map to Success?* Knowledge Quest, 42(1), 30-36.
- Komar, K. (2010). *Legislative methods in Arizona*. Thesis, Masters of Social Work. Arizona State University. Phoenix, AZ. Print.
- Koppel, J., Daugherty B. D., Garcia J., & Whitsett, A. (2014). *Introduction*. In Koppel, J., Daugherty B. D., Garcia J., & Whitsett, A. (Eds.), *Arizona's vulnerable populations* (pp. 7-26). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Kweit, M. G., KIweit, R.,W. (1981). *Implementing Citizen Participation in a bureaucratic society. A contingency approach*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Lanning, K., Rider, M., & Hornback, T. (2012). *Local businesses, economic development, and civic engagement*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town*

- hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 135-140). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Leighninger, M. (2012). *Identifying the engagement gaps*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 74-81). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Linden, R. M., (2002). *Working across boundaries*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuckartz, U. (2014). *The building blocks of systematic qualitative text analysis*. In *Qualitative text analysis: A guide to methods, practice & using software* (pp. 15-36). London,: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446288719.n2.
- Macdonald, M. P. (2015). *2014 November General Election Turnout Rates*. United States Election Project. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida. Retrieved September 4, 2016. <http://www.electproject.org/>.
- Machado, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Democracy at Risk*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- MacLaury, J. (1998). *A Historical Guide to the U.S. Government*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved Aug 18, 2016. <https://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/dolhistoxford.htm>
- McLellan, E., Macqueen, K. & Neidig, J. (2003) Beyond the Qualitative Interview: Data Preparation and Transcription. *Field Methods*. 15(1), 63-84. DOI: 10.1177/1525822X02239573.
- McWhortor, P. (2012). *Nonprofits and civic engagement*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 116-123). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Meixel, B. & Eisenbrey, R. (2014). An epidemic of wage, theft is costing worker, hundreds of millions of dollars a year. *Economic Policy Institute*. Issue Brief #345. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.epi.org/publication/epidemic-wage-theft-costing-workers-hundreds/#_note1.
- Morales, M. C., Murillo, E., Paso Del Norte Civil Rights Project, *Border Network For Human Rights, & The Labor Justice Committee*. (2011). Human Rights Report. El Paso, TX: Texas Civil Rights Project. Retrieved from http://texascivilrightsproject.org/docs/wt/wagetheft_ep110623.pdf.
- Mize, R. & Swords, A. (2011). *Consuming Mexican Labor*. North York, Ontario, Canada: Toronto University Press.

- Napier, J. (2011). "Interfaith Dialogue Theory and Native/non-Native Relations." *Illumine: Journal of the Centre for Studies in Religion and Society Graduate Students Association*. 10(1), 77-90. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18357/illumine101201110738>.
- National Issues Forum. (2011). *About*. Dayton Ohio Retrieved October 3, 2016. <https://www.nifi.org/en/about>.
- ONEPHXID. (2016). *Why Support the Proposed ONE PHX ID?* Retrieved on October 7, 2016. <http://onephxid.org/>.
- Parker, David M., Strickler, Susan, Sanders, Laura L., Hennelly, Joseph M. (Eds). (2014). *Industrial Commission of Arizona 2014 Annual Report*. The Research & Statistics Division. Phoenix, AZ: Industrial Commission of Arizona. Retrieved from <http://www.ica.state.az.us/Commissioners/Forms/2014AnnualReport.pdf/>.
- Passantino, A. (2015). *WHD collects nearly 247 million in back wages*. Chicago, IL: Seyfarth Shaw LLP. Retrieved from <http://www.wagehourlitigation.com/dol-compliancerule-making/whd-collects-2015/>.
- Phoenix New Times. (2016). *Arpaio*. Phoenix, AZ: New Times. Retrieved Oct 7, 2016. <http://www.phoenixnewtimes.com/topic/arpaio-6498482>.
- Pilkington, E. (2015, September 27). "Tearful Boehner condemns 'false prophet' conservatives before resignation." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/sep/27/john-boehner-resignation-government-shutdown-will-not-happen>.
- Prescott-Smith, J. M. (2012). *Civil discourse and the quality of engagement*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 58-62). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone the collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rawlings, K. C. (2012). *Introduction*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 13-35). Phoenix, AZ: Hoydyon State
- Roberts J., J. (2012) "Houston Community Rallies to Bring Down Wage Theft. Houston, TX: Down With Wage Theft." Retrieved from <http://downwithwagetheft.org/2012/03/22/houston-community-rallies-to-bring-down-wage-theft>.

- Salant, T. (2010). *Intergovernmental Relations: The State and Local Governments*. In Shelton, P., Jones, J., & Proctor, M. (Eds.), *Arizona's government: the next 100 years* (pp.79-89). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Schlager, E. (2010). *Why Institutions Matter for Good Governance*. In Shelton, P., Jones, J., & Proctor, M. (Eds.), *Arizona's government: the next 100 years* (pp. 23-32). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Schneider, J. (2007) Connections and Disconnections Between Civic Engagement and Social Capital in Community-Based Nonprofits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(4), 572-597. doi:10.1177/0899764006297236.
- Schugurensky, D. (2012). *Civic engagement and participatory governance*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 102-108). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Smith, A. (2013). *Civic engagement in the digital age*. Pew Research Center. Washington, D.C. Retrieved Nov 11, 2015. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2013/04/25/civic-engagement-in-the-digital-age/>.
- Strobeck, K. (2010). *The Legislature and Arizona Government*. In Shelton, P., Jones, J., & Proctor, M. (Eds.), *Arizona's government: the next 100 years* (pp. 47-60). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Sullivan, E., & Rassel R. G. (1999). *Research Methods for Public Administrators*. Library of Congress.
- Tellez, M. (Director). (2013). *Workers on the Rise*. AZ Worker Rights Center: Phoenix, AZ.
- Tellez, M. (2011). Immigration and the state of labor: Building a movement in the valley of the sun. *Latino Studies*, 9, 145–154. doi:10.1057/lst.2011.10.
- Tisch, J. M. (2015). *Latino Civic Health Index*. National Conference on Citizenship. Washington, DC: U.S. National Conference on Citizenship. Retrieved October 3, 2016. <http://ncoc.veracitymedia.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/2015-Latinos-Civic-Health-Index.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2016). *Wage and Hour Division History*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved September 4, 2016. <https://www.dol.gov/whd/about/history/whdhist.htm>.
- Valdez, D.,W. 2015. "El Paso adopts anti-wage theft ordinance" June 6, 2015. El Paso Times. Retrieved July 23,

2015 <http://www.elpasotimes.com/story/news/local/2015/06/16/el-paso-adopts-anti-wage-theft-ordinance/71955886/>.

Vanbiezen, I., Mair, P., & Poguntke, T. (2012). Going, going,...gone? The decline of party membership in contemporary Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 51(1), 24-56. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2011.01995.x

Wade, Michael S. (1976). *The bitter issue*. Tucson, AZ: Arizona Historical Society.

Welch, N., & Rajakovich, E. (2012). *Civic leadership and civic status in Arizona*. In K. Rawlings (Ed.), *100th Arizona town hall report, civic engagement* (pp. 83-91). Phoenix.

Yates, M. D., (1998). *Why unions matter*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Zukin, C., Ketter, S., Andolina, M. Jenkins, K., & Carpini D. X. (2006). *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

IRB EXEMPTION GRANTED

[Ilana Luna](#)
[Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies, School of](#)
 Ilana.Luna@asu.edu
 Dear [Ilana Luna](#):

On 7/19/2016 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol: Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Case Study: The closing of the Arizona Interfaith Alliance for Worker Justice and Implications on Barriers to Civic Engagements in its Wake
Investigator:	Ilana Luna
IRB ID:	STUDY00004455
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRP-502a - TEMPLATE CONSENT SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Open Ended Interview Questions, Category: IRB Protocol; • HRP-503a-

<p>TEMPLATE_PROTOCOL_SocialBehavioralV02-10-15.docx, Category: IRB Protocol;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citi Training 2, Category: IRB Protocol; • Citi Training 1, Category: IRB Protocol; • Confidentiality Agreement, Category: IRB Protocol; • Recruitment Script, Category: Recruitment Materials;

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 7/19/2016. In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Shawn Sickler

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT

Title of research study: Case Study: The closing of the Arizona Interfaith Alliance for Worker Justice and Implications on Barriers to Civic Engagements in its Wake.

Investigator: Principal Investigator: Ilana Luna, Student: Shawn Sickler

Why am I being invited to take part in a research study?

We invite you to take part in a research study because of your connection with the AZ worker Rights Center. You must be 18 or older to participate.

Why is this research being done?

I hypothesize that organization such as the Arizona Interfaith Alliance for Worker Justice closing will harm the community by taking away the medium that allows them to address and fix the problems within the community. This loss will add to lack of resources which make up the barriers of civic engagement they are already facing adding to a narrative of how the nonprofit system undermines the social justice mission and consequently, the stability of workers' rights organizations, specifically this one, of challenging barriers to civic engagement.

How long will the research last?

We expect that individuals will spend 1 hour participating in the proposed activities.

How many people will be studied?

We expect about 8-12 people will participate in this research study.

What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?

We will sit down and I will ask question about your involvement with the AZ Worker Rights Center and the community it engaged with. The interview will be record with an audio recorder for transcription at a later time. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview recorded; you can also change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know. You are free to decide whether you wish to participate in this study.

What happens if I say yes, but I change my mind later?

You can leave the research at any time it will not be held against you. Your interview will be deleted and not used.

Is there any way being in this study could be bad for me?

Possible emotional discomfort reflecting on the decline of the AZ Workers Rights Center

Will being in this study help me in any way?

We cannot promise any benefits to you or others from your taking part in this research.

What happens to the information collected for the research?

Your responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used.

Who can I talk to?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, talk to the research team at **(602)543-5681**

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Social Behavioral IRB. You may talk to them at (480) 965-6788 or by email at research.integrity@asu.edu if:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You have questions about your rights as a research participant.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

Please let me know if you wish to be a part of the study.

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What was your association with the AZ Worker Right Center (AZWRC)?
2. How long did you serve in that role? (Date – Date)?
3. What were your primary functions with the AZWRC?
4. Do you feel organizations like the AZWRC increase participation in civic engagement?
5. What type of civic engagement organizing did/do you take part in (in general)?
6. How did the AZWRC contribute to your civic engagement?
7. How did you use civic engagement to help the AZWRC address the issues of wage theft and labor rights? If so, what were they? Outcomes?
8. Was civic engagement the right tool to help nonprofits like the AZWRC to meet their mission?
9. What percent of your work/involvement/ in your capacity with the AZWRC did you spend on civic engagement? Would you utilize civic engagement more or less? Would you utilize civic engagement any differently?
10. In your capacity with the AZWRC how did you go about recruiting and retaining members, volunteers, and board members as well as keeping them involved and active? Challenges face? Lessons learned?
11. What tactics did you use to educate the community and/or local governments about the AZWRC's mission and campaigns order to spread the message and recruit? Challenges face? Lessons learned?
12. How often did you experience potential new members seeking help, or volunteers offering help that ended up being no shows? What did you do to address it?

13. What portion of your time do you think was spend on finding funding versus tasks that addressed the AZWRC's mission? How would you have spent that time otherwise?
14. How has/did the search for funding affect your ability to carry out tasks related to the AZWRC's mission?
15. What barriers did you encounter in civic engagement when acting on behalf of the AZWRC between the local government and state or federal governmental departments (ex. Wage and Hour Division)? How did you address it? Lessons and Strategies learned?
16. What has your civic engagement activity consisted of since your involvement with the AZWRC ended?

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW: JUAN (PSEUDONYM)

INTERVIEWER: It is hard to work with a bunch of different organizations to set a forum up.

Juan: It is harder when you don't know the players. You know the players, 3 to 5 calls and you can make it.

JUAN: In L.A. there are 5 worker centers at least. You know, San Francisco Pomona, they are all very well organized. Actually I just spend a couple of days out in LA. when I am trying to put the workers center here. To learn from that experience.

INTERVIEWER: Find people that are successful at it!

Juan: And there are. The difference is that the government gives a lot money to the Labor groups.

INTERVIEWER: The state government?

Juan: The state, the city I don't know but there are some workers centers that are funded by the municipalities or someone else. That's the biggest difference about Arizona, nobody is gonna give us shit."

INTERVIEWER: Nothing! I applied for grants during my internship and none of them were accepted.

INTERVIEWER: Did you work for the Arizona Worker Right Center at any point in the past?

JUAN: Actually I was the president. For uh 2 or 3 year. I was President of the board and at the beginning I just started helping them with translation. That's how I got involved with the center.

Interviewer: How long did you serve in that role?

JUAN: I'm not sure, I think it was about two or three years as President of the Board

INTERVIEWER: In your functions as President of the board did you do any organizing with the community?

JUAN: Yea Yea we yea we, I was part of the organizing plan when we were creating the organizing plan I was suggesting a lot of stuff. And you know in that time I was working with the Union, I was still the gate to get the union support for the worker enter. I was very involved with what they were doing with that.

INTERVIEWER: Do unions not often support worker centers?

JUAN: This workers center in particular was created by unions and other folks. The executive Director of the Arizona AFL-CIO. She saw the necessity and other unions too so they decided to work and create make something. There were these two, I don't recall the name. They organized the centers with the unions. At the beginning they put the money to create a dinner. The unions were happy and very involved with the center. Then there was a disconnect and we don't know what exactly happened. But the unions were happy.

INTERVIEWER: How did the Arizona Worker Rights center contribute to your civic engagement or activism?

JUAN: Well it all depends on what you call Civic Engagement. Normally if you say civic engagement someone thinks of the vote process, register to vote, or educating people to vote. I think the workers right center did lots of civic engagement. Because to me yes I think that to vote, getting people to vote, and to defend the vote that's civic engagement, but that's only part of civic engagement. I mean civic engagement to me like you said is to be a civic person. Like if you go to some pace you have to make sure the...the workers

that are there have to be paid well, treated well, so...so to me that is the civic engagement the center was doing. Was educating normal citizens, you know, I mean, why write off the people that are making the food, that are fixing stuff, taking care of the kids, how these people are, is being treated. I think that was a perfect thing the center was doing.

INTERVIEWER: I agree. Civic Engagement is definitely getting together, having that conversation and spreading knowledge.

JUAN: Yes and spreading the reality

INTERVIEWER: What percentage of your time was spent working with the Workers right Center did you spend on civic engagement do you think?

JUAN: Roughly probably 50% yea probably 50%. Yea because most of the time uh as president we were working on, you know having meetings working on organizing plans and stuff like that. But probably the other 50% of the time. Yea, I was a volunteer right and my job allowed to work with my schedule and support other actions, but most of the time, most of my time I was either in a meeting with the workers center board or at actions the other 50% of the time.

INTERVIEWER: In your capacity with the Worker Rights Center how did you go about recruiting and keeping new members and volunteers?

JUAN: One is, and probably the most important is the person that comes looking for assistance or help you know if you educate that person well then that person gets inside and ask if he or she deserve it, you know talking about payment or wages. And that person is going to be so educated he or she is going to understand this is part of the system, the system is broke, that we the workers don't have a strong voice. So if that person understands that then they are going to stay around the center and and help assisting other people. The other one is that they were regular citizens that they, they uh, hear about the center and they just come in are say how can I help? A lot of students, and that was mostly because that Dr. Luna was there and there were like 3 or 4 professors from ASU from the center. The other one is Phoenix is kind of a small city in the activist World, so...so like on weekends when we have events with other organizers we go there and help. When there would be event at the workers center then the other organizers they used to attend. Sometimes when they attended the events they would say "oh we can help too here." you know. So those are the three, people who come for, help assistance, or education, regular citizens who knew about the center who said how can I help here, a lot being from school, the rest being from the other organizations.

INTERVIEWER: Did you ever have a problem with people being no shows, people coming in to ask for assistance or to volunteer and not show up?

JUAN: Yea, unfortunately yes, we had that a lot, cause of um, there are some reasons of that. You know being a Latino myself an immigrant myself, not being English your first language and trying to understand the culture here and how the government works here you know you get discouraged. You know a lot of people were thinking oh yea if I go to this place they are going to help me. And the good thing about the center was that they did not help people. They used to assist and tell the people what their options were so you know sometimes people would say "I have to do it myself? Never mind. Or "this is going to take forever, never mind." Because that was thing every case used to take time.

INTERVIEWER: Time is money right?

JUAN: Time is money. And sometimes more than time, it take a lot of work, so some people say, no, I'm going to no. I want to spend my time here. So unfortunately there are too many of those cases because of I'm going to do it and they don't do it.

INTERVIEWER: How did your search for funding affect your ability to carry out the task related to the mission of the Worker Rights Center?

JUAN: in a very heavy way. I think it hurt to apply to grants. That's like a whole nother special trait. You have to know who and how to ask how to apply so the center that was a problem that we had all the time, that we were...we would say that we need just one person to focus on grants or money because sometime we would have a coordinator and he or she wouldn't know what to do, to apply for grants or to represent the worker. So unfortunately you could miss a lot.

INTERVIEWER: Can you remember the portion of time you spent looking for funding versus addressing the mission.

JUAN: Well in my person I did not spend as much time. I spoke with other unions about the center saying "hey can you give some money to these guys?" So I was more focusing on...on the mission of the center but I know a lot of people spend a lot of time. You know unfortunately coordinators put a lot of time to find money. Yea

INTERVIEWER: What barriers did you encounter in civic engagement did you run into when working on behalf of the worker rights center and with the government, federal, state, local?

JUAN: Well unfortunately you know bureaucracy is heavy and most of the time they didn't help us at all. I mean they helped us in a way where we start a public campaign and we could say yes we did do what the government said we were supposed to do. 10% of all the cases that...that...that the system helped us. You know most of the time the positive results were because we did put pressure, you know public pressure, and that was you know the only way.

INTERVIEWER: Since your involvement with the worker rights center what has your civic engagement consisted of?

JUAN: Well as I said um that if we keep on the same page that civic engagement is about to educate workers and community you know, that's what I do, that's my job, and that my job until last month you know uh working with the union, uh working with companies negotiating agreements negotiating benefits for the workers, educating the community about the workers uh probably 90% of my time.

INTERVIEWER: is there anything I didn't ask about the Workers Right Center or Civic engagement you think I should know or that would benefit me?

JUAN: yea, there is...there is a very important component in the workers center, most of the workers center but specific in Arizona have to do with immigration. Uh most of the people who used to go to the center probably I want to say 80% to 90% are undocumented people and probably 75% didn't speak English. You know. So...so that component made the center more special you know because first we need to educate the worker on the culture, second about the government you know cause there is this misconception that in the United States everything is great you know so people used to say, "hey why is he not paying me, I work why is this person not paying me?" "Why I get hurt on the job they are not helping me?" You know, so going through the system an immigrant says "no this isn't right." You know in most Latin American countries there is

an honor system, you know, so if I do something for you I expect you're going to do something for me. If I get you something I expect you're going to get me something without drama. Cause you know that's the agreement. Here people says "ok I did this and he doesn't want to pay me ok he's the person who is not doing it."

INTERVIEWER: His honor is the one that is hurt?

JUAN: Yea. And unfortunately the other one is religion. Many immigrants and people from Latin America we are very heavy religion people. So sometimes people say, "ok so you don't want to pay me God will punish you. You know so we have to fight a lot with that. So I think going back to the original question is the immigrant portion has a lot...has a lot do with the center. You know because some people will say, you know I'm undocumented so I don't have rights. And they do, they have rights. Being undocumented means you have to be hiding, hiding from the police, from the system. Now when they would come to the center and we would say let's fight with the system

INTERVIEWER: And they are like wait a minute that's who I'm hiding from.

JUAN: Exactly. The reality is they are not our friends, the have a job to do. So you know.

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW: MARIA (PSEUDONYM)

MARIA: I have had a couple roles. From August 2008 through May 2011 I was a labor rights promoter um at that time there was just two of us at the Worker Rights Center um. From May 2001 through January 2013 I was one of the three directors. Then um in 2015 and 2016 I was on the board of directors. So I have had a couple of roles with the Worker Rights Center.

INTERVIEWER: How long were you with the Worker Rights Center for?

MARIA: Well I started in August 2008 and then um worked there through January of 2013, so about 5 years. Then another year and a half as a board member.

INTERVIEWER: What were your primary functions with the Worker Right Center?

MARIA: As a labor rights promoter um I was, that was when we were initially opening the center and um the work was largely service based. Serviced based and doing labor rights trainings, so I um I lead the worker rights trainings and did the case management.um for the workers who were coming in that thought there rights were violated. So doing an intake with them identifying what violations of law there were and then um figuring out what options they had and how they want to try to resolve their issue. That was largely what I did for the first couple years and then as the director the structure, the leadership structure changed a lot. Which I am sure is one of the issue that lead to the eventual closure, but um at one point there was one director with several employees under them. And when we were staffed by primarily folks from the master's program we all had this idea of this horizontal organization um equal shared power um so we had 3 directors. I was director of operations which was kinds of more the administrative and case management. Um which included fundraising. And then there was a director of campaigns so they did a lot of the civic engagement work um the community building, events, leadership training. Um then there was an outreach...education and outreach director, so each director focused on one aspect of the larger mission. So my role was largely like doing the fundraising working with the board of directors.

INTERVIEWER: How do you feel organizations like the Worker Rights Center increase participation in Civic Engagement for employees, volunteers, and the community in general?

MARIA: I'll start with me. As a staff member I actually moved to Arizona to work for the worker rights center as a Jesuit volunteer. So it was my first introduction to Arizona, to the politics here um and it was how I got to meet the leaders of the other organizations and learns what the community is really focused on organizing around. Um so for me it was um it built exposure, awareness around the issues, the intersectionality of the issues, um and that's how I got connected with so many other groups. Once you have a personal connection with those other groups they will personally ask you to participate in their rallies and their forums you know support their actions. Um so you know it becomes very personal, with a personal investment. For the workers that came through the center initially for services we eventually...we eventually kind of tried to plug them in if not try to have them create the opportunities. At least plug them into the opportunities with the things we were doing at the center and um for a lot of them that was the first time they had done anything like that. They felt safe because they were part of an organization they knew us, they knew what our messaging was, our objective was um so this was the first time they would go to a rally of something like that. And they would bring their families

so it became you know a great opportunity for them. I think another branch of folks this affected was, that the group tried to organize was, um the worker rights center started out before 2008, for 2 years it was a faith labor alliance with an executive director put together by the faith community. And the goal was to educate the faith community and plug them into the organizing campaigns and um so that kinds remained a thread. A certain points in our history faith, religion, or working with faith groups, sometimes it wasn't always part of what we were doing and sometimes it was a really intricate part, but those folks, the faith communities we were doing the outreach too or bringing in workers to speak to, for a lot of them that was the first time they heard of many of these issues. Many of them didn't even know what wage theft was or how that was connected with immigration. Um and opportunities were presented to them if this is something that you want to volunteer to come we are doing and action against an employer come support the workers. You know this person that just came and told you their story we are going to go against his employer next week so come. So there are a lot of different people that I think are affected. Also students because we reached out to a lot of people who wanted to do internships and you know they might not have otherwise of gotten involved and it was like a first step in the door. Um does that answer your question?

INTERVIEWER: oh yea definitely. Was that the Arizona Faith Network you were working with or someone else?

MARIA: No so the organization started off as a, well we had a parent group interfaith workers justice it is a national organization, they paid the organizer to come to Arizona kind of establish relationships with the unions and faith communities and then um, and that was her work for years. It was under interfaith workers justice.

MARIA: One thing I would mention about the civic engagement too is that um the Worker Rights Center was very unique because of who was leading it, especially when it was being led by students in the master's program because we, our lens was really about intersectionality and so we brought so many different types of people together and it was a safe place um like there hadn't been anywhere else in Arizona. For example unions met at our...at our um center um there was a LGBT group that could not find a place to meet anywhere else so they met at the center. Um there was a planned parenthood meeting there once. I mean we were so open and that really increased exposure I think to the staff and to the workers to see how all of these things are part of who we are, part of our identities part of a larger identity. Um so I just wanted to mention that I think because of the workers right center intersectionality and the vision the leaders had it increased exposure to different kinds of issues. Like once we did a caravan for peace that had to deal with the drug trade and you know. The drug trade we can connect to the forced migration of people and that's why they end up vulnerable workers here it's easy to tie all this stuff together. And that was something very unique about the Worker Rights Center.

INTERVIEWER: Seems the center was set up well. As a student of the program I can see the vision you all had. So what percent of your time with the Worker Right Center was involved with civic engagement?

Maria: Um for me personally, I as a director anyway um I was not the director that was responsible for the organizing and the collaboration with the other groups so me personally um that was probably like 5% of my role. I think I have an important

perspective because I was the person at the workers right center the longest that the civic engagement I think is really um it is really important for um because if it part of your mission and you're doing it strategically it can really help your organization grow and retain members and keep people excited about the issue, keep it on top of people's minds. Um bring visibility to it and that eventually brings funding and get a larger group of people involved. So I think civic engagement has its part and is really important. I think where we kind of could have improved with it, you know we were so under-resourced and under-staffed that um we kind of threw ourselves into these actions and we were not picky enough about what we participated in so we didn't always have a strong message about why we were doing it and we didn't coordinate well enough, we didn't capitalize on publicity to make sure that our presence there was known at some point it just becomes um a distraction. I think um it is not enough to just show up there has to be a lot of work around it and it has to be part of a larger strategy not something you just send people out to. There has to be some work done around it. Real organizing now reminding people first connecting with them, understanding their stories, why this is important to them and then showing them how what they are feeling what their vision is how it connects with this specific action. What I think ended up happening was you know "oh crap we need to turn out 5 people we committed 5 people can you bring a friend" and you know that is just meaningless. So um as long as it is part of a strategy and is treated that way I can see it really helping to grow and organization.

INTERVIEWER: So you're saying too much engagement can be distracting at some point?

MARIA: I think that if it is not done with purpose, I mean that was, civic engagement was part of our mission. Service...service was a big part of the mission, empowering workers, improving work conditions, bringing in faith communities so I think civic engagement is um is..is if it is done strategically, if you're going out into the faith communities, educating them about the issue, involving them in action um preparing workers at the same time to share their stories um helping them connect their personal issues to the larger issue. I mean that is a way of organizing that builds a community. But the way it was done because of the understaffing and having so many things going on at once, so many services, so many priorities and not really prioritizing on one or two things, just always having so much going on. Just another task.

INTERVIEWER: Having a lot of ambition isn't always bad though.

MARIA: Yea but when, yea, I feel strongly about this now but anyway.

INTERVIEWER: So what kind of tactics did you use to educate to community and local government about the mission. I know you mentioned a few things like, using the faith network, is there anything else you did?

MARIA: For governments um we did a lot...we did outreach to the consulates to um to share, to let them know there were support group people who were already here facing issues at work. Um we the government agencies specifically I don't think they ever cared. Our partnership only became important like when the Wage and Hour Division for example or the state version of that they are so so underfunded and understaffed. They had one Spanish speaking person and we have millions of Spanish speakers here. Um and so they would like turn over, they would send people that came there to us, to our nonprofit, and you know our workload was huge also. But um they wanted to know

enough about our services to refer people but I don't think they ever cared that much at all.

INTERVIEWER: They were just trying to get the people out of their doorstep.

MARIA: Yea

INTERVIEWER: There any other major way people got referred to you?

MARIA: Um others, there was like a hotline that was like a community lead outline, they sent us a lot of people. The other community groups that were like member organizations like ours they would send us people. Um if we ever went on the radio we would get like hundreds of calls, if we did Spanish speaking radio, we did it like 4 times because we would be inundated. There would not be enough people to answer the phones. My first day on the job in 2008 there were 3, we had 4 phone lines and they were going off the whole day nonstop, my boss was sure I was going to quit, the need was tremendous. Um I'm trying to think of how else.

INTERVIEWER: Well the government isn't that easy to educate haha.

MARIA: Yea and it is not like they show up to community events. One thing I didn't think about we did try to, we had a wage theft campaign um that we were initially trying to push as a city ordinance and we were trying to get city council support for that campaign so we met with a couple to talk about what we saw at the workers right center, the stuff that was happening why...what it was we wanted to pass um why that would solve the issue to try to get them on board. We had also done like around the elections we hosted a forum and allowed the candidates to speak. We invited the perspective counsel people to share their ideas about different issues. So that was also a way to increase visibility and exposure to the issues and educate the governmental leaders.

INTERVIEWER: Even though your job was fundraising how do you feel fundraising affects the organization's ability to carry out the mission?

MARIA: I have a lot to say. I think um we had a number of issues as the workers right center. One of the biggest issues was that we relied on these puny grants instead of doing work that would bring in funds and at the same time be promoting the mission. For example we didn't do a whole lot of, after reverend Trina our founder she left and the 3 of us became directors we didn't do a lot of the faith outreach. If you can be financially supported by individual donors and by faith communities um then you're doing your fundraising in a way where at the same time your increasing awareness around wage theft you're inviting people to the organization to become volunteers so that like exactly what I mean when I say the fundraising is doing the mission work. But when you rely on these big grants um I mean it's just uh, it is just time prohibitive. It takes so long to write them and like when you get them, especially if it is a federal grant, like we had a grant from OSHA and the reporting requirements were so ridiculous, they were ridiculous, they took up hours and hours of the director's time. Um and there were restrictions on how you use the money. What we really needed was money for to fund the director's position you know cause after I left it basically went down to just one director that lead the organization. Sometimes there was one other person on staff, so it was always like one or 2 people after me. Um so all they really needed was funds to pay the salary of the director but people only wanted to fund leadership opportunities, or the services aspect, or the wanted to pay for only the equipment, so we ended up buy a projector and a printer when you know we had this need that we couldn't pay for because they were so strict with the

funds. Um and that's where, that's a big part of the problem. The fundraising was my job but it was still only just a small part of it because we had so much on our plate. Another issue was we didn't do a good job with board development and having the board take a big part of responsibility for the reliability and sustainability of the center um I mean the board's role is important in fundraising to make sure we can sustain ourselves. Um our board was not at all...they didn't do any fundraising for us so work that should have been like a 7 person or 10 people or however many people were on the board and it fell onto the shoulders of one person who was also the primary case manager. That would have been more sustainable in the case of fundraising and in relation to going to the churches for fundraising. Having it be a member based fee driven organization, I think that would have had the same benefit of not having restrictions on the money, you're accountable then only to the members because they are the ones paying for your work and investing in your work and when you're having this conversation with them and getting them to become members then your really working on the sustainability of the center. Being a member driven fee organization is one way to work fundraising into the mission. The way we did it doesn't work.

MARIA: Here is a story as an example, we were funded by the Catholic Campaign for Human Development, that's where we got all the seed money for this. And Reverend Trina or executive director the first couple years also started the faith labor alliance and opened the Worker Rights Center. She is a Presbyterian minister and Presbyterians have um a more open view on health care, what I am trying to say is they are not pro-abortion but they are pro women getting health services they need. So when the Catholic Campaign for Human Development found out she was going to be our coordinator they did not like that and said, they called her and told her you either um either we are going to drop all the funds or your quit immediately. She quit that day and I became executive director for about a week before we developed the 3 detector structure for the organization. Um then they still pulled the money that was \$60,000 of \$110,000, immediately we lost over half of our budget. So I mean point being when you rely too heavily on grants that can be pulled any time you can be screwed.

INTERVIEWER: What has your civic engagement consisted of since your involvement with the Worker Rights Center ended?

MARIA: I don't know if this is normal or not but I was burned out when I left. I didn't leave on bad terms I was just drained. I kind of fell out of the activist community for a while, my only personal connection to the movement was through my husband who is a union organizer and does a lot of immigration work. So if he personally invited me to something or the union was doing worker actions I would go but that been my primary involvement since I left the center.

MARIA: I have something add about one of your questions from earlier about challenges to civic engagement. SB1070 and more specifically the neighborhood raids that were happening when sheriff Arpaio would block off sections of Hispanic neighborhoods um and do patrols. People did not want to leave their homes, they were scared, and participation in the workers right center dropped significantly. Like we could not get anyone to come.

INTERVIEWER: Was that when the problem with no shows started?

MARIA: That was a big part of it. Um so immigration status and fear, the culture a fear here was a huge challenge to civic engagement. Why would you put yourself on the line to help a worker who doesn't even work in your workplace to fight against his employer? You know like people might take risks for themselves but probably not just anyone else, especially someone they are just meeting at the workers right center. So many...let's say in order to get the case management service the workers had to go through a training and they...let's say 20 people went through the training and then when we did our follow up appointments maybe 8 would come to the appointment and of that maybe 1 would do something about it. And that 1 person the vast majority of times would want to file a claim with the state agency, they did not want to confront their employer. There was just so much fear that they were not willing to seek any kind of remedy or recourse and they were owed thousands and thousands of dollars. That's not considering minimum wage and overtime violations.

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW: ROBERT (PSEUDONYM)

INTERVIEWER: What was your association with the workers right center.

ROBERT: I started off as a volunteer in 2012 and then joined the board um late in that same year um then became president of the board from 2013 to 2015.

INTERVIEWER: How long was that over?

ROBERT: A little over 3 years. 2 years as the board president.

INTERVIEWER: You went from volunteer to president quickly.

ROBERT: Yea I did and we will talk about that but there was a lot of turnaround um and need for people to fill certain roles. So yea I got onto the board quickly and it just so happened Juan was stepping down and so when that position opened up I volunteered as a nominee for that position.

INTERVIEWER: Nice! What were your primary functions with that role?

ROBERT: As the president of the board it was kind of about keeping tabs on the board and gathering everybody. We had meetings, sometimes we would go uh with having meeting once a month and when things needed to get done and the board was more of a working board we would meet twice a month. It was about setting an agenda for the meetings, and also doing a little bit of kind of coaching and uh making sure everyone was sticking to the mission and everyone was committed to their roles at the center. Making sure we were financially solid, that there was fundraising activities going on and supporting the executive director in their role.

INTERVIEWER: Other interviews people mentioned sticking to the mission can be a challenge

ROBERT: And that's why having a mission is important so you can always go back to it and say are we doing what we said we were supposed to be doing, but it was hard not to.

INTERVIEWER: Do you feel organizations like the Worker Rights Center increase participation in civic engagement.

ROBERT: um Very much so I mean I think um a lot of the grassroots organizations that exists nowadays are very heavily geared towards civic engagement really trying to move. Although the Worker Rights Center and a lot of other organizations around town are service oriented. Um I think a lot of it is starting to move towards more civic engagement or being active in social justice stuff. Um building leadership, using membership and educating and training people to be an advocate for themselves um rather than just coming and receiving a service then going back to their situation and their communities who could use civic engagement as a way to empower people um and have them be an advocate for themselves and be able to spread the word to others about how they can effect change and try to change things for their...for things that affect them in their daily lives and I think civic engagement is a big big part of that.

INTERVIEWER: That's actually a good segway to a question I was going to ask later, what tactics did you use to educate the community, local government, staff, volunteers, about the mission of the Worker Rights Center.

ROBERT: A lot of word of mouth.um Phoenix while it's a big city. It is a big community, but the nonprofit world is small enough that everybody knows each other so you start to run into the same people, start to get to know who is running all the different organizations, um and so um it becomes a word of mouth. Sometimes there is a sharing of memberships so members refer each other to the different services that the different nonprofits do. Other times it can be more competitive, you know working on that

membership model so sometimes it is a little bit of a battle for memberships. A lot of radio spots, getting on the public radio you know to promote working with the department of labor or the equal employment opportunity division, um compensation lawyers. So those are the ways some media, other organizations referring people to us and word of mouth.

INTERVIEWER: How did the Worker Rights Center contribute to your civic engagement, and what does that consist of?

ROBERT: For me personally I have a long tradition of civic engagement I think I grew up being taught civic engagement as part of my family's culture and principle always be community involved, give to your community, um so it is something I grew up with and is kind of how I became involved with the Worker Rights Center. I met some of the former directors at school and when I found out they were involved at the workers right center it caught my attention and connected me to stuff I was always kind of involved in civic engagement and participation so I gravitated over to see what they were doing at the Worker Rights Center and like you said I quickly became a big part of it joining the board and then becoming the board president. It just reinforced what I always kind of done in term of being involved in community outreach, grassroots organizing, and doing that kind of civic engagement work so I continued to do it even though there is not the opportunity to do it through the worker rights center I continue to do it through other organizations in other settings.

INTERVIEWER: Awesome, can you share what some of those other organizations are?

ROBERT: Yea so, there is um there is uh, when I was part of the Worker Rights Center I got involved with the living wage coalition which is very active, in fact they are...it is a coalition made up of different organizations that's lead by LUCHA. Um so then other organizations like CASE, Puente participates um different other advocacy groups are at that table and now it is actually trying or is proposing a uh actual amendment that is going on the ballot in November to increase the minimum wage and have a sick leave be part of the, you know work compensation. There are other labor deals that are happening here in the valley so I'm just really involved in pushing that there are a lot of interconnections. Right now I work at Valle del Sol a behavior health and primary care organization, so it is more health related but there is a lot of conversation now out about how health is connected to labor is connected to politics is connected to the environment. So the idea of a healthy community has to do with your access to transportation, your access to food, access to education, good working conditions, you know salary, wage, um and so all of these things are overlapping and causing a lot of nonprofits to come together and form coalitions to address issues of food and transportations and policing and things in the labor sector. Some people are working inside the system, uh register people to vote, urg people to do civic engagement, helping to elect people to boards and um positions of power, and some people are um more kind of rattle the system more like your Puente that are very much trying to shake the system up a little bit. So you got those working in the system, against the system, and completely outside the system. Those that don't rattle the system but say we are going to create something over here, something new. And I think all those three tactics are important for effecting system change and civic engagement is a big part of all three of those I think.

INTERVIEWER: What percent of your time with the Workers Right Center would you say you spent on civic engagement?

ROBERT: Um I'll say it was about 50%. I divide it 50/50 because I say there is the work, working with the workers, new members, doing campaigns and activities, civic engagement. But then there is the administrative side, being able to fundraise, strategize, organize, um it does divide your time and effort. You want to be out in the field all the time. You want to be working with people all the time. But there is this component where you got to keep the organization open. Financially stable, you run it like it was a for-profit. You have business plans, strategic plans, fundraising plans, all that takes time and effort.

INTERVIEWER: It is the bane of all

ROBERT: isn't it!

INTERVIEWER: How did the search for funding affect your ability to carry out tasks related to the worker rights centers mission?

ROBERT: Tons. That was ultimately kind of what was our downfall, funding. Very difficult. Take funding it is a small enough community of nonprofits and a smaller world of funders, whether foundations or different organizations all being asked for money from the same people so that money dries up quickly. It's not always spread out evenly. Competition for funds is huge and ultimately if you don't have the money to stay afloat, to keep things going and operating, then you do you have to close and that's what happened to us. I think a little bit to is um it is very difficult was losing focus on the mission. You end up having a strong mission then you know where to go to seek the funds, but like I said it is very competitive and isn't always easy to get those funds. So you start looking for other opportunities to find grants, and different things but those grants are asking you to do different things so you end up shifting your mission to try to go chase the dollars versus sticking to your missions saying sink or swim whether we get money or not this is what we are doing. But when that money starts to dry up you start to fudge that what we are doing and you end up chasing money and grants instead of sticking to your principles. Unfortunately funding is a huge huge part of what drives services and allows you to stay afloat or not.

INTERVIEWER: Foundations are looking for that 5 year plan that return on some sort of social capital, they want to see their money be productive.

INTERVIEWER: How did you go about recruiting and retaining staff, volunteers, and board members?

ROBERT: Yea um members and volunteers um just word of mouth. I mean we had people calling all the time, everyday there were people calling saying I've had my wages stolen, I have an issue. So we would bring people in and anytime that we had someone come in with a case we would ask them to attend a, know your rights training, for us to even assess or analyze their case. Um That was kind of our way to say we don't want you to just come in and kind of take the service and go away we want you to become a part of the larger a part of the movement, get yourself educated, get yourself civically engaged. Um so it was really...you know people refer workers to us and we would engage them through training a, know your rights training, and other education piece to try to get them involved. With board members, uh kind of the same thing we would um you know just tell the story of the Worker Rights Center and wage theft um and people would become

interested in supporting us and we would invite them to come and sit in on a couple of meetings, and then invite them to be board members. I think one of the things we did not know early on was um in recruiting board members is you want people who believe in the mission, are passionate about the Worker Rights Center. But you always want to be strategic. “Oh this person has a lot of good contacts” right, “this person is connected legally”

INTERVIEWER: This person has a CPA

ROBERT: Right right, so we ended up having a board full of people very passionate about the central mission of the Worker Rights Center but were all very similar. No one had connections to deep pockets or financial stuff so that was something that we learned through experience that's it is not just a matter of believing in the workers center and be passionate about it you have to be strategic in choosing your board members.

INTERVIEWER: What were things you tried to do to address potential new members, volunteers from being no shows?

ROBERT: Ah Well I mean look they were volunteers. Um callbacks we would call people back and try to stay on top of them, reminding them and calling them right before the meetings, or calling them afterwards saying hey we missed you. Trying to stay as connected as possible. But we understand that it was a challenge. People work and are limited on time that they can come. You know after a long day of work the last thing they want to do it drive back across town to go to a meeting. Um people have day care situation, transportation situations, so we knew those things were a challenge and they were very hard to overcome. It was understood if you invited 10 people you know you were going to get 2 or 3 people to come so you wanted to invite as many people as possible to secure some kind of turnout because you just understood there would be a lot of no shows. You know sometime you try to offer food, or some kind of gift card, um some kind of incentive, but we didn't have the financial resources to do that and sometimes there was some discussion on whether that was appropriate or not.

INTERVIEWER: People should want to show up to help themselves. What barriers did you encounter in civic engagement did you run into when working on behalf of the worker rights center and with the government, federal, state, local?

ROBERT: a couple of them. I'd say one is the climate. I mean Arizona um is not a union friendly state it is not a labor friendly state um you go to Nevada or other nearby states you can see the government locally and federally and different counties are very supportive of unions, very supportive of labor rights, um increases in minimum wage, all these kinds of things. And here in Arizona that climate just doesn't exist. It is exactly the opposite. There are very powerful people, lobbies, and interest trying to keep wages down, union busting, just trying to squash any kind of organizing right labor organizing. It is not a labor friendly state. The other thing I would say is that unfortunately a lot of the institutional organization in the city, county, and state government um they have good intention, good policies, good programs, they all exist kind of...of in the ivory tower. It all exists on paper, in theory, they are not connected to the people on the ground, they are not out in the community, and they are not out at events. They expect people to go to them and know all about them and to seek out their services but they are not at community functions, they are not at the health fair, not at the parks, so people don't know about them. That disconnect between what they do and the people they serve it is

very hard to have any kind of relationship with them. Then people end up being mistrustful of them. Immigration status is probably a third thing. People have concerns about their residency status. Undocumented folks there is no way they are going to take a risk going to a government agency. Even if that agency says we don't ask, we don't want to know, we don't want to get you into trouble. People don't want to get on databases and on their radar so they are scared to access those folks.

INTERVIEWER: Anything else I didn't ask you can think of?

ROBERT: No we covered it pretty well.

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW: ANA (PSEUDONYM)

INTERVIEWER: What was your role with the Worker Rights Center?

ANA: I was proudly their last executive director prior to the closing of the center.

INTERVIEWER: How did you get involved with them?

ANA: I found out there was a job opening um 2 executive directors before and I didn't jump at the opportunity because I was working full time somewhere else but then when the opportunity came around the second time I thought ok there's something there, something I should try, see if I can do it um and I really enjoy the work that was done there.

INTERVIEWER: How long did you serve in that role?

ANA: 16 Months

INTERVIEWER: What were your primary functions as executive director?

ANA: Everything, Answering the phone, returning...running cases, returning calls, um figuring out if we had a case, doing membership meetings, working with the interns, you, working with the board of directors. I had anywhere from 8 to 12 bosses at one point. Um sending out mailings doing fundraisers, gathering grants, writing grants, shall I stop now it's a lot.

INTERVIEWER: Sounds like you were running the whole thing?

ANA: Yes the whole show.

INTERVIEWER: Do you feel organizations like the workers right center increase participation in civic engagement?

ANA: I think it gives a window to people who might not know even what civic engagement is a taste of it. It gives an opportunity to people that might be afraid of going to bigger organizations. I always tried to make it a warm and friendly environment as I could in order to get those people engaged.

INTERVIEWER: What type of civic engagement or organizing did you take part in with the Worker Rights Center?

ANA: A little bit of everything as well from protesting, being on different committees, going to the state capital, being recognized by state legislators for the work the center had done. Um being named on the floor that was really exciting that was one of the best things. Um protesting, getting paid to protest as I always jokingly said. Um forming different committees, being on different boards of directors.

INTERVIEWER: How did you use civic engagement to help the Worker Right Center address wage theft and labor rights?

ANA: Um by going out to different communities' coalitions and expressing the concerns that the workers had. So highlighting the stories of worker justice, gather stories of worker justice to get the information out to the masses. People work 8 to 5 days and people don't take into consideration, even I didn't take into consideration...there was this restaurant that I used to go to, it is owned by a cousin of a member who we shall not mention, um someone that is very civically minded, very civically engaged. His cousin owns this restaurant and come to find out months later that he employs not only undocumented workers but employs undocumented workers at 5 dollars an hour. Which is just, I have not been able to go back to the restaurant, I refuse to go back to the restaurant. Um yea so highlighting those stories to other people.

INTERVIEWER: What percent of your work at the Worker Rights Center was spent on civic engagement?

ANA: Gosh um, that's a tough question to answer to measure. There is not a task you do even if it is just writing a letter to be able to ask for money you are still trying to gather people and get people engaged in doing the right thing. It is hard to quantify, I want to say 80% maybe?

INTERVIEWER: In your capacity with the workers right center how did you go about trying to recruit new volunteers, members, board members?

ANA: By being on other boards to begin with, getting it out there what we were doing. Um making connections to people who I felt were already civically engaged or had some knowledge about what was going on. Someone that has a sense and a feel for what the workers go through. I tried to get a priest or pastor from south phoenix engaged and there wasn't the same familiarity with the people.

INTERVIEWER: What tactics did you take to educate the community and local government about the work of the workers right center?

ANA: When I went down to the state capital for, they have the Arizona Latino Coalition for legislatures and reps and I found out that they have a day where they would listen to different groups so I tried to get involved with that and to speak to them through that method. I also tried to go down and speak one on one with the reps and so I did that and I took stories of the members. I think stories have a lot of power because it connects them to something they may not know and it puts a face and a name. So I would take little pictures of different members and I would take bibliographies of our members and I would always leave them. I am very much of a leaving something behind kind of person for them to remember so I would always take a little box of candy or little box of whatever but always make sure it had our logo on it.

INTERVIEWER: When it came to no shows what is something you tried to do to prevent that or to ease it?

ANA: There was really. It's disappointing when you put stuff together for people. I tried to have the third Wednesday of the months be our membership meeting and I would always bring different speakers or different community organizations to be able to speak to the new membership. Like one day we had Danny Rodriguez who is a lawyer come out and talk about contracts. You know you put a lot of work behind it you can do fliers you can call your membership, you um do all these other things, make a facebook event, put it on your facebook, um it is not just like one day you show up and say let's have a meeting there is a lot of effort and planning behind it. And it is disappointing um when people didn't show up in the numbers you consider are important. A lot of people don't consider contracts, a lot of our community members that we serve didn't consider contracts to be important to them. But I think it was the lack of knowledge of knowing the importance of a contract and selling that point as well.

INTERVIEWER: How did the search for funding affect your ability to carry out tasks related to the Worker Rights Centers mission?

ANA: I always thought, when I first started I thought once a week at least I'm going to write grants. Then you get caught up in so many other things that are happening that that once a week becomes uh a once every 2 weeks, once a month, and that was my biggest guilt trip. Had I of written more grants, had I of applied to more things, if I did research more maybe we could have kept the center going.

INTERVIEWER: The need for funding to tremendous.

ANA: You can never catch up, you have to continually have some, one specific person dedicated to doing that.

INTERVIEWER: What barriers did you encounter in civic engagement when acting on behalf of the Worker Rights Center with local government and agencies?

ANA: I think just the disparity of it all. The distance. I don't know if you ever been to the wage and hour department that's on Central and Van Buren you have to go through security, it is a federal building. So you have to have ID and you have to get through security. Not a lot of our members wanted to get through security to begin with, knew where the wage and hour division was, or at the very basic level there is always a subgroup in this American culture that is not focused on, not listen too, not given the respect they deserve, but they are such an integral part of what we do, they are the reason that in my hand I hold a cup that's clean, there is ice in it. It always astonishes me the lack of disparity and the distance between the worlds. I have no problem going to the Wage and Hour Division, I have an ID, I don't mind going through security, and yet I felt odd and weird even going through those same things because I knew a lot of our members weren't going to be able to do that. Didn't have the materials, didn't have the tools that we take for granted, that I take for granted.

INTERVIEWER: What has your civic activities consisted of since your involvement with the workers right center has ended.

ANA: Nothing. I don't know if it is recovery time, but sick and tired of it time, sadness time, yea it's a lot of things.

INTERVIEWER: Anything else to add?

ANA: Nope that is it.