Inclusion Norms in Ontario Settlement Agencies as Workplaces: Between Prefiguration and Systemic Exclusion

Michaël Séguin & Bianca Briciu, Saint Paul University
Amy MacDonald, Clearview Training & Consulting
Michael Okunlola, Waterloo Pentecostal Assembly
Sahar Zohni & Christine Kouri, National Newcomer Navigation Network

ABSTRACT

This article examines the issue of inclusivity within nonprofit organizations as workplaces, focusing on the perspective of immigrant frontline workers of the Ontario settlement sector. Using a community-based collaborative approach, 25 frontline workers were invited to describe their experiences of integration of differences at work, involvement in decision-making, and equitable working conditions. Eight managers from the same agencies were also interviewed to better understand the policies and practices in their organization. The semi-directed interviews revealed that, while most organizations successfully integrate differences, there are some significant limitations regarding the involvement of immigrant frontline workers in decision-making and fair employment practices. This demonstrates a persistent form of systemic exclusion at the heart of Canada's cultural mosaic.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article traite de la question de l'inclusion au sein des organisations à but non lucratif en tant que milieux de travail, et ce, du point de vue des personnes travailleuses immigrantes de première ligne du secteur de l'aide à l'établissement en Ontario. En utilisant une approche de recherche communautaire collaborative, 25 personnes salariées de première ligne ont été invitées à décrire leurs expériences en matière d'intégration des différences au travail, de participation à la prise de décision et de conditions de travail équitables. Huit personnes cadres des mêmes organismes ont également été interrogées afin de mieux comprendre les politiques et les pratiques en place. Ces entretiens semi-dirigés ont révélé que, si la plupart des organismes parviennent à bien intégrer les différences, la participation des personnes travailleuses immigrantes de première ligne à la prise de décision et aux pratiques d'emploi équitables présente d'importantes lacunes. Ces résultats démontrent une forme persistante d'exclusion systémique au cœur de la mosaïque culturelle canadienne.

Keywords / Mots clés : settlement, settlement agencies, immigrants, inclusion, equity, EDI, community-based research / établissement, organismes d'aide à l'établissement, immigrants, inclusion, équité, EDI, recherche communautaire

INTRODUCTION

While research on equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) in the Canadian private sector is abundant (Klarsfeld, Ng, Booysen, Christiansen, & Kuvass, 2016; Kuptsch, Charest, Tomei, & Cyr, 2022), much less is known about the nonprofit sector. Recent evidence suggests that while the commitment to diversifying staff and leadership is taken seriously by Ontarian nonprofit organizations, the questions of equity and inclusion remain largely unaddressed (Gagnon, Cuckier, Olivier, & Ying Mo, 2024; McIsaac & Moody, 2014). Yet, equity, inclusion, and respect for workers' rights are essential components of the *Decent Work Charter* initiated and promoted by the Ontario Nonprofit Network (2018). This begs the question: to what extent are community-based nonprofit organizations, as employers of a diverse workforce, sufficiently equipped to become inclusive workplaces?

Settlement service providers across Canada are not immune to these challenges. While most of their frontline staff consists of immigrants to Canada,[1] many settlement organizations struggle to implement their commitment to EDI as employers, especially when resources, time, and expertise are lacking (Day & Greene, 2008). Each new wave of refugees to Canada further exacerbates this predicament, as settlement agencies are pressured to hire more diverse frontline workers to meet client needs with sometimes little capacity to properly train and integrate these employees. Without the appropriate welcome, accompaniment, and support when challenges arise, there is a real danger of staff burnout and turnover in settlement agencies (Mukhtar, Dean, Wilson, Ghassemi, & Wilson, 2016).

This article addresses these issues through the perspective of managers and immigrant employees in the settlement sector in Ontario. In an exploratory manner, given the study's small sample, the article focuses on the practices with the most impact on the inclusion experiences of frontline workers, most of whom are racialized women. In doing so, the authors identified several organizational norms that bring EDI to life, while also pointing out some of their limitations.

LITERATURE REVIEW: INCLUSION IN THE THIRD SECTOR AND SETTLEMENT AGENCIES

Diversity management is now a well-established field in the private sector, even though its effectiveness is highly debated (Dobbin & Kalev, 2022; Kalev, Dobbin, & Kelly, 2006). But what about the third sector? Most studies to date on diversity management in the nonprofit and voluntary sectors have focused on diversity in terms of board composition and the increased organizational performance that diverse boards enable (Weisinger, 2017; Weisinger, Borges-Méndez, & Milofsky, 2016). Little, however, is known about practices designed to foster workplace inclusion among diverse employees, particularly within contexts of significant financial and human resource constraints, such as the Canadian settlement sector.

Diversity and inclusion in the third sector

This literature review found only a handful of relevant studies focusing on employee perspectives of workplace inclusion in human-service-oriented organizations, including nonprofit hospital employees (Brimhall, 2019; Brimhall, Williams, Malloy, Piekunka, & Fannin, 2022), child welfare workers in the public sector (Brimhall, Lizano, & Mor Barak, 2014; Brimhall, Mor Barak, Hurlburt, McArdle, Palinkas, & Henwood, 2017; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012, 2015), and social workers

(Acquavita, Pittman, Gibbons, & Castellanos-Brown, 2009). These studies provide empirical evidence that a climate of inclusion can increase job satisfaction (Acquavita et al., 2009; Brimhall, 2019; Brimhall et al., 2014, 2022; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012, 2015), strengthen commitment to the workgroup and/or organization (Brimhall et al., 2022; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012, 2015), and reduce turnover (Brimhall et al., 2014; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012, 2015).

Empirical evidence regarding specific policies and initiatives that foster a climate of inclusion in community-based organizations is scarce and theoretically ambiguous. These practices include support for "high quality leadership interactions" (Brimhall et al., 2017, p. 233), leaders who invite, encourage, and value the input of others in decision-making (Brimhall, 2019), greater workplace diversity (Acquavita et al., 2009; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012, 2015), and organizational-level factors such as "social support" and "organizational diversity efforts" (Acquavita et al., 2009).

The scope of these studies is mainly limited to nonprofit boards and/or executive leadership. In this regard, they found strong evidence for formalizing diversity and inclusion efforts and embedding them in policies and practices such as recruitment to ensure accountability (Acquavita et al., 2009; Brown, 2002; Fredette, Bradshaw, & Krause, 2016; Solebello, Tschirhart, & Leiter, 2016), setting up a specific EDI task force or committee (Acquavita et al., 2009; Brown, 2002), or "mentorship programs, orientation practices, and socialization processes such as retreats and relationship-building rituals" (Fredette et al., 2016, p. 35). These aspects tell us little about the effectiveness of specific policies and practices that foster a climate of inclusion *as experienced by* racialized and minoritized employees.

Diversity and inclusion in the Canadian settlement sector

Inclusivity is one of the top values that inform settlement sector practices in Canada, along with respect, empowerment of newcomers, and cultural sensitivity (George, 2002). Many settlement agencies provide newcomer mentorship programs and workplace training to help other organizations create "immigrant-friendly workplaces" and "build intercultural competencies" (Ashton, Pettigrew, & Galatsanou, 2016, p. 75). This makes it undoubtedly one of the most culturally diverse sectors of Canadian society. Is this same commitment to foster inclusion among newcomers as clients also extended to employees who have experienced immigration? Are the settlement sectors' efforts to welcome and include newcomers within Canadian society at a macro level also replicated on a meso level, i.e., among employees within settlement organizations?

There is a growing body of literature about the structural constraints of Canadian nonprofit settlement agencies and the various ways they adapt their services to meet the needs of their diverse clients (Giwa & Chaze, 2018; Janzen, Brnjas, Cresswell, & Chapman, 2020; Senthanar, MacEachen, Premji, & Bigelow, 2020). However, we know little about the ways they manage and support their diverse workforces. This literature shows that inadequate, unstable, and restrictive funding, combined with mandatory program quotas, creates competition and distrust among settlement service organizations and staff burnout among frontline workers, particularly among small ethno-specific agencies (Mukhtar et al., 2016; Richmond & Shields, 2005). Settlement agencies may support inclusion, but they face systemic challenges and barriers that restrict their capacity to create it. These challenges have only increased since the end of the 1980s with the gradual implementation of

New Public Management. The adoption of this approach to running public service organizations imposed a neoliberal austerity agenda on settlement agencies characterized by a focus on efficiency, funding instability, reduced autonomy, and more rigid control by the state while offloading its responsibility onto communities and volunteers (Lowe, Richmond, & Shields, 2017).

Yet, these systemic pressures do not reflect the full breadth of experience of inclusion (or lack thereof) in the settlement sector. While we can expect inclusion based on culture and ethnicity to be prominent features of the sector, evidence shows that inclusion based on sexual (Giwa & Chaze, 2018) and religious diversity (Bramadat, 2014) is sometimes lacking. Beyond these social identities, we can interrogate the depth of the inclusion experience. Studies about the Ontario settlement sector (Bauder & Jayaraman, 2014; Türegün, 2013a) show that immigrant settlement counsellors are not always seen as influential stakeholders, but rather as an appropriate "means" to serve organizational "ends." A study on social inclusion of immigrants through recreation programs in Toronto (Forde, Lee, Mills, & Frisby, 2015) highlights this paradoxical double standard. The attributes that make immigrants valuable program volunteers—their multilingualism and cultural backgrounds—are the same attributes that exclude them from employment with the organization, mainly because of English language fluency requirements. It is thus important to open Pandora's box of inclusion in the settlement sector to explore the tension between utilitarianism and tokenism.[2]

In sum, there is a gap in the literature concerning what fosters a climate of inclusion in diverse third-sector organizations such as settlement agencies, where frontline workers are hired specifically for their *cultural and linguistic diversity*. How do these diverse organizations, which serve diverse populations, foster a climate of inclusion? Bolder still, can we conceive of these agencies as prefigurative spaces of inclusion? According to Yates (2015), to prefigure means "to anticipate or enact some feature of an alternative world in the present as though it has already been achieved" (p. 4). While prefiguration has been mostly studied in relation to political mobilization and activist movements (Ashton et al., 2016; Senthanar et al., 2020), the authors hypothesize that the settlement sector has lessons to teach about inclusion given its prominent place at the forefront of Canada's cultural mosaic. This article offers an empirical account of immigrant workers' subjective experiences of inclusion and the obstacles that prevent settlement organizations from living up to their social purpose.

THEORETICAL APPROACH: LOOKING AT EMERGING INCLUSION NORMS
This article is framed by the intersection of the sociology of social norms (Alter, 2018; Rubington & Weinberg, 2008) and the management of diversity in organizations (Ferdman, 2014; Nishii, Khattab, Shemla, & Paluch, 2018), seeking to understand both the practices that create greater organizational inclusion and the incomplete (and often contested) nature of such practices.

An interactionist sociology of the inclusion norm
Every institution creates norms that govern its social life in a way that fosters both collective learning and collective action (De Munck, 1999). As such, norms act as "grammar of social interactions" (Bicchieri, Muldoon, & Sontuoso, 2018, p. 1), defining what is acceptable or not in a group. From time to time, new norms can be introduced by "crusading reformers" (Becker, 1997, p. 147), challenging widespread societal ways of doing and thinking (e.g., challenging racist stereotypes), often

by aligning with social movements (e.g., Black Lives Matter). Social norms are inevitably associated with power. They are created by normalizing discourses of exclusion (Ponzoni, Ghorashi, & Van Der Raad, 2017). Acker (2006) illustrates this unevenly distributed power and the systematic disparities that come with it in the concept of inequality regimes that pervade the structure of organizations. Though they are seen as legitimate by the actors who reproduce them, these organizational regimes reinforce wider social norms (e.g., the sexual or racial division of labour). This begs the question: if we can think of organizations as spaces that reproduce inequality regimes, can they also become spaces that reinforce the social norms of diversity, equity, and inclusion?

While social movements continue to address discrimination and systematic disparities in society at large, the scholarly discourse on organizations moved to a more proactive concern with creating diverse, equitable, and inclusive environments (Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). This concern reflects a shift from challenging existing norms to the reinforcement of alternative ones, seen as more democratic. With the caveat that all norms, even the most democratic ones, produce standards that lead to exclusion (Dobusch, 2014, 2021), this article examines inclusion as a complex set of prefigurative norms. In prefigurative practice, the end becomes the means, and the level of inclusion of immigrant workers in these organizations prefigures the integration of newcomers into Canadian society.

Defining inclusion as a set of normative practices
Shore, Randel, Chung, Dean, Holcombe Ehrhart, and Singh (2011) argue that inclusion is the balance between "belongingness"—the need to be part of larger social groups—and uniqueness—the need to preserve a distinctive sense of self. In other words, workplace inclusion is "the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the workgroup through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness" (Shore et al., 2011, p. 1265). Inclusion is neither assimilation (belongingness without uniqueness) nor tokenism (uniqueness without belongingness). As Ferdman (2014) points out, inclusion is something workers experience phenomenologically through characteristics such as feeling safe, involved and engaged, respected and valued, influential, authentic and whole, recognized and honoured. Inclusion can be experienced at multiple levels, such as within one's own workgroup, in the relationship with one's supervisor, through organizational practices and policies, and in one's relationship with upper management (Ferdman, 2014; Mor Barak, 2022).

Although it is possible to measure inclusion at each of these levels, a growing number of scholars (Mor Barak, Lizano, Kim, Duan, Rhee, Hsiao, & Brimhall, 2016; Nishii, 2013; Nishii & Rich, 2014; Shore et al., 2018) prefer to look at the broader "climate of inclusion" that emerges from different normative practices. The authors agree with Nishii (2013) that such a climate is based on three dimensions: equitable employment practices, integration of differences, and inclusion in decision-making. In short, an inclusive work environment rests on whether "individuals of all backgrounds—not just members of historically powerful identity groups—are fairly treated, valued for who they are, and included in core decision-making" (Nishii, 2013, p. 1754). From this conceptualization stems the question at the heart of this research: which practices do foster a climate of inclusion from the perspective of immigrant frontline workers in Ontario settlement agencies? What "prefigurative" norms do these practices promote and on whose terms? And what are the limits of these same norms?

METHODOLOGY: A COMMUNITY-BASED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH

The design of this research is based on a mixed methodology, combining a heuristically administered Linkert scale (Nishii, 2013) with semi-structured interviews. The following explains the rationale for adopting this method in community-based research, as well as the sampling and analysis strategy.

A collaborative approach

Community-based participatory research is a problem-driven and change-oriented research approach. It involves partnerships with community organizations based on their specific needs (Leavy, 2017). Although the level of community involvement can vary greatly from one research design to the next, the engagement of the beneficiaries as co-researchers constitutes a distinctive feature. This creates a different research dynamic, where the aim is not just to contribute to the creation of scientifically valid knowledge, but to building community capacity (Caine & Mill, 2015).

This research emerged from conversations with leaders and members of the National Newcomer Navigation Network (N4), a pan-Canadian network of over 350 organizations assisting newcomers. In the wake of activism motivated by racist violence throughout North America, not to mention the COVID-19 outbreaks that disproportionately affect migrant and racialized populations, many N4 member organizations made public statements condemning racism and other forms of systemic discrimination. While these pledges were an important first step, the N4 team realized that health and settlement organizations frequently struggled to implement their commitments to EDI. The authors launched this project in October 2022 with a "coordination circle" that met on average once a month. Contributors also met three times with an "advisory circle" made up of three people with in-depth knowledge of the Ontario settlement sector.

Sampling: Organizations, workers, and managers

After customary ethics approval, our main research partner reached out to 31 Ontario-based settlement organizations identified as community partners who showed an interest in anti-racism and equity work. Eight organizations working primarily in English agreed to participate. They all adhere to EDI principles to various degrees: cultural diversity among their staff is a given, they are committed to accommodating workers' needs, they offer diversity training, most have diversified panels when it comes to interviews, and most have a diversity committee. Table 1 summarizes our organizational sampling.

Table 1. Description of partner settlement organizations

Organization	Size	Region	Demographic	Ethno-specific	Diversity committee
Org A	Medium (100–500 employees)	Southwestern Ontario	Large urban population centre (100,000+)	No	Yes
Org B	Small (4–99 employees)	Eastern Ontario	Large urban population centre (100,000+)	Yes	Yes
Org C	Small (4–99 employees)	Northern Ontario	Medium population centre (30,000–99,999)	No	Yes

Table 1 (continued)

Organization	Size	Region	Demographic	Ethno-specific	Diversity committee
Org D	Small (4–99 employees)	Northwestern Ontario	Large urban population centre (100,000+)	No	(Yes)*
Org E	Small (4–99 employees)	Greater Toronto Area	Large urban population centre (100,000+)	Yes	No
Org F	Small (4–99 employees)	Southwestern Ontario	Small population centre (1,000–29,999)	No	No
Org G	Large (500+ employees)	Greater Toronto Area	Large urban population centre (100,000+)	No	Yes
Org H	Small (4–99 employees)	Greater Toronto Area	Large urban population centre (100,000+)	No	Yes

* This organization has a "Fun Committee," which acts more or less like a diversity committee.

Each partner circulated a flyer to their settlement employees inviting immigrant members of their frontline staff to participate in a research interview via Microsoft Teams. To be recruited, workers had to be born outside of Canada and had to be working with immigrants, refugees, and/or asylum seekers in an Ontario-based settlement agency for at least six months. In total, we interviewed 25 frontline workers, 21 women (84%), and four men (16%), ranging in age from 18 to 65 (43 years old on average). Eighteen (72%) identified as racialized in the Canadian context. One identified as belonging to a sexual minority (4%) and two reported a disability (8%). Twenty-one had a university degree (84%), 12 of which were master's degrees (48%). Most have been living in Canada for more than a decade (12 years on average) and working extensively in the settlement sector (eight years on average). Employees' job titles varied, with the most common being Settlement Worker and Settlement Counsellor.

The recruitment criteria for managers were they must have been working for an Ontario-based settlement agency for at least 12 months and have been nominated by the organization for the interview. In total, eight managers were interviewed, seven women (87.5%) and one man (12.5%), ranging in age from 41 to 58 (50 years old on average). One (12.5%) identified as racialized in the Canadian context. None identified as belonging to a sexual minority or having a disability. All had a university degree, three of which were master's degrees (37.5%). Five were born in Canada and most have been working extensively in the settlement sector (12 years on average). Managers' job titles included Human Resources Manager, General or Senior Manager, and Executive Director.

Mixed data collection tools
Given the exploratory nature of this research, we decided to cross-reference quantitative data (to administer a scale) and qualitative data (to have a conversation about their answers) obtained via a single online interview. We used a slightly adapted short version of the climate for inclusion scale developed by Lisa H. Nishii (2013) (available in Appendix I). Based on a five-point Likert scale rang-

ing from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) administered through a semi-directed interview, this survey focused on the inclusion climate as it was lived by immigrant frontline workers and managers. Although the same scale was used for all interviews, the follow-up questions were slightly different for workers and managers. In the case of workers, questions focused on their subjective experience of inclusion. In the case of managers, questions focused on understanding their organizational practices for inclusion.

To organize the anonymized data collected from the interviews, the authors conducted a thematic content analysis of verbatim using NVivo (Bardin, 2013). Consistent with Nishii's definition of inclusion, our coding aimed to identify practices that promoted or hindered the integration of differences, participation in decision-making, and the perception of fair employment practices. As such, we categorized practices as either promoting a climate of inclusion or leading to a climate of exclusion. In keeping with the inductive spirit of qualitative data coding (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), consideration was given to practices that did not fit into this initial grid. To promote coding consistency, a single person carried out the coding under the supervision of the principal investigator. The analysis consisted of tracing the central inclusion norms as expressed by workers and managers.

RESEARCH RESULTS: FOUR EMERGING INCLUSION NORMS

Based on thematic coding of the data, the authors identified four norms that most managers and frontline workers aspire to. These norms, which also prefigure what an inclusive workplace can be, are: 1) opening spaces for the expression of cultural differences; 2) fostering positive relationships; 3) empowering workers; and 4) developing transparent and equitable employment practices. This article describes these inclusion norms and the practices that bring them to life, but also some of the obstacles to their implementation. When relevant, the results of the Nishii scale are also referenced (see Appendix 1).

Welcoming, celebrating, and accommodating differences

A first emerging norm is the creation of a culture of tolerance where everyone can openly live their identities, especially their cultural and religious ones. An overwhelming majority—22 frontline workers (88%) and all eight managers (100%), according to scale results—see their workplace as a non-threatening environment in which they can reveal their "true" selves. Eleven workers (44%) and four managers (50%) spontaneously referred to this ability to include and celebrate cultural differences as one of the distinctive features of settlement agencies. For some, this collective openness is the result of the blending of cultures in a context of mutual acceptance: "no matter where you are from, you always end up interacting with very different cultures and backgrounds, beliefs and faiths" (IFW-1). For other interviewees, this spirit of cultural tolerance is more than an unplanned outcome of a diverse demographic; it is the result of an organizational strategy. One participant explained:

> But I think my organization is very open and you can come and wear any dress that is culturally appropriate for you in terms of religion or other things. Yes, I think this organization is really fair. We have even a prayer room. I'm not Muslim but have some colleagues who are Muslims. So, everything is here designed now to help and understand and let us be whatever we are in terms of religion or culture. (IFW-3)

Many means are deployed within organizations to create a multicultural atmosphere of tolerance and celebrate the uniqueness of diverse cultures. Among them, we find: being able to speak their mother tongue, bring or cook their own culturally appropriate food, wear their own culturally appropriate clothing, share music or films, and celebrate holidays (such as Ramadan) or important moments (such as Black History Month) with colleagues.

This openness to cultural otherness extends to the issue of accommodating diverse needs. Twenty-two frontline workers (92%) and all managers shared with us that their organization goes to great lengths to accommodate the needs of their employees. In practice, the accommodation process can take many forms, both formal and informal: cultural and religious (prayer time and space, time off for celebrations, remote working and flexible schedule during Ramadan, offering *halal* or vegetarian options), family based (adjusting work time to children's schedule, granting longer time off for weddings abroad), and mental health and physical health (tracking food restrictions, adjusting workload to health condition, adjusting work time for medical appointments, meeting accessibility needs).

While many employees pointed out the importance of multicultural openness and answering workers' needs, a minority of employees considered this openness to diversity to be incomplete or incongruent. One important example is the experience of employees adhering to cultural practices that conflict with Canadian cultural norms. For example, five racialized employees (20%) talked about a culture of assimilation in their organizations. One worker expressed this point very clearly:

> So this [assimilationist] mold is very much a like-minded mold. I think our organization prefers the newcomer employees to be ones that are willing to … bring forth the favorable parts of their identity. Right? Like so, for example, if you don't mind drinking alcohol or being in a bar or, you know, eating certain types of foods and stuff they don't like … I don't feel that it's as much accepted with people that may have any type of restriction in their life. It just doesn't fit that mold. They want people that can be completely super flexible and open … . (IFW-4)

These employees were clearly wary of the expectation to engage in certain ways of speaking or behaving. They had to assimilate to the "Canadian token norm" (IFW-4) and show only the parts of themselves "acceptable" to the white Canadian-born majority. In other words, they faced a paradoxical (and racist) injunction: assimilate yourself—"[be] the right kind of migrant" (IFW-4)—and then you can fully be yourself at work.[3]

The same kind of shortcomings are seen with accommodation. As three frontline workers (12%) noted, the effectiveness of policies is by no means guaranteed since their interpretation is subject to the goodwill of supervisors. Furthermore, accommodation is a tool that can easily be instrumentalized according to managers' values, personal affinities, or current organizational priorities to assist some and stigmatize others.

Fostering positive relationships

A second norm is the quality of the relationships that can make the organization feel like a community or a family. This unexpected norm (we did not explicitly ask about it) reflects the strong attachment many of the frontline workers have to their workplace. When asked to complete the scale,

18 frontline workers (72%) and all the managers said that employees in their workplace are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs that they fill. Fourteen employees (56%) referred to the open-mindedness of their colleagues and 11 (44%) to the open-mindedness of their leader. Open-mindedness was described as the tendency to listen to and respect others, to show humility and curiosity, and to demonstrate an encouraging attitude.

A fundamental consequence of this open-mindedness and concern for the wellbeing of others is that people feel a strong sense of community and belongingness. Twelve employees (48%) and one manager (12.5%) referred to their colleagues as a work family or to their workplace as a friendly environment because of their understanding, care for, and respect for each other, both professionally and personally. As one worker mentioned:

> We have this like family culture at work, I would say, and that I think it has provided that safe space. Some of us come, you know, from different backgrounds. Parents, no parents. You know, refugees and non-refugee ... So we all are able to understand a little bit about everyone and it just humbles everyone. And then that's how we're able to kind of be open amongst each other and be our true selves. (IFW-19)

This diversity contributes to a shared understanding of what it means to be an immigrant and makes the environment comfortable (something even more meaningful for newcomers who left a large part of their social network behind them). The settlement agency becomes a "second family" where co-workers "are always there for each other to help each other" (IFW-23).

One strong indicator of that family spirit is the extension of relationships beyond work-related interactions. Nineteen employees (76%) reported some level of informal social inclusion. The main form of social inclusion was socializing during lunch hour or outside work, and going for walks together during the lunch break. Some organizations have planned potlucks, but most socialization seems to be informal. Several employees socialize with colleagues outside of work, going out for dinner or having dinners at each other's houses, hosting a farewell gathering for a colleague, going to the beach, or camping together. One worker summed it up as follows: "Part of the reason I don't leave this job is because I made my strong friends in this job" (IFW-16).

Opportunities for workers to collaborate both as a team and with other teams also seemed to strengthen inclusion. Six workers (24%) highlighted how collaborative work made them feel like an insider. They described this as sharing information and ideas with colleagues, working in teams to serve clients, or participating in working groups. One mentioned that this collaborative spirit is cross-departmental and it is possible because they value regular and "strong communication" (IFW-2). Another important element of that spirit is that people feel supported by their colleagues in work-related tasks, especially when they bump into more difficult issues. Seven frontline workers (28%) told us they could share their needs not only with their supervisor but also with their team members who offer solutions, tips, advice, encouragement, and support. In one worker's words: "Sometimes we don't know each other in terms of cultures, but we learn from each other and every day we learn new things from our colleagues, no matter the cultures" (IFW-14). This collaboration is made possible by the shared commitment to offering the best services to newcomers.

Unsurprisingly, however, not every employee thinks of their workplace as a family. This seemingly positive metaphor can have a paternalist or assimilationist connotation (e.g., employees are like children, and good kids do not rock the boat). It can also be seen as a way of compensating for precarious working conditions and low wages with the ethos of mission-driven caring work (Baines, Cunningham, Campey, & Shields, 2014). In a context of rising demands, insufficient resources, and unstable employment structures, framing settlement work as "being primarily a 'labour of love' which is seen to be a reward in and of itself" (Baines et al., 2014, p. 86) can be a dangerous idea. As such, when filling the scale, three frontline workers (12%) disagreed that employees in their workplace are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs that they fill. Four (16%) neither agreed nor disagreed. In the follow-up question, five employees (20%) mentioned they did not feel comfortable expressing ideas, opinions, or perspectives that were different from their workgroup or supervisor while two participants (8%) talked about fear of reprisals if their views challenged those of the dominant culture. One worker expressed it as such: "I don't feel that all staff here are created equally or are treated equally. … It seems that basically anybody who applauds the organization and doesn't have any points for improvement or criticism tends to have, you know, a voice that's a little bit more heard" (IFW-4). Some frontline workers felt they had to fight hard to have their voice heard; others felt pressured to go along with the group.

This difficulty in expressing oneself may also have a cultural component. Two frontline workers (8%) note that internalized cultural codes are sometimes at play. For example, in some cultures, power imbalances related to age or managerial status call for respectful obedience and keeping quiet (Hofstede, 1984). In others, being blunt and making your point, even with your boss, is the norm. A worker framed it as follows:

> Canadian culture in nature is a bit conservative. If you ask someone if they want something or not, or if you have an idea and the person wants to say no, they never say no in your face. They say: "Oh, I'll think about it." In some cultures, including my culture, when someone says, "Oh, I'll think about it," it is partial agreement. In the Canadian context, it is mainly a no. (IFW-22)

This shows how different communication styles and cultural codes can also lead to misunderstandings and a lack of inclusion.

Though cultural differences can also act as obstacles to the informal socialization central to building a family-like environment, the biggest obstacles to this informal socialization come from management itself or from work conditions (such as teleworking). Six frontline workers (24%) explained that they did not often socialize with other co-workers, especially when they are "constantly reminded that, you know, your lunch is only an hour. So, if you don't have time to go, don't go to that type of thing" (IFW-1). For another worker, it was a financial issue: "Our income is very limited, and people are at a point where it's either a beer or beef" (IFW-21).

This lack of meaningful engagement with colleagues also translates into what a minority of workers perceived as discrimination—most often racial micro-aggressions[4] (Sue et al., 2019). Two employees (8%) reported experiences of discrimination from colleagues, four from managers (16%), and two from clients (8%). For example, discrimination from colleagues may mean being excluded from

conversations by colleagues who are speaking their native language(s) or not being taken seriously in their role. When it comes to managers, the issue is often about one's ideas not being considered (yet the same idea, coming from someone from the dominant culture, is accepted), not being invited to some conversations when others are, having to fight to be heard when others' ideas are solicited, or being reprimanded for speaking up. Positive relationships in the workplace and a family ethos prove insufficient to compensate for the systemic precarious conditions of low pay, instability, stress, and an inability to challenge management (Baines et al., 2014).

Empowering workers

Another norm that emerged during the interviews was empowering workers. This dimension of inclusion goes beyond welcoming and celebrating employees' unique diverse characteristics. According to the scale, 18 frontline workers (72%) and seven managers (87.5%) reported that leadership actively seeks input from all their employees. The managers all stressed the diverse means they used to seek this feedback, whether it be through formal survey tools, regular staff meetings or all-staff gatherings, one-on-one meetings, working groups, information sessions, or emails. Two managers (25%) mentioned that within their organization, frontline staff are seen as experts in their domain, therefore their input is highly valued. Twelve frontline workers (48%) stressed that management actively sought their input and valued their perspectives as a main source of client information, seeking their thoughts and ideas to improve service delivery, inviting their feedback on policy drafts, and involving them in strategic planning meetings.

But what is this input actually used for? According to the scale, 16 employees (64%) and six managers (75%) consider that all employees' insights are used to rethink or redefine work practices. On the one hand, managers pointed out that employees were influencing decisions in the organization. The examples they offered include changes to policies and procedures regarding staff leave, benefits, hybrid work arrangements, mental health training, compensation review, and unionization. On the other hand, only eight employees (32%) mentioned that their feedback was used to influence decisions and/or strategic planning. One of the preferred mechanisms for this exchange of ideas is the working group. As one frontline worker expressed: "I've been a part of two or three working groups since joining and honestly it is open to all. … It's nice to know that you're allowed to be a part of, you know, whatever decision-making that is going to long-term affect the organization" (IFW-20). In the long run, this practice of seeking input is important since it demonstrates to workers that their knowledge, perspectives, and ideas are valued.

A corollary to consultation is the autonomy granted to employees. According to the scale results, 15 employees (60%) and six managers (75%) said that all employees could make work-related decisions on their own. These answers show that the degree of autonomy varies greatly according to the nature of the job and the range of decisions available to frontline workers. The examples that managers and employees gave included staff being allowed to manage their own schedules and meetings, and to determine how best to serve clients within the organizations' ethics and policy guidelines. Frontline workers appreciate the absence of micromanagement. One said they felt free to take risks, while another commented that they felt trusted: "You know, she [their supervisor] makes us feel like we are adults. No micromanaging. This is a wonderful, wonderful thing that I

found in this job" (IFW-8). Two managers added that clearly defining staff roles and providing clarity regarding expectations encourages autonomy by helping inform employees of the area(s) they have ownership over.

This sense of agency is finally fostered through the development of each individual employee. According to the scale, 17 frontline workers (68%) and all the managers believe that their organization invests in the development of all its employees. In fact, it appears that all the organizations studied provide a basic level of mandatory job-related training for their employees, covering topics such as EDI, mental health, trauma informed care, positive spaces, etc. Twenty-one workers (84%) reported having transparent and equitable access to these training opportunities. Five managers (62.5%) mentioned they provide mentoring and job shadowing to help new employees learn and develop. Beyond mandatory job-related training, some organizations are investing in their employees with funding as well as time and flexibility to pursue additional professional development opportunities. Three managers (37.5%) and three frontline workers (12%) said their organizations provided employees with the space to pursue further education (e.g., doing courses from the office, time to work on certification, taking three months' leave to complete a master's program).

This workplace empowerment norm is not experienced the same way by all employees. According to the scale, not all employees feel properly consulted and listened to—one (4%) disagreed with the idea that all employees' input is actively sought, and six (24%) were undecided; six (24%) disagreed that their opinions influenced decisions, and three (12%) were undecided. In the qualitative interview, three workers (12%) referred to decisions made by managers and passed on to staff, without explanation or discussion (e.g., shutting down a program without talking to employees first). Nine employees (36%) mentioned that while their ideas may be solicited, they are not necessarily included, which is quite disappointing since they run the programs every day. Two racialized employees (8%) mentioned a fear of "backlash" and reprimand preventing them from offering their input and genuine feedback to help the organization. In their experience, voices that criticize the organization are often silenced: they are labelled as "difficult" or "disrespectful" (IFW-13) for speaking out.

The same limit to the norm of employee empowerment comes into play when we look at their room for maneuvering and making decisions independently. Ten frontline workers (40%) did not agree (three [12%] disagreed, seven [28%] were undecided) with the scale statement that in their workplace all employees were empowered to make work-related decisions on their own. During the interview, nine (36%) participants mentioned having experienced some level of micromanagement and a lack of freedom in how their work was done. They felt their hands were tied and that they did not have the liberty to think outside the box. Three employees (12%) felt constrained by time and resources due to a high-volume workload with many competing priorities, and four (16%) cited leadership close-mindedness. Two managers (25%) acknowledged this lack of autonomy coming from hierarchical structures or a bilateral loss of trust that led to unionization. In fact, front-line workers' autonomy over decision-making remains mainly at managers' discretion since unions are not common in the settlement sector (Baines et al., 2014). In this sample, only two organizations are unionized.

Finally, a significant number of employees reported unequal access to professional development. According to the scale, two employees (8%) disagreed with the idea that their workplace invested

in the development of all its employees, and six (24%) neither agreed nor disagreed. During interviews, five frontline workers (20%) mentioned a lack of professional development opportunities at their organization (e.g., due to the location of their agency) and three (12%) mentioned a lack of transparency in opportunity sharing (e.g., training falling back on employees' proactiveness). Among the practices of exclusion from training opportunities frontline workers also mentioned: being declined training without a reason, lack of schedule flexibility, lack of funding for training, and lengthy approval processes for new training programs. This lack of opportunities is not happening in a vacuum. Funding for training has been increasingly reduced under the austerity agenda of the New Public Management model, which disproportionately affects the many workers with precarious employment status in settlement agencies (Lowe, Richmond, & Shields, 2017).

Developing transparent and equitable human resource practices
The last inclusion norm emerging from this study pertains to transparent and equitable human resource practices. When asked to fill out the scale, 18 frontline workers (72%) found the hiring practices of their employer fair, three disagreed (12%), and four (16%) were undecided. During the qualitative interview, 17 (68%) acknowledged they were hired based on their credentials (including foreign credentials), previous experience (including non-Canadian experience), and/or transferable skills. Among them, eight (32%) were grateful that their relevant experience (including volunteering in the settlement sector) played a significant role. One frontline worker with a background in business explained: "So when I was hired, I don't think it was for my credential … I'm not a social worker. I didn't have experience. But I really have a genuine love for helping people. … So, like, I was always [an] advocate or [a] volunteer with the organization helping newcomers" (IFW-3).

For their part, all managers expressed confidence in the fairness of their recruitment, mainly because it was based on the assessment of skills, competencies, and previous experiences rather than bias. Five of them (62.5%) mentioned that this process has been evolving in recent years to be approached with the EDI lens. This means that job openings are formally posted on multiple channels, job postings are worded sensitively, interview accommodations are offered (if needed), and interviews are conducted by hiring panels. Two managers (25%) went a step further and made the interview process an intentional opportunity to build an inclusive climate in their agency, either through adding a question about EDI or a human rights pledge.

The equity of the promotion process seems to be a much trickier business, including from the point of view of the managers themselves. When surveying these managers with the scale, only four of them (50%) found their promotion process to be fair, three (37.5%) neither agreed nor disagreed, and one (12.5%) said the question did not apply given the size of their organization. That said, according to five of them (62.5%), what made it fair was the formality of the process (having a job description, an inside and outside job posting, an interview, etc.). Surveying workers with the Nishii scale, only 11 (44%) agreed that the promotion process in their settlement agency was fair, eight (32%) disagreed, and six (24%) were undecided. During the qualitative interview, 17 workers (68%) saw some fairness in the process since they knew immigrant frontline workers who were promoted to leadership positions within the organization. Seeing immigrants becoming managers, and even the CEO in one big organization, shows frontline workers that promotion is possible.

Since promotion opportunities are quite limited in the settlement sector (especially in smaller organizations), salary remains one of the major symbols of recognition for their work. Yet, settlement agencies depend on grants and funding from donor agencies, including Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC). According to the scale, only four managers (50%) felt their organization was offering "equal pay for equal work," three (37.5%) were undecided, and one (12.5%) disagreed. As part of efforts to create more equitable salaries, two managers explained that their organizations (25%) had engaged in a regular external review of pay equity and were compliant with the *Ontario Pay Equity Act*. Though it has been challenging to keep pace with the rate of inflation and the settlement sector lately, three managers (37.5%) said their organization was still reviewing salaries annually; one was following the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants' salary survey, the others were doing their own market research. Employees were even less optimistic when it comes to salaries. Only 10 (41.7%) agreed with the scale statement about "equal pay for equal work," 11 disagreed (45.8%), and three (12.5%) were undecided. In the qualitative follow-up, seven workers (28%) mentioned that salaries were fair given that everyone received the same amount based on their seniority, contractual status, and position.

While transparent and equitable human resource practices are important factors in fostering a climate of inclusion, putting this norm into practice poses some limitations in the settlement sector. For instance, not everyone experienced a fair hiring process. Four frontline workers (16%) mentioned that their non-Canadian credentials were not recognized in their agency. Three managers (37.5%) and five frontline workers (20%) reported that immigrant frontline workers were often hired primarily for their language skills, not necessarily their qualifications, especially when there was a linguistic shortage. Four employees (16%) referred to this practice as tokenism, i.e., hiring people from a certain racial, ethnic, or linguistic group as a diversity *façade*. One interviewee recalled this: "after the introduction of the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion department, they were able to hire a black man as a manager of a small department. And they ticked the box" (IFW-21).

The same kind of limits to fair human resource practices can be seen in promotion practices. Six employees (24%) and three managers (37.5%) mentioned the lack of a clear promotion process or significant loopholes in the process, resulting in the promotion being at the discretion of senior management. Such process is hence biased in favour of unwritten criteria, such as familiarity with the organization, supervisor's opinion, seniority (which is then often synonymous with whiteness) or belongingness to a certain group (in the case of ethno-specific organizations). One manager explained: "The thing about this process that is challenging is [that] it's not the best person that gets the job. It's the person who meets the kind of basic minimum requirements who has the seniority" (MNG-3). Even in organizations that do have a formal promotion process, five workers (20%) and two managers (25%) mentioned that the process was far from neutral. In addition, according to nine workers (36%) and two managers (25%), advancement opportunities for newcomers are limited because of a lack of recognized credentials (e.g., a Canadian degree), language skills (e.g., a certain level of English proficiency), a lack of specific identity (e.g., belonging to an ethnic or religious group in ethno-specific or confessional agencies), or a narrow vision of their capabilities (e.g., thinking an immigrant cannot lead outside the settlement unit). For sure, such bias can be a cause of great frustration for talented and overqualified frontline workers.

Finally, the issue of equitable salaries is probably the most burning and complex one, since it does not entirely depend on the agencies themselves (Mukhtar et al., 2016; Richmond & Shields, 2005). Equity is itself a difficult concept (Bernstein, Bulger, Salipante, & Weisinger, 2020). One manager explained that salaries and benefits may be considered "equal" in terms of the same pay being offered for the same pay grade (or job title), but they were not equitable based on the nature and scope of work within one organization or compared with other agencies doing similar work (MNG-1). Another manager illustrates the kind of paradoxical headaches that may come with equity in a big organization: "Every time we would have been able to increase our salaries [as a unit] because the funder supported that, our organization said, 'no,' because then we're not equitable. Then that means [that in] our government-funded programs [by IRCC], their staff [could] get more money than our childcare people [in another unit]…" (MNG-8). The outcome is a high turnover rate of settlement workers since they can get better paid elsewhere in the settlement sector.

Aside from the equity problems faced by managers, the workers themselves raised the issue of injustice caused by their wages. Six employees (24%) and three managers (37.5%) felt salaries were inadequate compared with other organizations. Seven employees (28%) mentioned they felt underpaid for the nature and volume of the work they did compared with others who did similar work, i.e., being mental health workers, engaged in emotionally distressing work, dealing with the "dark side of life" (IFW-8). Finally, six workers (24%) and one manager (12.5%) saw the wages as unfair because salaries did not provide a decent standard of living, particularly in the context of soaring inflation. While many felt highly invested in and indebted to their settlement agencies, their very poor salaries were forcing them to re-evaluate their work future.

DISCUSSION: THE SYSTEM AT PLAY BEHIND INCOMPLETE INCLUSION NORMS

This article describes the norms and practices of workplace inclusion in the Ontario settlement sector by paying particular attention to the voices of frontline workers. What emerges is a mixed picture, where certain norms seem strongly institutionalized (most notably the celebration of differences and the valuing of mutually supportive relationships), while others seem unevenly implemented (most notably involvement in decision-making and fair HR processes). These norms and practices are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of inclusion norms and practices in the Ontario settlement sector

Norms	Openness to differences	Positive relationships	Workers' empowerment	Equitable HR practices
Inclusive practices	Celebrating differences	Caring for people as friends or family	Enabling employee influence on decision-making	Hiring based on credentials, experience, and skills
	Accommodating cultural and religious needs	Fostering workplace collaboration	Giving employees autonomy	Fair promotion practices
			Investing in employee development	Fair salaries and benefits
Exclusive practices	Assimilationist cultural expectations	Lack of safety and care	Not incorporating employee input	Utilitarian and token hires
	Individualization of accommodation	Discrimination and lack of support	Micromanagement and lack of autonomy	Biased promotion practices
			Unequal access to training opportunities	Unequitable salaries

We can now return to our initial question: can these settlement organizations be seen as prefiguring an inclusive workplace for newcomers? We believe that the answer to this question is partly yes. Some of the dynamics described so far illustrate a workplace where it is possible to bring "one's whole self to work" (Ferdman, 2014, p. 42), while others illustrate dynamics of exclusion and marginalization pertaining to Canadian society in general.

Dynamics prefigurating an inclusive workplace
Three key points need to be highlighted: settlement agencies 1) intentionally hire people from all cultures dedicated to the common good; 2) are committed to celebrating and accommodating differences; 3) are quite successful in creating a supportive environment. First, the importance of diversity does not need to be demonstrated within the settlement agencies under study: its value is self-evident. A survey of the Toronto settlement sector in 2006 showed that 86 percent of settlement workers were women, 75 percent were newcomers, and 63 percent were racialized, which shows intersectional dimensions of diversity (Wilson, 2006). In this present study Ontario-based sample, 84 percent of frontline workers self-identified as women and 72 percent considered themselves racialized. Clearly, newcomers' diverse languages and cultural backgrounds are inescapable employment assets for settlement agencies (Türegün, 2013b). The managers interviewed spoke about intentionally hiring newcomers because they valued their non-Canadian expertise and cultural backgrounds. This example of the value of diversity and its alignment with the mission of the agencies to contribute to the integration of immigrants is an example of prefiguration.

Second, celebrating religious and cultural differences has the virtue of recognizing that cultures are different from one another and that accommodations are a way of honouring the rights of immigrants in their adopted country (Haq, 2016). Since the enactment of Canada's Multicultural Act in 1988, multiculturalism has been a marker of cultural identity but remains nevertheless a fragile, contested ideal (Bilge, 2012; Hiranandani, 2012). Frontline workers in settlement agencies come from minoritized groups whose voices and contributions are too often overlooked or tokenized. Evidence of the norm of empowerment in settlement agencies shows the impact of fully valuing, engaging, and developing the capabilities of frontline workers as respected experts in their field.

Third, positive relationships emerge as the intentional commitment of many frontline workers to engage with colleagues in a caring, curious, and open-minded way. This commitment leads to spontaneous positive dynamics, which can be supported by creating opportunities for collaboration, mentorship, and socialization. Even though the metaphor of the family may not always have positive connotations, employees used it to describe being an insider, being unconditionally accepted as a whole person in an interconnected web of caring relationships. Feelings of inclusion and "insider" status due to good relationships with colleagues are some of the factors that lead to increased employee retention and reduced turnover (Brimhall et al., 2014; Hwang & Hopkins, 2012, 2015). This is also an example of prefiguration.

Dynamics contributing to systemic forms of exclusion
Important limitations to the norms of inclusion in the settlement agencies we studied are reflective

of broader systemic racism and exclusion in Canadian society. Three dynamics include: 1) frontline workers having to adapt to the unwritten rules of the Canadian dream; 2) being caught in a racialized organizational hierarchy; and 3) becoming a means to economic ends, doing underpaid care work.

First, the ideas of tokenism or assimilationist workplaces, although raised only by a few participants, are representative of the broader difficulties of multiculturalism in Canada. According to Shore et al. (2011), an assimilationist culture does not balance the need for uniqueness and the need for belonging characteristic of inclusion. Typically, managers are representative of the dominant culture, and they have certain expectations that immigrant frontline workers abide by Canadian norms, values, and behaviours without a critical lens for examining those norms and values. There are thus three problems with this partial integration of differences: 1) room is made only for differences that do not come in conflict with dominant norms, 2) the hegemonic power of the white norms is not to be questioned, and 3) people have to comply to these norms if they are to be successful (Grimes, 2002; Kang, DeCelles, Tilcsik, & Jun, 2016). This danger is omnipresent in the agencies that welcome newcomers, despite their commitment to integration.

Second, the way diversity is distributed in the settlement sector shows a hierarchical structure. A survey of the Ontario Nonprofit Sector in 2013 showed that despite its diverse workforce, the sector was less diverse in its leadership (McIsaac & Moody, 2014), an issue arising from systemic forms of exclusion in the larger Canadian society. While frontline workers have a certain degree of autonomy in how they do their work, their feedback is not always integrated into the larger functioning of the organization, which shows that minoritized workers are often seen as means to an end rather than influential stakeholders (Liu & Guo, 2021). They experience frustration at being caught between wanting to respond to the needs of clients, which they understand better, and following the authority of managers, who are typically representatives of the dominant white culture.

Third, while Canada is internationally lauded for its multiculturalism, which has become inextricably linked with Canadian identity (Kymlicka, 2021), the hard truth is that Canada's immigration system is set up to meet its economic needs, not necessarily the needs of immigrants (Chand & Tung, 2019). In that context, settlement agencies have the difficult task of mediating between the government's utilitarian conception of immigration (linked to the needs of the job market) and the needs of the immigrants themselves. The impact of the Canadian government's policies regarding the burden of supporting and integrating an increasing influx of newcomers to Canada falls largely on immigrant women who work and volunteer on the frontlines in the settlement sector (Lee, 1999). The norm of inclusion has a hard time competing with deeply rooted gendered norms in society that see care work as women's work. This is compounded for racialized women via cultural assumptions and expectations around how racialized ethnic minority groups care for their community's needs (Charlesworth, 2010; Lee, 1999). The settlement is no exception.

CONCLUSION
This study sought to bridge important gaps in the existing literature on workplace inclusion in settlement agencies, in four valuable ways. First, while participants of existing studies are often organizational leaders, we interviewed frontline workers about how they perceived EDI policies and practices. Second, while most studies focus on measuring a climate of inclusion within a single or-

ganization, we focused on immigrant frontline employees from different settlement agencies across Ontario to offer a more comprehensive understanding of inclusion norms and practices in the settlement sector. Third, while most studies use either quantitative surveys or qualitative interviews or focus groups, we employed mixed methods, using both a validated quantitative scale to measure the climate of inclusion (Nishii, 2013), as well as semi-structured qualitative interviews. Finally, the authors sought the perspective of diverse employees who are hired and valued specifically for their diversity, a situation that makes them more vulnerable to exclusive practices such as differentiation and tokenism (Shore et al., 2011; Turco, 2010).

The interviews confirm that the settlement agencies understudy are trying to walk the talk of workplace inclusion. Differences are celebrated and accommodated, so most people feel they can bring what is unique about themselves into a work environment they belong to. From a general outlook, equity in employment conditions seems to be the next frontier, that is going beyond applying universal norms, to having a closer look at the advantages and disadvantages faced by different groups (Bernstein et al., 2020). To do so, more resources are needed, which ties back to the funding structure of the sector. This also applies to decision-making and to the old argument being made by leader-member exchange theorists (Dulebohn et al., 2012; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995): who is being heard versus ignored by leaders? This might require more intentionality, including some training or coaching, especially if we are to address the racial gap identified earlier.

However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of these findings. First, the sample was small (25 participants from eight organizations of a possible 230 organizations in Ontario). Second, these participants were recruited from organizations that are members of the National Newcomer Navigation Network, a pan-Canadian education and advocacy network. The results may be influenced by an assumed self-selection bias in the fact that most organizations that accepted to be part of this research have been doing EDI work for some time now. The portrait presented here may be more positive than what is playing out in most Ontario settlement agencies. Nonetheless, it provides some good lessons on inclusion in the third sector.

NOTES
1. We use immigrants in a broad sense, whether people are landed immigrants, asylum seekers, or refugees.
2. Tokens can be defined as "numeric minorities in segregated occupations" (Turco, 2010, p. 895). As such, they face various obstacles to their career advancement that are compounded by their isolation.
3. Such an assimilationist norm is not simply a cultural issue. It can just as easily be formulated in heterosexist terms. As one interviewee (IFW-20) mentioned, despite a strong openness to cultural differences, many individuals from the LGBTQ+ community feel "tolerated" rather than "celebrated" in settlement agencies.
4. While most frontline workers did not describe their discrimination in terms of sexism and/or racism, it bears many of its intersectional caracteristics given the demographic makeup of the sample.

REFERENCES

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society*, *20*(4), 441–464. doi:10.1177/0891243206289499

Acquavita, S.P., Pittman, J., Gibbons, M., & Castellanos-Brown, K. (2009). Personal and organizational diversity factors' impact on social workers' job satisfaction: Results from a national internet-based survey. *Administration in Social Work*, *33*(2), 151–166. doi:10.1080/03643100902768824

Alter, N. (2018). *The strength of difference: Itineraries of atypical bosses*. Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Publishing.

Ashton, W., Pettigrew, R.N., & Galatsanou, E. (2016). Assessment of settlement services systems in western and northern Canada: Perceptions of settlement provider organizations. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *48*(3), 69–89. doi:10.1353/ces.2016.0026

Baines, D., Cunningham, I., Campey, J., & Shields, J. (2014). Not profiting from precarity: The work of nonprofit service delivery and the creation of precariousness. *Just Labour*, *22*. doi:10.25071/1705-1436.6

Bardin, L. (2013). *L'analyse de contenu*. Paris, FR: Presses universitaires de France. doi:10.3917/puf.bard.2013.01

Bauder, H., & Jayaraman, S. (2014). Immigrant workers in the immigrant service sector: Segmentation and career mobility in Canada and Germany. *Transnational Social Review*, *4*(2–3), 176–192. doi:10.1080/21931674.2014.952978

Becker, H.S. (1997). *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. Free Press.

Bernstein, R.S., Bulger, M., Salipante, P., & Weisinger, J.Y. (2020). From diversity to inclusion to equity: A theory of generative interactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *167*(3), 395–410. doi:10.1007/s10551-019-04180-1

Bicchieri, C., Muldoon, R., & Sontuoso, A. (2018). Social norms. In E.N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Stanford, California: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/social-norms/

Bilge, S. (2012). Mapping Québécois sexual nationalism in times of "crisis of reasonable accommodations." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *33*(3), 303–318. doi:10.1080/07256868.2012.673473

Bramadat, P. (2014). Don't ask, don't tell: Refugee settlement and religion in British Columbia. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, *82*(4), 907–937. doi:10.1093/jaarel/lfu040

Brimhall, K.C. (2019). Inclusion is important … But how do I include? Examining the effects of leader engagement on inclusion, innovation, job satisfaction, and perceived quality of care in a diverse nonprofit health care organization. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *48*(4), 716–737. doi:10.1177/0899764019829834

Brimhall, K.C., Lizano, E.L., & Mor Barak, M.E. (2014). The mediating role of inclusion: A longitudinal study of the effects of leader–member exchange and diversity climate on job satisfaction and intention to leave among child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *40*, 79–88. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.003

Brimhall, K.C., Mor Barak, M.E., Hurlburt, M., McArdle, J.J., Palinkas, L., & Henwood, B. (2017). Increasing workplace inclusion: The promise of leader-member exchange. *Administration in Social Work*, *41*(3), 222–239. doi:10.1080/23303131.2016.1251522

Brimhall, K.C., Williams, R.L., Malloy, B.M., Piekunka, L.R., & Fannin, A. (2022). Workgroup inclusion is key for improving job satisfaction and commitment among human service employees of color. *Administration in Social Work*, *46*(5), 347–369. doi:10.1080/23303131.2022.2085642

Brown, W.A. (2002). Inclusive governance practices in nonprofit organizations and implications for practice. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, *12*(4), 369–385. doi:10.1002/nml.12404

Caine, V., & Mill, J. (2015). *Essentials of community-based research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Chand, M., & Tung, R.L. (2019). Skilled immigration to fill talent gaps: A comparison of the immigration policies of the United States, Canada, and Australia. *Journal of International Business Policy*, *2*(4), 333–355. doi:10.1057/s42214-019-00039-4

Charlesworth, S. (2010). The regulation of paid care workers' wages and conditions in the non-profit sector: A Toronto case study. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, *65*(3), 380–399. doi:10.7202/044888ar

Day, N.E., & Greene, P.G. (2008). A case for sexual orientation diversity management in small and large organizations. *Human Resource Management*, *47*(3), 637–654. doi:10.1002/hrm.20235

De Munck, J. (1999). *L'institution sociale de l'esprit : Nouvelles approches de la raison.* Paris, FR: Presses universitaires de France.

Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2022). *Getting to diversity: What works and what doesn't.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. doi:10.4159/9780674290051

Dobusch, L. (2014). How exclusive are inclusive organisations? *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *33*(3), 220–234. doi:10.1108/EDI-08-2012-0066

Dobusch, L. (2021). The inclusivity of inclusion approaches: A relational perspective on inclusion and exclusion in organizations. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *28*(1), 379–396. doi:10.1111/gwao.12574

Dulebohn, J.H., Bommer, W.H., Liden, R.C., Brouer, R.L., & Ferris, G.R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, *38*(6), 1715–1759. doi:10.1177/0149206311415280

Ferdman, B.M. (2014). The practice of inclusion in diverse organizations. In B.M. Ferdman & B.R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 3–54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi:10.1002/9781118764282.ch1

Forde, S.D., Lee, D.S., Mills, C., & Frisby, W. (2015). Moving towards social inclusion: Manager and staff perspectives on an award winning community sport and recreation program for immigrants. *Sport Management Review*, *18*(1), 126–138. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2014.02.002

Fredette, C., Bradshaw, P., & Krause, H. (2016). From diversity to inclusion: A multimethod study of diverse governing groups. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *45*(1), 28S–51S. doi:10.1177/0899764015599456

Gagnon, S., Cuckier, W., Olivier, A., & Ying Mo, G. (2024). *DiversityLeads 2024. Diverse representation in leadership: A review of 10 Canadian cities*. Toronto, ON: Diversity Institute, Toronto Metropolitan University. https://www.torontomu.ca/diversity/reports/diversityleads2024/ [September 2024]

George, U. (2002). A needs-based model for settlement service delivery for newcomers to Canada. *International Social Work*, *45*(4), 465–480. doi:10.1177/00208728020450040501

Giwa, S., & Chaze, F. (2018). Positive enough? A content analysis of settlement service organizations' inclusivity of LGBTQ immigrants. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *30*(3), 220–243. doi:10.1080/10538720.2018.1463889

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Graen, G.B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 219–247. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5

Grimes, D.S. (2002). Challenging the status quo? Whiteness in the diversity management literature. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *15*(3), 381–409. doi:10.1177/0893318902153003

Hacker, K. (2017). *Community-based participatory research*. London, U.K.: Sage Publications.

Haq, R. (2016). Accomodating religious diversity in the Canadian workplace: The hijab predicament in Quebec and Ontario. In S. Gröschl & R. Bendl (Eds.), *Managing religious diversity in the workplace: Examples from around the world* (pp. 31–51). London, U.K.: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315593623-4

Hiranandani, V. (2012). Diversity management in the Canadian workplace: Towards an antiracism approach. *Urban Studies Research*, *2012*, 1–13. doi:10.1155/2012/385806

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hwang, J., & Hopkins, K. (2012). Organizational inclusion, commitment, and turnover among child welfare workers: A multilevel mediation analysis. *Administration in Social Work*, *36*(1), 23–39. doi:10.1080/03643107.2010.537439

Hwang, J., & Hopkins, K.M. (2015). A structural equation model of the effects of diversity characteristics and inclusion on organizational outcomes in the child welfare workforce. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *50*, 44–52. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.01.012

Janzen, R., Brnjas, C., Cresswell, J., & Chapman, M. (2020). Faith and settlement partnerships: Perspectives of community stakeholders. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, *18*(2), 239–260. doi:10.1080/15562948.2019.1658007

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(4), 589–617. doi:10.1177/0003 12240607100404

Kang, S. K., DeCelles, K.A., Tilcsik, A., & Jun, S. (2016). Whitened résumés: Race and self-presentation in the labor market. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *61*(3), 469–502. doi:10.1177/0001839216639577

Klarsfeld, A., Ng, E.S., Booysen, L., Christiansen, L.C., & Kuvass, B. (2016). *Research handbook of international and comparative perspectives on diversity management*. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kuptsch, C., Charest, É., Tomei, M., & Cyr, H. (2022). *Le futur de la diversité*. Québec City, QC: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Kymlicka, W. (2021). The precarious resilience of multiculturalism in Canada. *The American Review of Canadian Studies*, *51*(1), 122–142. doi:10.1080/02722011.2021.1878544

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Lee, J.-A. (1999). Immigrant women workers in the immigrant settlement sector. *Canadian Woman Studies*, *19*(3), 97–103. https://cws.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cws/article/view/7882

Liu, J., & Guo, S. (2021). Navigating transition to work: Recent immigrants' experiences of lifelong learning in Canada. *International Review of Education*, *67*(6), 733–750. doi:10.1007/s11159-021-09931-9

Lowe, S., Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2017). Settling on austerity: ISAs, immigrant communities and neoliberal restructuring. *Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research*, *28*. https://alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/22417

McIsaac, E., & Moody, C. (2014). *Diversity and inclusion: Valuing the opportunity*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Centre, Mowat Centre. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/99257 [February 2014].

Mor Barak, M.E. (2022). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mor Barak, M.E., Lizano, E.L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M.-K., Hsiao, H.-Y., & Brimhall, K.C. (2016). The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Human Service Organizations, Management, Leadership & Governance*, *40*(4), 305–333. doi:10.1080/23303131.2016 .1138915

Mukhtar, M., Dean, J., Wilson, K., Ghassemi, E., & Wilson, D.H. (2016). "But many of these problems are about funds…": The challenges immigrant settlement agencies (ISAS) encounter in a suburban setting in Ontario, ON. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *17*(2), 389–408. doi:10.1007/s12134-015-0421-5

Nishii, L.H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(6), 1754–1774. doi:10.5465/amj.2009.0823

Nishii, L.H., Khattab, J., Shemla, M., & Paluch, R.M. (2018). A multi-level process model for understanding diversity practice effectiveness. *Academy of Management Annals*, *12*(1), 37–82. doi:10.5465/annals.2016.0044

Nishii, L.H., & Rich, R.E. (2014). Creating inclusive climates in diverse organizations. In B.M. Ferdman & B.R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion* (pp. 205–228). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi:10.1002/9781118764282.ch11

Ontario Nonprofit Network (2018). *Decent work charter.* https://theonn.ca/publication/decent-work-charter/ [November 2018].

Ponzoni, E., Ghorashi, H., & Van Der Raad, S. (2017). Caught between norm and difference: Narratives on refugees' inclusion in organizations. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *36*(3), 222–237. doi:10.1108/EDI-11-2015-0093

Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2005). NGO-government relations and immigrant services: Contradictions and challenges. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *6*(3–4), 513–526. doi:10.1007/s12134-005-1024-3

Rubington, E., & Weinberg, M.S. (Eds.). (2008). *Deviance: The interactionist perspective* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson A. & B. Boston.

Senthanar, S., MacEachen, E., Premji, S., & Bigelow, P. (2020). "Can someone help me?" Refugee women's experiences of using settlement agencies to find work in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *21*(1), 273–294. doi:10.1007/s12134-019-00729-1

Shore, L.M., Cleveland, J.N., & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, *28*(2), 176–189. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.003

Shore, L.M., Randel, A.E., Chung, B.G., Dean, M.A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 1262–1289. doi:10.1177/0149206310385943

Solebello, N., Tschirhart, M., & Leiter, J. (2016). The paradox of inclusion and exclusion in membership associations. *Human Relations*, *69*(2), 439–460. doi:10.1177/0018726715590166

Sue, D.W., Alsaidi, S., Awad, M.N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C.Z., & Mendez, N. (2019). Disarming racial microaggressions: Microintervention strategies for targets, White allies, and bystanders. *American Psychologist*, *74*(1), 128–142. doi:10.1037/amp0000296

Trinaistic, E. (2020). Hackathons as instruments for settlement sector innovation. *The International Journal of Information, Diversity, & Inclusion*, *4*(2), 123–133. doi:10.33137/ijidi.v4i2.34035

Turco, C.J. (2010). Cultural foundations of tokenism: Evidence from the leveraged buyout industry. *American Sociological Review*, *75*(6), 894–913. doi:10.1177/0003122410388491

Türegün, A. (2013a). Immigrant settlement work in Canada: Limits and possibilities for professionalization. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie*, *50*(4), 387–411. doi:10.1111/cars.12025

Türegün, A. (2013b). Rebuilding professional lives: Immigrant professionals working in the Ontario settlement service sector. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *14*(3), 597–614. doi:10.1007/s12134-012-0258-0

Waters, R.D., & Bortree, D.S. (2012). Improving volunteer retention efforts in public library systems: How communication and inclusion impact female and male volunteers differently. *International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *17*(2), 92–107. doi:10.1002/nvsm.438

Weisinger, J.Y. (2017). Diversity and diversity management in nonprofit organizations. In J.E. Sowa & J.K.A. Word (Eds.), *The nonprofit human resource management handbook: From theory to practice* (pp. 323–338). New York, NY: Routledge.

Weisinger, J.Y., Borges-Méndez, R., & Milofsky, C. (2016). Diversity in the nonprofit and voluntary sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *45*(1), 3S–27S. doi:10.1177/0899764015613568

Wilson, B. (2006). *On the front lines of Toronto's immigrant- and refugee-serving sector: A report of the on the front lines project.* Toronto, ON: Community Social Planning Council of Toronto; Family Service Association of Toronto. http://socialplanningtoronto.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/on-the-front-lines_immigrant-sector_july-2006.pdf [July 2006].

Yates, L. (2015). Rethinking prefiguration: Alternatives, micropolitics and goals in social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, *14*(1), 1–21. doi:10.1080/14742837.2013.870883

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Michaël Séguin is assistant professor at Saint Paul University's School of Leadership, Ecology and Equity. Email: michael.seguin@ustpaul.ca

Bianca Briciu is associate professor at Saint Paul University's School of Leadership, Ecology and Equity. Email: bbbriciu@ustpaul.ca

Amy MacDonald is a trainer and facilitator with Clearview Training & Consulting. Email: amy@clearviewtraining.org

Michael Okunlola is the marriage and family pastor at Waterloo Pentecostal Assembly. Email: michael@wpa.church

Sahar Zohni is the manager of operations, planning and performance at the National Newcomer Navigation Network. Email: szohni@cheo.on.ca

Christine Kouri is the director of the National Newcomer Navigation Network. Email: ckouri@newcomernavigation.ca

APPENDIX 1

RESULTS BY STATUS AND RACE OF THE INCLUSION SCALE (*N* = 33)

	Frontline Workers			Managers		
	All (*n* = 25)	Racia-lized (*n* = 18)	Non-Racia-lized (*n* = 6)	All (*n* = 8)	Racia-lized (*n* = 1)	Non-Racia-lized (*n* = 7)
Integration of Difference						
My workplace is characterized by a non-threatening environment in which people can reveal their "true" selves.	4.36	4.11	5.00	4.63	5.00	4.57
My workplace values work-life balance.	4.16	4.06	4.50	4.63	5.00	4.57
My workplace commits resources to ensuring that employees are able to resolve conflicts among colleagues effectively.	3.80	3.61	4.33	4.13	4.00	4.14
Employees in my workplace are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs that they fill.	3.92	3.72	4.50	4.63	5.00	4.57
My workplace has a culture of appreciating the differences that people bring.	4.04	3.89	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.57
Inclusion in Decision-Making						
In my workplace, all employees are empowered to make work-related decisions on their own.	3.60	3.44	4.17	3.88	4.00	3.86
In my workplace, all employees' input is actively sought.	3.88	3.67	4.50	4.25	5.00	4.14
In my workplace, all employees' insights are used to rethink or redefine work practices.	3.56	3.33	4.17	4.25	5.00	4.14
In my workplace, all employees can offer ideas on how to improve operations outside of their own areas.	3.56	3.33	4.17	4.00	4.00	4.00
In my workplace, all employees can make use of their own knowledge to enhance their work.	4.08	3.89	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.57
Equitable Employment Practices						
The recruitment in my workplace is equitable.	3.72	3.50	4.17	4.50	5.00	4.43
My workplace has a fair promotion process.	3.16	2.89	3.83	3.71	4.00	3.67
My workplace invests in the development of all of its employees.	3.92	3.89	4.17	4.25	4.00	4.29
Employees in my workplace receive "equal pay for equal work."	3.04	2.71	3.83	3.88	5.00	3.71
My workplace provides safe ways for employees to voice their grievances.	3.80	3.61	4.33	4.50	5.00	4.43
Total Weighted Average	**3.77**	**3.58**	**4.31**	**4.28**	**4.53**	**4.24**

Note: Weighted averages are based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree)

Legend of the Color Code:

Disagree, Strongly Disagree	≤ 2.99
Neutral, Leaning to Disagree	3.00 - 3.49
Neutral, Leaning to Agree	3.50 - 3.99
Agree	4.00 - 4.99
Strongly Agree	5.00