

1-1-2010

# Identifying the relationship between network governance and community action program participation

Angelique M. Goliday  
*Walden University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

---

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu](mailto:ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu).

# Walden University

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Angelique Goliday

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by  
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Anthony B. Leisner, Committee Chairperson,  
Public Policy and Administrations Faculty

Dr. Raj Singh, Committee Member,  
Public Policy and Administrations Faculty

Dr. George Smeaton, University Reviewer,  
Public Policy and Administrations Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

David Clinefelter, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2010

ABSTRACT

Identifying the Relationship Between Network Governance and Community Action  
Program Participation

by

Angelique M. Goliday

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Public Policy and Administration

M.P.A., Walden University, 2009  
M.B.A., Franklin University, 2004  
B.A., The Ohio State University, 1999

Walden University  
August 2010

## ABSTRACT

The relevant literature consistently suggests that understanding citizen participation in community action programs is needed to maximize network governance efforts. Yet, there is no empirical evidence demonstrating a relationship between levels of network governance (NG) and citizen participation rates. The purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which levels of NG is correlated with levels of citizen participation in community action agency (CAA) programs, and whether variations in NG or variations over time in average income level is more strongly related to participation. The research was guided by the integrative model of democracy, which emphasizes citizen participation and is seen in Moynihan's theory of self-governance through community action agencies. The study utilized a secondary analysis of data retrieved from on state's Department of Development website. Participation rates of 10 state CAA programs were drawn from these public records and correlated with number of collaborative NG partnerships and mean state income levels over a 5-year period (2004-2008). Pearson's  $r$  tests indicated that number of network partnerships was positively correlated with participation in 8 out of 10 CAA programs including workforce development, education, housing, transportation, medical and food assistance, financial management, and maximum feasible participation programs. Participation in medical and food assistance programs was not related to partnerships. Additionally, variations in average income level were not correlated with program participation. The findings can contribute to positive social change by informing new NG practices to maximize collaborative community efforts to increase community participation, thereby possibly increasing self-sufficiency and reducing poverty.



Identifying the Relationship Between Network Governance and Community Action  
Program Participation

by

Angelique M. Goliday

M.P.A., Walden University, 2009  
M.B.A., Franklin University, 2004  
B.A., The Ohio State University, 1999

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Public Policy and Administration

Walden University  
August 2010

UMI Number: 3412973

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3412973

Copyright 2010 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to Ms. Pearline Womack (1880-1946), Mr. & Mrs. Urice Ross (1927-200; 1928-2009), Mr. Eugene Morgan Sr. (1926-2001) and Ms. Lillian Morgan. It is in their spirit that I know struggle, hardship, and most importantly, perseverance. In their spirit I find the guidance to lay the words to paper, always keeping in mind the hardships they endured that have afforded me the opportunity to present this document to the world. I thank you all. You did not labor in vain.

To Ms. Ethel Mae Dyer & Mr. Eugene Morgan Jr., without you two I would not be who I am. Without my mother I would not have had the fortitude to keep it moving and without my father I would not have the attitude to move the many obstacles that fell in my path along the way. It is in your spirit that I recognize the need for positive social change and contribution to civil society. Thank you for showing me better, for the provisions you both made, thank you for knowing and expecting that I could and that I would. Remember always that I never did anything alone.

To my husband, Vincent Goliday who took the brunt of many blows throughout my educational pursuits, thank you for being there every time I wanted to quit, every time I cried, and the countless times when irrational became the norm. You have truly been an inspiration to me as a public servant and you have played a huge role in defining my role as a public servant and of public service. You have kept me grounded in my faith and being with you has made me stronger and better. So, as my mother said to my father, Frankenstein, meet your monster!

And to Myles Jordan, my baby who has always been a man and who changed my world; I truly have no words to express how much this document belongs to you. I give



you this with great expectations. As I have honored those before me and realized what their struggles have afforded me, I pray you do the same. You will never know your impact on my world. And I believe that before it's said and done, you will have a similar impact on the entire world. You are awesome. For you-in the spirit of the future-I have found the motivation to write, to work, and to live every day pursuing positive social change. To you Myles...my little renaissance man, with love always.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I acknowledge my God; through Him I realized my purpose and He then provided so that I may do His work. In Him, all things are possible. And He has been with me throughout this difficult journey, in fact, at times I'm quite certain he carried me. Through trials and tribulations he has prepared me for many things. I thank God for strength and endurance.

Secondly, I thank Dr. Anthony Leisner. Dr. Leisner you were an excellent ear and a positive guide. You were always there to support me, even when times got tough. I know that you did all you could do for me and that you gave your very best. For that I am truly grateful. I thank you for your continued support throughout the program.

Also, Dr. Reginald Taylor, thank you for your excellence and support. You believed in me when I did not believe in myself. You made sense of what seemed impossible. You've been more than a great educator, you have been a great friend. I appreciate you and wish you much success and prosperity.

Finally, my team...Vince & Myles, Mommy & Daddy, Adrain McConnell, Ms. Peggy Wells, Ms. Janine Migden-Ostrander, Dr. Naomi Sealey, Ms. Robbie Perkins, Ms. Edna Spotser, Aristotle Mante, Mrs. Maria Durban, Mrs. Mindy Goliday...thank you all for your support. May God bless you!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY .....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study .....	3
Problem Statement.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Nature of the Study and Theoretical Base .....	9
Rationale for the Study .....	11
Research Questions.....	11
Definition of Terms .....	13
Assumptions, Scope, and Limitations.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	16
Summary.....	17
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	19
Introduction.....	19
Literature Selection and Research Methods.....	20
Theoretical Framework.....	21
Government versus Governance and Democracy .....	21
Networks, Collaborative Governance, and Democracy.....	25
The Role of Public Administrators and Politicians in Networks .....	32
Community Action Agencies and Networks.....	34
Evaluating Networks: Efforts to Respond to Social Issues.....	39
Gaps in the Current Literature.....	42
Summary .....	43
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS .....	45
Introduction.....	45
Research Design, Questions, and Approach.....	45
Quantitative Research Questions.....	47
Sample Populations .....	48

Instrumentation.....	50
Justification of Method.....	50
Research Ethics.....	53
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	55
Introduction.....	55
Purpose of Study.....	55
Analysis of Data.....	55
Relationship between Partnerships and Participation.....	56
Explanations of the programs listed are found in Appendix A.....	57
Descriptive Statistics.....	57
Relationship between Ohio’s Mean Income and Program Participation Rates.....	59
Descriptive Statistics.....	60
Summary.....	60
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	61
Introduction.....	61
Research Questions.....	61
Summary of Findings.....	62
Relationship to the Literature.....	64
Directions for Future Research.....	67
Recommendations for Action.....	70
Implications for Social Change.....	70
Summary.....	71
REFERENCES.....	73
APPENDIX A: Secondary Data Set and program descriptions.....	83
APPENDIX B: PRESIDENTIAL TIMELINE.....	98
APPENDIX C: Glossary.....	101

CURRICULUM VITAE.....103

## LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 1: Variables and Statistics</i> .....	48
<i>Table 2: Sample Size by Years</i> .....	49
<i>Table 3: Relationship between number of partnerships and the number of participants</i> .	57
<i>Table 4: Program Participation Descriptive Statistics</i> .....	58
<i>Table 5: Program Partnership Descriptive Statistics</i> .....	58
<i>Table 6: Income Descriptive Statistics</i> .....	60

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

### Introduction

Competition among the public, private, and nonprofit sectors is increasing as governments turn to networks to address the increasingly complex social problems such as poverty and social inequality (Goldsmith & Kettle, 2009). Networks or collaboratives involve third parties from the private, public, and nonprofit sectors to solve complicated problems (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). Some consider network governance to be ineffective because it may encourage competition between participating stakeholders (Sehested, 2004). This is similar to Dahl's (2003) assertion about the separation of powers: competition decreases the effectiveness of government. However, research indicates that network governments and collaboration are increasingly beneficial to public sector efforts (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

The lack of education, political participation, and access to technology at the hands of poverty continues to plague American government and exacerbate income and social inequalities (Sandel, 2002). These are problems that traditional approaches to public administration have been unable to resolve without adding to the complexity of government (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007). Wolin (2003) found that the complex market-based government found in the United States required a citizen who is active by way of voting but also content with an unseen government. Contemporary Americans do not fit this form and individuals in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century fell short of these specifications as well (Sirianni, 2009). As people and society change, so changes traditional forms of government (Salamon, 2002).

Aristotle believed that active participation was essential to democratic governance (Jaeger, 2005). Modern technology may serve Aristotle's purposes; either it enhances or limits democratic participation by increasing access to government or limiting access to those who are not able to access the needed technology (Bolgherini, 2007). In this view, poverty and its byproducts may be a threat to democratic governance (Bernard, Reenock, & Sobeck, 2007).

Social and economic inequality may be perpetuated by the market-based government design that encourages competition between powers (Dahl, 2003). The competitive nature of American people requires doing what is needed to be the winners and leaving behind those less apt to compete (Lamounier et al., 2002). The competitive nature of American government seen in the separation of powers may inhibit democracy (Hudson, 2006).

A primary concern of the study was how the relationship between the citizen and the state has been impacted by the collaborative governance in a government known for its separation of powers. Traditionally, citizens have relied on the government to resolve issues they were unable to resolve (Beach, 2002). If collaborative government shifts administrative tasks to third parties, then citizens may claim harm because of tax monies paid to the government for performing these tasks and may increase the demand for transparent accountability (Salamon, 2002).

This study considered the role of community action agencies (CAA) as a democratic agent. Specifically, it evaluated the role of the CAA in network governance as it relates to citizen participation. Goals included determining the influence of network



governance on participation and whether or not that influences the relationship between the citizen and state.

### Background of the Study

This study contributed knowledge that addressed the social outcomes of poverty and social inequality, identified in the previous section, through its evaluation of the methods in which network or collaborative governance responds to these social problems. Because social problems are increasingly complex, combined efforts are quickly becoming the most efficient way to deal with the issues (Salamon, 2002). A goal was to assess the delivery of public services in network government as shown in CAAs in Ohio.

Traditionally, American public policy has used time-honored approaches to address poverty. These approaches have typically been centered on income redistribution and social transfers (Smeeding, 2005). Many of those programs are the offspring of the Social Security Act of 1935 (Social Security Administration, n.d.). These programs include social security, Temporary Assistance for Families and Children (TANF), Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), and child support and welfare programs (Social Security Administration, n.d.). These solutions have proven to increase dependencies for both participants and the state alike (Beach, 2002).

What remains to be seen is whether the increased dependency on social programs increases poverty. It may be viewed that as the need for social programs increases, taxes increase to fund those programs, thereby reducing the income of citizens and businesses. Alternatively, administrators may opt to avoid tax increases by eliminating programs and thereby worsening the condition of program participants. One may claim either alternative to be negligent and perhaps result in demoralizing the nation (Roepke, 1948).

While these relationships were not the focus of the study, implications concerning these relationships were developed throughout the study.

Because of the changing and various needs, the hierarchical approach to governance is being replaced by collaborative governance, which relies on partnerships and specialization to accomplish goals (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). This is exemplified in President Johnson's and Senator Moynihan's declaration of war on poverty (Moynihan, 1969). The public policy outcome was the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA). A primary goal was to end poverty by eliminating the causes of poverty (Nemon, 2007). The EOA introduced CAA to local communities to implement the programs designed to eradicate poverty, as well as to increase democratic engagement among the impoverished (Moynihan, 1969). However, an incorrect assumption was that the Johnson administration had a well-defined cause of poverty (Nemon, 2007).

In theory, the impoverished would be best suited to govern themselves because the impoverished were highly aware of their condition (Moynihan, 1969). This ideology was very similar to that of Roepke (1950) who believed that middle class clerks were the key to restoring post-World War II western democracies. In any case, the CAAs were charged with helping the poor with social decision making, coordinating improvements such as antipoverty programs, and simply providing service to the poor (Office of Economic Opportunity [OEO], n.d.). In short, the CAA effort was not fully effective during its first years (Moynihan, 1969). By 1974, the community action initiative had almost no political support (Nemon, 2007). Moynihan (1969) cited numerous reasons but most notable was that the community action leaders were not prepared for the task. Salamon (2002) cited that the social programs that failed between 1960-1970 failed

mostly because of the political inattention, poor guidelines, few program objectives, and minimal attention to the required administrative tasks. Little attention was given to the fact that the root cause of poverty had not been formally defined (Nemon, 2007).

While the ability for nonprofits to perform administrative tasks well has been debated, current research indicates that contemporary nonprofits are responding to community needs whenever possible (Nemon, 2007). Salamon (2002) found that 42% of federal programs were being administered by CAAs by the 1980s. Because of the large number of CAAs and their contributions, the CAAs have gained a substantial leverage on policy (Salamon, 2003).

Alternatively, state agencies are not always at liberty to act or react in the agency's preferred manner (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). Cross-sector collaboration can alleviate some of these limitations (Skelcher, 2006). Skelcher (2006) found that collaboration across sectors enabled public managers to achieve goals indirectly, by way of influential relationships. In these instances, the relationship with the CAA is beneficial because they are not held by the same boundaries as either private or public sector organizations, they may be more flexible, have additional resources, or be able to assume more risk than the public sector which is constantly under public scrutiny (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

Moynihan (1969) stated that CAAs are primarily led by those in the community. Salamon (2002) documented the public ambivalence associated with nonprofit management. Nonprofit leadership teams are typically less educated than those in the public or private sectors because the nonprofits are unable to secure highly qualified talent on their restricted budgets (Bishop, 2006; Angelica, 2000). To be clear, this is not

to state that because these individuals lack a formal education then they are less capable, but instead to emphasize that a businesslike approach is also required to maintain balance (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). As a result of this imbalance, decision making may become a matter of politics, where nonprofit leaders may be forced to compromise efficiency for cost or some other factor (Stiglitz, 2002). It is possible that cross-sector governance as seen in this view, may suppress the true interests of those represented.

There is a risk that competing participants may attempt to uphold individual interests over the group interests in the collaborative environment. This is because American democracy is founded on and known for its tradition of individualism (Hudson, 2006). Individualism can be a useful trait when viewed as a chance for expressing views in civic participation (Hudson, 2006). Moreover, Smith (1776) asserted that the principal purpose of capitalism, to increase individual wealth, benefits the greater good.

However, it becomes political when competing participants attempt to use power and resources to influence objectives and may harm those intended to benefit from collaboration (Sehested, 2004). Smith (1776) acknowledged that increasing the wealth of the country must come before individual states and cities partake in accumulated wealth. The wealth must flow from the top down rather than from the bottom up. “We must give Caesar’s things to Caesar but the rest to God, family, neighbors, and ourselves” (Roepke, 1950, p. 91). It is implied that competition among individuals who seek to assert power for their sole benefit prior to, or rather than, promoting the greater good may be a disservice. This is a morality issue, however, and is beyond the scope of this study.

As government and civil society erodes, the act of governance is more often a collective activity, involving multiple groups of stakeholders (Sandel, 1996; Bogason,

Kensen & Miller, 2004). It is important to consider whether the citizen and state relationship is affected by networks and collaborative efforts. Research indicated that citizens have begun to turn to local CAAs more frequently than they turn to government agencies (Salamon, 2002). If collaborative efforts can be reduced to politics, then this may also mean that there is the potential for citizens to lose confidence in members of the network such as the CAA (Sehested, 2004). This creates an issue of accountability and therefore, the stability of democratic governance should be monitored (Skelcher, 2006).

The existing literature rarely speaks to the role of CAAs in collaborative government. This suggests that much research is needed because the community action agencies typically act as the front-line workers for many government programs (Bishop, 2006). Weick and Sutcliffe (2001) recognized the importance of the front-line worker as the first to come in contact with program participants and therefore are holders of valuable information. If there are changes in the public perception of the administration and nonprofits alike, the CAA may be the first to acknowledge the change.

#### Problem Statement

There have been few studies concerning collaborative governance and fewer studies that specifically consider the role of CAA in collaborative governance (Skelcher, 2006; Koontz & Thomas, 2006). Instead, most studies focused on multilevel governance and the diminishing hierarchical government structure (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). This lack of information related to the manner in which these changing relationships influence public policy and the interests of the people is problematic to academics and practitioners alike. This information is essential where CAAs are involved because CAAs are tasked with representing the traditionally underrepresented (Moynihan, 1969). This lack of

research on the relationship between the CAA and network governance will be discussed in depth in chapter 2.

Collaborative governance affects the citizen-to-state relationship, causing a real or perceived threat to the stability of democratic governance. As the public needs increased, network governance emerged to address the state's difficulty in meeting those needs (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). In Ohio, as a stakeholder separate from the state itself, the CAA has a participative role in network governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008). The research problem was that community action agencies have not been able to substantially increase citizen participation and increase self-sufficiency as intended. It was anticipated that the presence of networks may be positively related to community participation.

This study attempted to evaluate the CAA's efforts to achieve goals that cannot be addressed in the public sector. This analysis was an effort to assess whether community or self-governance, as Moynihan (1969) and Johnson intended, is being threatened or enhanced in the face of collaborative governance. This study was designed to determine if network partnerships have influenced citizen participation in social programs.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore theories concerning collaborative methods, which include CAAs, and their ability to affect the quality of individual and community lifestyles, as well as the stability of democratic governance. This study considered Moynihan's (1969) view of community action as it relates to the creation of community action agency programs established under the Economic Opportunity Act. The study examined network governance in Ohio to evaluate the effectiveness of network governance, and determine if it affects the relationship between the citizen and the state

when CAAs are a third party. It should be noted that there is little research that evaluates the better governance approach where traditional and collaborative approaches are concerned (Ansell, 2008).

#### Nature of the Study and Theoretical Base

In this study, the theoretical base was the integrative model of democracy. This model highlights citizen participation and integration into the democratic process through collective dialogue (Sehested, 2004). This theory was applied to Moynihan's ideology that communities could successfully self-govern via local community action agencies. This theory, as applied to Moynihan's beliefs, provided the framework for the study.

The study was heavily founded on the assumption that CAAs actually function as intended, as a method of self-governance (Moynihan, 1969). Professional experience indicates that Ohio CAAs do serve as a method of self-governance because they manage human and social programs that assist in maintaining civil order. Research indicated that the primary role of CAAs in Ohio is to distribute Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) funds for a variety of social services, or administer federally funded social programs (Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies). This theory was examined using a statistical test to draw inferences about whether program participation rates are indicative of success in meeting overall program goals, maintaining order, and increasing the likelihood of self-sufficiency.

The target population included individuals who used programs at local CAAs. Both by default and in theory, this group consists of low income, disabled, mentally challenged, and minority groups. Research indicated that these groups are often politically underrepresented (Solt, 2008).

Both Solt (2008) and Putnam (2000) established that political representation and participation is typically more prevalent in middle- to high-income groups. This is driven by the market-based structure of public administration and politics (Dahl, 2003). However, Weakliem, Anderson, and Heath (2005) found this to be true in nonprofit democratic governments as well.

Mettler and Soss (2004) believed that it is possible that these groups participate most often because the political climate requires specific groups to participate. For example, if immigration legislation is being voted on, immigrants are more likely to participate. This indicates that participation may be driven by an individual's relationship or place in society as defined in specific public policy.

Again, the CAAs have a significant role in the policy implementation and execution process, especially when policy drives participation. An example can be seen in the Welfare to Work programs administered by nonprofits in Wisconsin (Cancien & Meyer, 2007). Research found the Wisconsin W2 project to be one of the most successful collaborative efforts designed to implement the Personal Work Responsibility and Opportunity Act of 1996 (Mead, 2004). Seen in this view, the CAAs are taking an active role in self-governance. However, and as stated previously, these initiatives tend to be focused on survival means, such as public utilities welfare, and faith-based policies and social programs as defined by the CSBG (Bishop, 2006).

Without proper political representation, the community condition is unlikely to change (Dawson, 2001). Self-governance should not consist merely of efforts to survive without enhancing the community quality (Moynihan, 1969). Government should be involved in ensuring the community condition is conducive to economic and civic growth



(Dawson, 2001). This study assessed the two variables, network government and civic engagement, in an effort to generate new knowledge concerning the best approaches to political representation and social change through mutual collaboration. Throughout the study, the assumption that CAAs function as intended, as a method of self-governance, was maintained (Moynihan, 1969).

### Rationale for the Study

This study was needed to assess the respective roles of the state, the citizen, and the nonprofit. Nonprofits were designed to supplement governance, not sustain governance (Moynihan, 1969). Professional experience indicates that community action agencies, as in many networking governments, now have an avid role in public policy making. Their views and perceptions are largely developed through their front-line employees, again, most often the working poor (Moynihan, 1969). It was unclear whether this was self-governance or community participation, whether it was effective, or whether it was simply another slight to an at-risk population. Chapter 2 provides some insight to these concerns.

Previous research on this issue is minimal. The possibilities associated with collaborative governance are critically important to social change as well as democratic governance. Both public administrators and academics alike can benefit from empirical evidence of the effects of a changing governance paradigm (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007).

### Research Questions

Choguill (2005) asserted that social science research is often hindered by its natural tendency to be subjective and difficult to quantify. Further, research design is often driven by the research goals (Choguill, 2005). With that in mind, it is important to

consider the research questions as well as the method in which the research plans to address those questions. This study was concerned with the influence of collaboration between the public sector and the CAA, on the citizen experience and participation. The research questions used secondary data to draw inferences about whether the collaboration was positively or negatively related to participation. The research questions also addressed the possibility that any relationship identified could be the result of factors not previously considered. The research questions were:

1. What is the effect of the number of partnerships as recorded by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) on the number of program participants as recorded by the ODOD?
2. What is the effect of Ohio's mean income as measured by the annual American Community Survey collected by the US Census Bureau on participation rates as recorded by the ODOD?

Based on previous research conducted within the framework of the integrative model of democracy, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. The number of partnerships as recorded by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) is positively correlated with citizen participation, as recorded by the ODOD, in each of 10 community action agency programs (Employment, GED/Diploma, Post High Ed, Childcare, Transportation, Health Care, Housing, Food, Financial Management, Maximum Participation).
2. Variation in Ohio's mean income over the five most recent years for which data is available from the annual American Community Survey collected by the US

Census Bureau (2004-2008) is positively correlated with citizen participation, in each of 10 community action agency programs.

#### Definition of Terms

*Collaborative governance:* A type of governance in which public and private actors work collectively in distinctive ways, using particular processes, to establish laws and rules for the provision of public goods (Ansell & Gash, 2008, p. 545).

*Collaborative public management:* The process of multiorganizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved or easily solved by a single organization (O'Leary, Gerard, & Bingham, 2006, p. 7).

*Direct democracy:* In direct democracy citizens act outside of traditional representative political institutions to replace elected officials, ratify or reject legislation, or circumvent representative government altogether and pass laws directly (Gerber & Phillips, 2005, p.310).

*Direct government:* Delivering or withholding a good or service by public employees alone (Salamon, 2002, p.49).

*Governance:* Refers to the acts of a group which addresses public problems that governments alone cannot solve while promoting general welfare (Boyte, 2005, p. 536).

*Network governance:* Governance that relies less on public employees and hierarchical bureaucratic structure and more on partnerships and nongovernmental organizations designed to complete public work (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

*New governance:* A new approach to public problem solving defined by the term governance in place of government, emphasizing the new collaborative nature of

government and by the term ‘new’ recognizing the need for a new approach to considerable tests (Salamon, 2002, p. 8).

*Tool of public action:* An identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem (Salamon, 2002, p. 19).

#### Assumptions, Scope, and Limitations

A primary concern was the assumption that CAAs actually function as Moynihan (1969) intended, based on the description of the goals of the CAA, which is, to encourage self-governance. The literature did not indicate that the CAA has traditionally attempted to encourage self-governance unless self-governance consists only of managing federally funded programs. This scope of this study was limited to the function of the CAA in the community.

In Ohio, the CAA has typically represented the interests of community to the state where basic survival needs have been concerned. However, during election years, the CAAs become more active in engaging the community to vote and they assist in urban restoration. Yet, there was little evidence that the CAA encouraged citizens to participate in daily civic life, such as PTA or city council meetings. The politics of daily life may often play a greater role in community growth and restoration (Putnam, 2000). If this assumption had proven to be false and it was found that the CAA did not promote commitment to local politics, then Putnam’s (2000) position concerning the underrepresented—the lower class lacks the political representation needed to support community ideals and goals—would have been reinforced. .

Because the latter was found to be true, then the ramifications will be twofold. Firstly, there is empirical evidence that the CAA is acting according to original

intentions. The value of this information can be considered with regard to what and/or how, the community agency is actually functioning. Secondly, political representation among the low income is exceptionally limited and based largely on support from the federal government and politics associated with network governance, which is implied in the literature review. Lastly, findings identified the relationship between collaboratives and civic engagement. This leaves little room for subjectivity and may also force community leaders to compromise important goals.

Timing and context were a significant hindrance to the study. The economic crisis, coupled with the loss of blue collar jobs in the state of Ohio, may have caused an increase in public program and assistance applications. This is known as covariance. However, covariance normally occurs when variables are randomly selected (McNabb, 2008). The possibility of covariance will be addressed in Chapter 3.

Further, the public perception of the state has declined (Anderson et al., 2008). The change in the public perception of the American government has been documented over the last 20 years. Whether this shift had some influence on the study may be important. Specifically, community action leadership teams may feel harmed by the increase in dependence on their services; or the attitudes of citizens towards government may have been altered based on their dependence on the community action agencies. While the examination of particular attitudes is outside the scope of this study, it is acknowledged.

Initially, there were concerns about the geographic restrictions limiting the study. The regional economic condition inhibits generalization. There was little to do to address this issue because the purpose of the study was to assess individuals who met

predetermined criteria. Additionally, some areas had different experiences with CAAs based on their area.

### Significance of the Study

This study is useful to public policy, democratic governance, and the promotion of positive social change. Recent political activity encourages positive social change. This study provides new knowledge concerning the best ways to offer representation to those that are lacking by way of local community action agencies. This study provides a theory concerning whether social programs or other collaborative methods are more effective at influencing the quality of individual and community lifestyles, thereby enhancing the stability of democratic governance. It determines whether participation and interaction within local CAA can be considered a form of civic engagement and/or self-governance.

The public perception of governance has changed dramatically within the last 20 years (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). The face of governance is changing, becoming a more collective activity. It is essential to evaluate the public reception of these changes (Bogason et al., 2004). Public administrators should prepare to respond to effectively to possible changing perceptions.

The findings are useful to practitioners attempting to determine the best ways to encourage participation among the underrepresented, manage collaborative governments, and ensure the maximization of roles in each sector. Because CAAs have received little research attention, it is imperative to highlight their potential position in initiating social change. Academics and practitioners alike are served by this reassessment of public and nonprofit roles in civil society, as well as the potential for social change therein.

Additionally, this is valuable for social change because it may free a voice that is often unheard. In the midst of a changing form of governance and civil society, giving consideration to this population may encourage increased civil participation. This is increasingly important as network or collaborative governance changes the shape of public administration.

### Summary

This study evaluated how the CAA may influence citizen participation. In Ohio, CAAs have affected public policies on utilities and welfare because of their position as program administrators (OACAA, n.d.). Of primary concern was whether CAAs focus on self-governance through political representation in policy making. There was little evidence to indicate that CAAs made solid efforts to engage citizens in civil participation or the political process. This was supported in chapter 2.

Research indicated that survival alone can do little to enhance the quality of life (Putnam, 2000). According to Putnam (2000), American civic and social life began to lose value as people placed less emphasis on community and social capital. This argument supports the concept that collaboration is essential to a productive civil society. Perhaps, as Roepke (1948) suggested, the answer is that collaboration should be seen as a method to balance the needs of society.

This research spoke to the collaborative efforts between all the public, nonprofit, and private sectors. Emphasis was given to the relationship between the public and nonprofit, as the nonprofit has assumed many of the state's administrative duties. Moreover, because the nonprofit in this study (the CAA) is often the first to come in contact with the citizen, they may possess helpful insights concerning the needs and

interests of the populations they serve. This information is valuable because America is in the midst of change as shown in chapter 2.

In Chapter 1, the discussion focused primarily on social inequality as a by-product of poverty. The many outcomes of poverty are discussed. These include political underrepresentation as well as economic and social segregation. As stated, these conditions have a significant impact on access to education, technology, and employment thereby violating Reich's (2002) interpretation of the social contract. This discussion is important to the background of the research problem. Because of these issues, network governance emerged.

Chapter 2, review of the literature on democracy, collaboration and community action agencies, provides a foundation for the study. . It compares multiple views to establish a theory about the interaction among collaboration, community action agencies, and network governance. .

Chapter 3 provides a description of this quantitative, nonexperimental study. The quantitative analysis identified the relationship between network governance and civic participation as it is influenced by local community action agencies. This method assisted in forming opinions concerning the theories in chapter 2 about whether collaborative social programs or other methods are more effective at influencing lifestyle quality. Chapter 4 presents the findings. Chapter 5 contains the implications for social change and recommendations for future study.



## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

### Introduction

This section discusses the attempts to reduce poverty through social policies implemented via collaborative governance. It is based on the integrative approach to democracy, which encourages active citizen participation in governance (Sehested, 2004). Emphasis was placed on the collaborative efforts of citizen incorporation in government to implement programs in response to social policy. The goal was to reinforce the assertion that networking or collaboration is not a new concept. What remains unclear is how well the integrative approach to democracy has addressed citizen needs.

A notable government response to social problems—and perhaps the foundation of all social policies—is the Social Security Act of 1935. The Social Security Act was the administrative response to increasing poverty among the elderly caused when veterans' compensation funds were exhausted (Social Security Administration, n.d.). In addition, most Americans experienced considerable financial difficulty after the Great Depression and World War II (Goldsmith & Kettle, 2009). It should be noted that Roepke (1950) documented the demise of western institutional support systems as early as post World War I. The administrative response to these problems set the foundation for generations of social dependence.

Anderson (2003) claimed that public policy makers must have acute knowledge of the circumstances surrounding public problems prior to acting. Moreover, Brettschneider (2006) contended that potential policy outcomes should be considered as part of an ideal democratic environment. Both ideologies might have been very useful in

the Social Security scenario because they may have reduced post-implementation dependency levels. The offspring of the Security Act includes Temporary Aid for Needy Families and Children (TANF), public assistance (in Ohio, Ohio Works First [OWF]), child support, foster care, and alimony (Social Security Administration, n.d.).

### Literature Selection and Research Methods

Much of the literature review concerning network governance consists of social and democratic governance theories. First, democratic governance and the types of democratic governance are imperative to the discussion of network governance. This will be discussed first as they provide the foundation for network governance. Additionally, network and collaborative governance will be discussed in detail. Lastly, the evolution and current position of CAA will be established. In this study, the terms *network governance* and *collaborative governance* are used interchangeably. The manner in which these forms of governance were used in response to the social outcomes of poverty as well as their impact on civic participation will be assessed.

Literature was selected for review from EBSCO and OhioLink databases based on several criteria. First, journal articles were to be published only in peer reviewed journals. This was necessary to ensure academic validity. The literature will be explored using several combinations of related terms such as network governance, collaborative governance, CAAs, and collaborative public management. As mentioned above, research found these terms to be used interchangeably. Preferred literature included these terms. Lastly, chosen literature will have been published within the last 5 to 7 years. This is an effort to ensure that ideologies were current and to ensure that the research problem had not been addressed.

Literature selection is important to the research design and statistical analysis.

While the study considered the relationship between network governance and community program participation, there are many factors that may influence changes in the two. The literature showed that outcomes from participation in network governance were contextual. For this reason, the statistical test must be able to control for certain factors when identifying potential relationships to determine if the same was true for the sample. According to Faherty (2008), Pearson's  $r$  is well suited to accomplish these goals.

Faherty (2008) provided an outline of types of data and statistical tests. Faherty's (2008) outline documents which types of tests are appropriate for each type of data. Pearson's  $r$  is a form of linear regression (Morgan & Gliner, 2000). A positive relationship is found when the values of both variables increase simultaneously (Morgan & Gliner, 2008). A negative relationship exists when the value of one variable increases while the value of the other variable decreases (Morgan & Gliner, 2008). Therefore, Pearson's  $r$  is suitable to predict participation rates as the number of network partnerships change. The results of the test may provide insight concerning the role of the community action agency within the network.

## Theoretical Framework

### *Government versus Governance and Democracy*

To grasp the significance of democracy, one must be able to consider governance in a way that encourages practical comparisons (Skelcher, 2006). Democratic governance is relevant to this discussion because it provides the foundation for and the significance of political representation. Democracy is useful in "reinforcing agreement, encouraging moderation, and maintaining social peace in a restless and immoderate people operating a

gigantic, powerful, diversified, and incredibly complex society...as long as the social prerequisites are met” (Dahl, 2003, p. 251).

However, meeting social prerequisites may be an issue if one’s position is not clearly defined (Roepke, 1950). For example, post world war II American society began to change in a way that caused families to collapse (Beach, 2002). A byproduct of public assistance programs was that divorce became a more acceptable option than times past, and with new highways making travel easier, families began to dissolve (Roepke, 1950; Schorr, 1997). Roepke (1950) realized the need for collaboration to resolve these issues and sought to achieve a “third way” or a balance between collectivism and Smith’s (1776) version of capitalism. This third way, or collaborative approach, to public problems and democratic governance is the focus of this study.

It has been established that defining the social prerequisites for democracy may be difficult. Still, founding the prerequisites for democracy is important because it may identify the conditions under which democracy thrives. There are several variations of democracy, all of which may be influenced by governance. Assuming the prerequisites are different for each type increases the complexity of the situation. This study will evaluate five types of democracy: direct, indirect, deliberative, aggregative, and integrative.

There are two types of government: *direct* and *indirect*. Direct government involves the management of public services and goods exclusively via government agencies (Salamon, 2002). Indirect government involves third parties, either nonprofit or private sector institutions, is not founded on hierarchy, and includes relationships based on influence and market-based interactions (Salamon, 2002). In contemporary public

administration, governance replaces the government as policy making and implementation are more frequently done among groups or networks (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007).

However, the dissolution of the hierarchical establishment may be the cause of the loss of individual identities within communities (Roepke, 1950). Roepke (1950) referred to excessive collaboration as hyper-integration and cautioned against extreme interdependency. In upcoming sections, this hyper-integration, this loss of community identity will be further evaluated.

Direct democracy refers to citizens exercising their rights explicitly to affect policy or political representation (Gerber & Phillips, 2005). This is also known as *participative democracy* (Mayer, Edelenbos, & Monnikhof, 2005). Direct democracy is used most often when different forms are unavailable or when citizens assume that their needs and concerns are not being heard (Gerber & Phillips, 2005). Some argue that direct democracies should be reduced because citizens are not well equipped to handle the dealings of governance (Hudson, 2006; Gerber & Phillips, 2005). Hudson (2006) believed that citizen involvement as defined in direct democracy may be problematic because it inhibits the lawmaker's ability to deliberate issues effectively.

Indirect democracy occurs when citizens participate through representation (Mayer et al., 2005). Here, the decision-making power lies within the designated representatives (Mayer, et al., 2005). However, indirect democratic activity may often lead to misrepresentation because a single vote may not characterize the interests of the group (Barbera & Jackson, 2006). The representative still has the ability to overrule the constituent's perspective for personal or private gain (Barbera & Jackson, 2006).

Deliberative democracy involves group negotiation of issues in effort to achieve the most common good (Bogason, Kensen, & Miller 2004). Deliberation can be an ongoing process, requires facilitation and management skills, and is most useful in the beginning stages of decision making (Scott, Adams, & Weschler, 2004). Groups established for the purpose of deliberation are known as governance networks (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007). Sehested (2004) argued that successful deliberation may enhance the understanding of the democratic process.

On the other hand, issues that may be litigious to the collaborative effort should not be deliberated because it could cause conflict within the group (Dryzek, 2005). One way to minimize the risk of dissension is to deliberate in private. Doing so ensures that stakeholders have the opportunity to consider vital information that may not be discussed in public and eliminates the possibility of generating responses based on constituent's expectations (Stasavage, 2007). However, stakeholders must be sure that private deliberation is also meaningful, that everyone has a chance to speak, and that different opinions are represented (Marshall & Ozawa, 2004).

Aggregative democracies consist of citizens or groups representing the combined interests of multiple groups as the primary democratic delegate (Sehested, 2004). Traditionally, the public sector has been expected to ensure that the will of the public is represented, not the interests of private groups (Salamon, 2002). According to the literature, network governance acts as an aggregative democracy and therefore may inhibit the democratic process (Sehested, 2004). This may be indicative of what Roepke (1950) called hyper-integration; numerous agendas are represented without fully representing the constituent's views.

Finally, having reviewed the possible forms of government, it can be concluded that Moynihan's approach at self-governance is best represented by the integrative model of democracy. The model emphasizes citizen participation and socialization into the democratic process through group discussion (Sehested, 2004). Integrative democracy has different requirements for citizens and politicians (Sehested, 2004). In this view, citizens inform politicians of their views and expect the politicians to represent those views (Sehested, 2004). As mentioned previously, what has not been established is what factors most directly influence participation in this form of democracy.

*Networks, Collaborative Governance, and Democracy*

Social change theories are important to the changing paradigms of governance because they address the evolution of collaborative governance. Agranoff (2003) stated that the emergence of collaborative management could be attributed to both social change and urban regime theories. Current government structures lack innovation and integrative ability, are inflexible and unresponsive, and cannot manage collaboration with private sectors (Moore, 2009). Social change theories support the idea that the changes in social life, such as increased complexity and diversity have fueled the emergence of collaborative governance (Agranoff, 2003; Sirianni, 2009). The argument is that governance must be well prepared to respond to these issues and as a result, the need for collaboration increases (Sirianni, 2009).

The urban regime theory states that government efficiency relies on collaboration with individuals outside the government (Agranoff, 2003). In this view, Sirianni (2009) considers the government to act as a civic enabler. As such, the government prepares citizens for and encourages participation in civil society (Sirianni, 2009).

As noted by Klijn and Skelcher (2007), collaborative governance may be the new form of democratic governance. Agranoff (2003) argued that collaborative governance is likely to become permanent as long as complexity continues to grow, government resources are limited, politics require collaboration, collaborative efforts are institutionalized, and knowledge and information continue to prevail as an economic product. Sirianni (2009) implied the same and argued that the public administrator should be charged with the task of preparing individuals for a “lifetime of shared governance” and encourages the current administration to require federal agencies to support the collaborative effort. In order to do so, agencies must be prepared to deal with various types of collaboration as well as the associated benefits and challenges.

To begin, it is important to understand the differences between network governance and collaborative governance. Collaborative governance involves managing relationships to manipulate regulation and systems to provide public goods, while network governance speaks only to carrying out civic work (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). However, much of the literature used the terms interchangeably, as though the assumption is that completing public work is equivalent to establishing policy, even though this may not be the case. The term *networked government* may also be used in accordance with the established definition of collaborative governance and will include the terms of network governance (Moore, 2009).

Research indicated that network governance can either enhance the democratic process by linking decision makers to the public or hinder the process by creating private interest groups (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007). Alternatively, networks may also be viewed as



the transition to a new type of governance or a new way for private interests to dominate the democratic process (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007). It is imperative that the federal government invests in the network governance model in order to ensure that network governance functions with maximum efficiency (Sirianni, 2009). Common characteristics of networks include:

1. Pluriformity: diverse group of discipline specific participating organizations
2. Self-referentiality: each participant has their own individual agendas
3. Asymmetric interdependencies: dependency does not mean cooperation
4. Dynamism: characteristics change over time (Salamon, 2002, p. 13)

Some advantages of network governance include specialized experience, innovative solutions and responses, speed and flexibility, and increased reach to available resources (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). Bringing multiple stakeholders to the discussion increases the flexibility of government and enables the government to obtain access to resources that may not have been available under different circumstances (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). Specialized experience is beneficial because it allows for experts to contribute to the process (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

Challenges to network governance include performance and general management problems associated with the limitations associated with the lack of hierarchical government structure (Skelcher, 2006). Because networks involve multiple stakeholders, there is no single authority or overseer that can enforce directives (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). Therefore, aligning goals and specialized experience poses limitations to network governance as well (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). Because public administration is made up of individuals working in very specific disciplines, few stakeholders are able to

contribute to issues outside their specializations but still work to maintain individual agendas within the group (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

Previous research in this area has been limited to network governance as it relates to multilevel governance and public and private collaboration (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). There is little research based on the relationship between network or collaborative governance and representation or democracy (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007). Moreover, a review of the literature found that researchers have not assessed the role of the CAA in network or collaborative governance. Because CAAs are often the first point of contact for citizens, especially low income and under represented citizens, their role in representation is essential to understanding collaborative governance and initiating social change (Nemon, 2007).

Collaborative governance is more strictly defined as “regimes of laws, rules, judicial decisions, and administrative practices that constrain, prescribe, and enable the provision of public supported goods and services through formal and informal relationships with agents in the public and private sectors (Heinrich, Hill, & Lynn 2004, p.6). Instead of supporting existing modes of market competition, collaboration maximizes the assets of each sector (Salamon, 2002). As mentioned previously, it is imperative that this is accomplished without one group dominating another, as is seen in cross-sector relationships (Angelica, 2000).

Common goals or tasks of the collaborative effort are problem identification, negotiating solutions to those problems, and program and or policy implementation in response to those problems (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Collaborative efforts exhibit the following characteristics:

1. Initiated by public agencies or institutions.
2. Participants in the round-table include nonstate actors.
3. Participants engage directly in decision making.
4. Formally organized groups that meet collectively.
5. Aims to make decisions by consensus (even if consensus is not achieved in practice).
6. Focus is on public policy or public management (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Advantages of collaboratives are much the same as those in network governance. Collaboratives join a number of stakeholders from the private, public, and nonprofit sectors to come to agreements on how to affect common goals (Lowe, 2008). The access to additional resources increases the public sector's ability to deliver public goods (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

However, collaboration also gives way to conflict (O'Leary & Bingham, 2007). As such, a disadvantage of collaborative governance is that stakeholders will have different levels of access to a variety of resources, giving some stakeholders an unfair advantage over others (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Sehested, 2004). This power struggle is common to aggregative democracies (Sehested, 2004). This was evident in Lowe's study on community development partnerships in Cleveland, Ohio (2008). Contrary to Milward and Provan's findings, the centralized power structure, combined with limited resources, significantly limited the influence of the community development partnership (Milward & Provan, 2006; Lowe, 2008). As a result, the community development partnership was not able to reach their goals (Lowe, 2008).

To avoid disproportionate allocation of power, the collaborative must be well designed (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). A well designed collaborative will consider the following in its design:

1. Identify and focus on public value.
2. Establish trust by creating several points of contact.
3. Guarantee objectives match with public value.
4. Opt for stakeholders that are fiscally established and able to take risks.
5. Consider the existing resources that can be used to encourage collaboration such as technology, authority, or monetary leverage (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

It is important to acknowledge that the relationship between stakeholders must also be managed within the collaborative (Milward & Provan, 2006). Member selection should be considerate to culture, independent values, mission, and goals (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Posner, 2009).

It is unclear whether collaborative and network governance encompasses integrative democratic principles because neither discusses including the citizenry in the process and instead specifically refers to stakeholders and or participants (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). In network governance, the integration refers to maintaining group cohesiveness (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). The government may either act as its own integrator or hire a third party or contractor as an integrator (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

This exemplifies the fact that both the private and nonprofit sectors have an important role in both network and collaborative governance (Goldsmith & Eggers,

2004). For example, nonprofit CAA administers federal programs such as TANF (Handler, 2006). Therefore, the nonprofit CAA exemplifies each of the four types of networks: service implementation, information diffusion, problem solving, and community capacity building (Milward & Provan, 2006). In the following section, the CAA will be discussed in detail.

Alternatively, private companies funded by federal money often manage Medicaid programs (Salamon, 2002). Federally funded, privately operated programs designed to complete public services are called hybrid collaboratives (Koppell, 2003). The existence of hybrid collaboratives supports the assertion that the private sector can complete tasks more efficiently than the public, which is documented as one of the reasons collaboratives have emerged (Salamon, 2002). Private sector leadership and methods were identified as more efficient than that of the public sector during the Clinton administration (Shafritz, Hyde & Parkes, 2004). However, Goldsmith and Kettle (2009) argued that there is no government task that the private sector cannot achieve more efficiently than the public sector.

Although the topic of private sector methods used in the public sector has been much debated, the fact remains that even in network governance, it is necessary to exercise a leadership style that erects trust, encourages the exchange of ideas, remains accountable to the public, and attempts to obtain communal achievement (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Goldsmith & Kettle, 2009). This is very different from the type of leadership that Burns found to be effective in traditional public administration, which sought merely to inspire production (Burns, 1978). This supports Sirianni (2009) and Putnam's (2000)

theories on social change. Public administrators should be responsible for creating an environment conducive to civic participation.

Although there are a few studies on networked governance and complexity theory, the literature indicated that the two are related; network governance is the response or byproduct of complexity theory (Morcol, & Wachhaus, 2009). Complexity theory supports the idea that organizations are increasingly dependent on other organizations, flexible, and self-organizing (Holland, 1995 as cited in Morcol & Wachhaus, 2009). These organizations are known as complex adaptive systems (CAS) (Pascale, Milleman, & Gioja, 2000). Sirianni (2009) found that successful collaboratives shared these same characteristics. In addition, Morcol and Wachhaus (2009) found that both networks and complex adaptive systems are interdependent, based upon relationships, and are self-organizing.

Complex adaptive systems theory is important to network governance because it may assist in defining roles of participants and possible management techniques. Uhl-Bien and McKelvey (2007) documented the importance of proper leadership, not management, in CAS systems. CAS systems, like network governance, require leadership because the final product is typically some form of information (Uhl-Bien & McKelvey, 2007). Subsequent sections will discuss the role of leaders in networked governments.

#### *The Role of Public Administrators and Politicians in Networks*

Managing network can be challenging because there is no hierarchy to identify the central authority figure (Milward & Provan, 2006). Managing indirect relationships requires a different approach than managing hierarchical relationships (Salamon, 2002). Few public managers have the negotiation and collaboration skills required to manage a

network (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Salamon, 2002). However, in collaborative or network governance, the public administrator remains responsible to the public (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Sirianni, 2009).

Skelcher (2006) found that many failed to consider the role of the public manager as someone who promotes democracy showing that their role in networks remains essential. Cooper (2006) agreed, stating that public administrators should be liable to ensure that citizens are well prepared for democratic participation. Sirianni (2009) also considered the public administrator to be an enabler of civic participation. Yet, the most effective way to enable civic participation is questionable. Moynihan (1969) required participation and it proved ineffective. However, Sirianni's (2009) research found that mandating participation increased the network quality.

Milward and Provan (2006) believe public managers should be charged with managing accountability, legitimacy, commitment, and conflict. In addition, the public manager "must balance effectiveness, efficiency, equality and equity, responsiveness, and accountability" (Salamon, 2002, p. 494). Balancing each of these can be extremely difficult for a public manager participating in networked government because there is no authority figure (Milward & Provan, 2006). Each participant will have a different interest and stake in the collaboration and will attempt to push those agendas forward.

Klijn & Skelcher (2007) considers the role of public manager with respect to the effect or role the network hopes to exert. For example:

1. If network governance group is designed to inhibit the democratic process as is sometimes seen in direct democracy, then public administrators

should be the primary decision makers and their positions should not be challenged by other forms of democracy.

2. If network governance enhances democracy, then the public administrator should work to increase involvement, set goals, and act as the final authority on competing views.
3. If network governance is the transition to a new form of democracy, then public administrators should act as moderators because they cannot influence current complexities of governance.
4. If network governance is a way for democratic institutions to increase their position in the process, then public administrators should manage the relationships in the network to influence policy (Klijn & Skelcher, 2007).

Similar to Klijn & Skelcher (2007), Goldsmith and Kettle (2009) consider the possibilities that network governance may be a phenomenon, a pattern, an approach, or a relationship. From this view, it is difficult to determine the proper role of the administrator, other than maintaining relationships and accountability, because academics and practitioners alike must determine the character of network governance (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004; Goldsmith & Kettle, 2009). Meanwhile, it is important for public administrators to ensure the political climate is conducive to collaboration (Sirianni, 2009).

#### *Community Action Agencies and Networks*

In Salamon's (2002) new government, the CAA may be seen as a tool for public service, or a method for harnessing collective efforts to address community problems.

The CAA offers a variety of services to local communities that the government may not



be able to administer (Salamon, 2002). These services are typically not inherently governmental and do not require governmental discretion or the use of judgment in decision making (Goldsmith & Burke, 2009).

In 2002, CAAs represented 96% of U.S. counties, administered nearly \$9.8 billion dollars, and provided aid to about 27% of those living in poverty (Power, Knowlton, & Alwin). In Ohio alone, there are CAAs in 52 of Ohio's 88 counties (OACAA). Their interests are represented by the OACAA (OACAA). The website for the OACAA indicates that the focus of the CAAs in Ohio is to eliminate poverty (OACAA). Like other local nonprofits, such as Senior Corps, Americorps, and Learn and Serve America, the CAAs are funded by the CSBG (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2009).

The CSBG grant, established in 1981, appropriates federal funding and supervision to local self-governing agencies without passing those funds the multiple levels of government (Nemon, 2007). The CSBG grant requires CAAs to complete frequent assessments to determine the needs of the community (Bishop, 2004). The CSBG grant directs CAAs to focus on acquiring and retaining employment, 'adequate' education and lodging, fiscal management, emergency services, community wellbeing and nutrition, encouraging self-sufficiency, and collaborating with other antipoverty groups (National Association for State Community Services Programs, 2000).

As such, continued funding relies on goal achievement and progress judged by both federal and local stakeholder standards (Nemon, 2007). Therefore, the CAAs dependence on public funds may leave the agencies susceptible to loss of funding amid

changing political climates (Nemon, 2007). This creates tension between the nonprofit and the government (Smith, 2002).

While CAAs are often given priority when federal appropriations are being distributed, CAAs do often compete with other nonprofits for charitable donations (Bishop, 2004; Nemon, 2007). This competition may increase tension between the nonprofits and the government (Smith, 2002). Ultimately, the dependence on public money can restrict the ability to self-govern (Nemon, 2007).

As mentioned in a previous section, the CAA exemplifies each of the four types of networks cited by Milward and Provan (2006). The CAA acts as a service implementation network because it works with public and private firms to provide services to their clientele (Milward & Provan, 2006). An example of service implementation is the distribution of funds, such as Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) that can be used to avoid utility disconnection.

Information diffusion occurs between the CAA, local government, and sometimes private companies depending upon the service provided. In the LIHEAP example, the CAA inputs client data that is sent directly to the program administrator, the ODOD, and to the company. Each participant is able to view the same data and respond accordingly.

Considering the various roles the CAA is able to fill, it is interesting to note that its original intention was to act as a partner in eliminating poverty. This indicates that the CAA has evolved into a complex firm that attempts much more than solving poverty, which can be seen in Massachusetts (Canavan, 2005; Nemon, 2007). This may be in response to the natural tensions associated with collaboration (Nemon, 2007).

Providing service, distributing information, and problem solving may fuel community capacity building in the CAA environment. These administrative requirements generate interaction between all three sectors. In the LIHEAP example, the OACAA might collaborate with the Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy (OPAE) and ODOD to determine how to best allocate the funds across the state, while the private company receiving payment accepts terms of the LIHEAP arrangement. The relationships built in this effort can be used to influence all levels of government.

The relationships within the network are based on empowerment and reciprocated trust (Heliwell, 2006). Moynihan (1969) documented many failed efforts to build community because the community did not trust the individuals tasked with program administration. Individuals who do not trust the government are less likely to add to a cause from which they do not benefit directly (Hetherington, 2005). This may be seen in community action program participation.

Moynihan encouraged participation as a form of empowerment (Nemon, 2007). For this reason self-governance was supported and promoted during the war on poverty (Moynihan, 1969). Maximum feasible participation involved individual contribution and produced positive results in some cases (Sirianni, 2009). This was heavily contested during that time and it continues to be contested among some who believe that the citizen should have minimal participation in governance (Hudson, 2006; Nemon, 2007). This supports Nemon's (2007) theory that the environment has an influence on the quality of participation.

In impoverished areas, involving local citizens is often troubled by their lack of confidence in leadership, lack of the wherewithal to participate effectively, feedback

from participants, and reliance on third parties for guidance in the process (Nemon, 2007). Confidence and the ability to participate have been discussed in previous sections but the implications of feedback have not. Feedback from participants is important because this feedback has traditionally not been supportive of participation in low income environments (Nemon, 2007). This is because those participants are heavily influenced by their environment (Anderson & Singer, 2008). This supports Nyborg's (2003) theory that social norms influence individual behavior. These things combined significantly hinder the value of participation (Nemon, 2007). Seen in this view, one may argue that participation among low income citizens should be limited (Hudson, 2006). Further, the war on poverty showed that participation did not guarantee empowerment (Borden, 1971; Kramer, 1969 as cited in Nemon, 2007).

Federal authorities reported that local leaders believed that citizen participation via CAA had become extreme (Nemon, 2007). The administrative response was the Green Amendment, which established a three-part board to govern the CAA, consisting of public and private sector leaders as well as member of the local community (Nemon, 2007). This may limit the citizen's voice because few residents commit to participate (Nemon, 2007). Even though citizens may not participate, nonprofits offer an opportunity for participation (Hall, 2001).

Whether low income citizens are capable of representing the community on a board is unclear (Nemon, 2007). Assessing the quality of the potential involvement would require the board to be willing to prepare individuals for participation (Nemon, 2007). Sirianni (2009) calls this investing in civic participation. From this view, the CAA as a tool may be considered an investment in civic participation because they are

federally funded (Bishop, 2004; Salamon, 2002). While the political role of the CAA is arguable, academics acknowledge their contribution to the democratic ideal (Hall, 2001).

One of the purposes of this study is to evaluate the CAAs in Ohio to determine the role of the CAA. With that stated, the fact that the OACAA cites the CAA objective as eliminating poverty deserves some consideration. It is well documented that social programs designed to minimize poverty have been increasingly successful at creating dependents rather than encouraging self-sufficiency (Dean & Rogers, 2004; Dwyer, 2004; Ellis & Rogers, 2004; Sandel, 2000). The following section will consider social programs administered by CAA in effort to eliminate poverty.

#### *Evaluating Networks: Efforts to Respond to Social Issues*

Networked governments are held to a wide variety of expectations from a number of stakeholders (Milward & Provan, 2001). Evaluating the effectiveness of the network requires assessments of the community, the network, and participation levels (Milward & Provan, 2001). What is not included in the assessment is the environment in which the collaborative work was completed.

For example, after U.S. welfare was reformed in 1996, many states reduced their support of postsecondary education and instead emphasized work first programs, but failed to consider the lack of available employment for those without training (Contini & Negri, 2007). Meanwhile, the nonprofit and citizens alike were charged with finding and preparing for work that didn't exist (Cancian & Meyer, 2007). Subsequently, the success of the collaboration may have been questioned, when in actuality, the effort might never have been successful at all. As shown in the war on poverty, welfare reform was

unsuccessful because like the war on poverty, it failed to address some of the root problems of poverty including education and the lack of workforce development.

In another example, Sirianni (2009b) classified the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a civic enabler. The EPA established a successful collaborative by preparing the agency for change, developing and funding the network, and outlining public issues in a public forum (Sirianni, 2009b). The EPA mandated collaboration (Sirianni, 2009b). The effect of mandated collaboration is not measured in the assessment. The study found only the particular collaborative effort to be successful but does not assess the manner in which mandatory participation may have influenced that success.

Alternatively, the Cleveland Development Partnership (CDP) was established to combine resources in effort to revitalize Cleveland neighborhoods in the face of globalization (Lowe, 2008). To do so, the CDP created community development corporations (CDC) (Lowe, 2008). Lowe (2008) found that the central power, the CDP was easily dominated by private interests, thereby limiting the influence of the CDC. This supports Milward and Provan's (2006) theory about centralization in networks but shows no support for Salamon's (2002) view, that decentralization is best. This network may not have been as successful as possible not because of their effort but because of their lack of information. Limited resources and power imbalances have been documented as causes for unsuccessful networks (Milward & Provan, 2006). As cited previously, one of the benefits of collaboratives is that it increases accessible resources (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). In this case, the network was unsuccessful because of the network itself (Milward & Provan, 2001).

Sirianni (2007) documented a similar effort in Seattle designed to increase citizen participation in local government while ensuring that citizens were held accountable for their efforts. She found that much like the EPA, the neighborhood planning approach was effective because it was well funded, well developed, and encouraged participation (Sirianni, 2007). The Seattle model was decentralized, and required some participants to decentralize their agencies for ease of collaboration (Sirianni, 2007). Again, Salamon's (2002) view that decentralization is more effective than collaborations with centralized authority is supported.

These examples suggest that when determining the role of the CAA, it is also important to consider the conditions under which collaboration occurs (Bryson, Crosby, & Middleton, 2006). This indicates that similar to CAS systems, successful collaboration may be contextual (Lawler, 2008). The complexity of organizations makes managing organizations difficult because of the lack of hierarchical control (Clippinger, 1999). Therefore, determining the successes of collaboration should give strong consideration to the circumstances under which collaboration occurs (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006).

As noted in networked governments, authority is not a function of hierarchy but is contained within the group (Bryson et al., 2006). The same is true for leadership (Schneider & Somers, 2006). In collaborative environments managers can only work to establish an atmosphere that is likely to produce the desired results because they cannot control each participant but merely influence behavior (Clippinger, 1999). This is relative to the discussion on evaluating networks because the context in which the network operates is likely to be its power source, a common power (Bryson et al., 2006; Wildavsky, 2006).

With that stated, whether or not the networked government should have a centralized or decentralized power may depend on the circumstances under which the collaborative was created (Bryson et al., 2006). It cannot be concluded that one method (centralized or decentralized power source) is more successful than the other. Like leadership, the success or failure of a collaborative effort, is based on the context under which the collaborative was created.

#### *Gaps in the Current Literature*

Although the literature on network governance offers analysis of a variety of networks, none consider the affect of the CAA and the number of network partners as it relates to participation. Alternatively, the literature on CAAs discusses collaborative efforts in detail but fails to address the role of CAA in the network. Much of the literature speaks generically to nonprofits. Those nonprofits are often discipline specific and do not offer a set of services within the community similar to those offered by the CAA. This paper attempted to determine the role of the CAA within the network and how it influences community participation.

This study considered whether the CAA, as a participant in network government, promotes, inhibits, or challenges the democratic process using inferences from statistical analyses identified in chapter 3. To do so, there was an assessment of social programs offered in the 52 CAAs located in Ohio. The review addressed the gaps in the literature concerning the CAA in collaborative networks. Specifically, whether the collaborative efforts truly represent Roepke's (1950) view of hyper-integration, meaning that the individual views are not represented and therefore Moynihan's view of the role of the CAA is not being realized remains to be seen. Moreover, whether the collaboration



between Ohio CAAs, public, and private sectors promote or challenge the democratic process has not been identified.

### Summary

Because of the complexity of modern problems and social issues, public administrators have been forced to find new and innovative ways of solving problems. That method is known as network governance. It consists of combining efforts across-sectors as a method to increase the efficiency of the public sector, ultimately enhancing their ability to address public problems. This may be best achieved when these collaborative efforts are approached in the manner of “traditional liberalism, which avoid the extremes or defects of both collectivism and laissez-faire capitalism” (Roepke, 1950, pp. 239-242). As stated previously, it is unclear whether individual views are communicated through CAA representation.

Community action agencies were established in effort to enhance the quality of life by eliminating poverty in low income areas. The intent was to encourage communities to govern themselves through connections with local government, thereby preparing them for civic and professional duties. The self-governance aspect failed for numerous reasons. However, the CAA succeeded as a method for delivering public services.

Today, CAAs are responsible for administering a number of human and social service programs. According to the literature on social dependence, self-governance has transcended in meaning to self-contained. The social programs offered by the CAA have been found to increase dependency not reduce poverty. Individuals in low income areas rarely work their way out of poverty.

To date, there is little research concerning the CAA as they relate to network governance. Because of technological, social, and educational advancement, an assessment of local CAA is necessary to determine how their role may have changed in response to social changes as well as how that role may evolve. It is clear that the role of the CAA may have changed to some degree, but what those changes have been are not evident in the literature. It is possible that local communities may be more or less prepared than ever for self-governance. Clearly, containing the poor is not effective. Therefore, if empowerment is a viable option at this time it should be considered because it may work given the current scenarios. Public administrators should work towards public policy that speaks to either condition.

## CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

### Introduction

This chapter explains the quantitative research methods used in this study. The goal was to determine if there is a connection between community action agency program participation and the number of partnerships in network governance. This quantitative study was based on an analysis of public records. A statistical analysis of the number of network partnerships and participation rates was used to measure the impact of the network governance on community action agency program participation.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section provides the research design and questions. Section two describes the sample selection. The third section provides a justification of the chosen methods. The final section discusses research ethics among nonrandom, protected populations. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval number for this study is 2-11-10-0324504.

### Research Design, Questions, and Approach

It has been established that (a) civic participation is positively related to education and membership in civic organizations (Perry, Brudney, Coursey, & Littlepage, 2008; Putnam, 2000), and (b) community action program participants typically do not embody these characteristics (ODOD, 2009). Lastly, it has been established that (c) social programs designed to reduce poverty and encourage self-governance have been ineffective (Beach, 2002). Network governance has emerged in response to these increasingly complex problems (Salamon, 2002). Moynihan (1969) documented the establishment of local community action agencies as a method of governance needed to respond to these problems effectively.

According to the literature review, the role of the CAA in network governance has not been examined to determine how it affects community program participation.

Therefore, further analysis was required. In this study, the influence of networked governance on CAA program participation was evaluated to see if it has a positive effect on citizen participation in an area that traditionally has low rates of participation.

According to the literature review, quantitative study best suits the research questions. This was a nonexperimental correlational study. This approach addressed the limits of public policy research; true experiments are difficult to complete in because of the inability to manipulate variables (Creswell, 2003). In this study, the variables could not be manipulated because the numeric value of each variable was documented and established over the 5-year period to be evaluated.

Because the variables could not be manipulated, it was difficult to show causation which might be possible in a qualitative analysis (Creswell, 2003). Qualitative analysis is often used when the researcher's goal is to determine why a specific event occurred (Creswell, 2003). In this study, what was unknown was whether changing contexts or the number of network partnerships has an influence on the number of participators. From this study, it was possible to determine how participation and/or the context in which participation occurs, not necessarily why participation occurs.

However, a disadvantage of the correlational study is that some variables cannot be controlled for (Creswell, 2003). For this reason, it is important to note that causation is not concluded. Exploration is limited to determining whether a relationship exists. No single identified relationship or lack thereof, can determine, absolutely, what the greatest influence on participation may be in a quantitative setting.

As such, the analysis of secondary data was designed to determine if a relationship existed between the number of partnerships involved in offering a program and program participation. The findings could be used to draw inferences concerning how context affects the participation rates as well as explain the role of the community action agency within this context. This information is relevant to social change because it may provide insight concerning the CAA and their role in the community.

#### *Quantitative Research Questions*

The research questions were based on the integrative model of democracy as applied to the local community action agency model described by the OEO. The CAA is responsible for helping the poor with social decision making, coordinating improvements such as antipoverty programs, and simply providing service to the poor (OEO, n.d.).

Within this framework, the following research questions were established:

1. What is the effect of the number of partnerships as recorded by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) on the number of program participants as recorded by the ODOD?
2. What is the effect of Ohio's mean income as measured by the annual American Community Survey collected by the US Census Bureau on participation rates as recorded by the ODOD?

Based on previous research conducted within the framework of the integrative model of democracy the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. The number of partnerships as recorded by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) is positively correlated with citizen participation, as recorded by the ODOD, in each of 10 community action agency programs (employment,

GED/diploma, post-high school education, childcare, transportation, health care, housing, food assistance, financial management, and maximum participation).

2. Variation in Ohio's mean income over the five most recent years for which data is available from the annual American Community Survey collected by the U. S. Census Bureau (2000-2004) is positively correlated with citizen participation, in each of 10 community action agency programs.

The methods of analysis and approach to the variables are summarized in the table below.

*Table 1: Variables and Statistics*

Research Question	Source of Data	Test Statistic
Does the number of partners influence participation?	Ohio Department of Development Public Records	Pearson's $r$
Is participation influenced by income?	U.S. Census Bureau Economic Reports	Pearson's $r$

#### Sample Populations

The secondary data population consisted of participants or users of local CAAs in the 52 Ohio CAAs that reported. The total number of community action agency program participants about which information was obtained varies by year as indicated in Table 2:

*Table 2: Sample Size by Years*

Program year	Total participants
2004	28354
2005	60200
2006	143166
2007	95591
2008	97696
5-year total	425007

This study specifically excluded minors, and considered only programs in which the requirements stated that participation is limited to adults between the ages of 18 and 70. By default, this sample included both minorities and disabled individuals. However, for each calendar year, the majority of the sample population was between the ages 24 and 44, White, female, a single parent, and a high school graduate. Even though relatively few reported no income, there were also only a few who were above 150% of the federal poverty guideline.

These participants were predetermined by the ODOD and based entirely upon the fact that they participated in a social program thereby used federal funds administered by ODOD. The ODOD's dataset was designed for the sole purpose of account reporting. However, as with most secondary datasets, the numbers remain useful for the purposes of this study and possibly others.

Protection of vulnerable populations is discussed in a subsequent section. This is not a random sample and therefore findings cannot be generalized (Faherty, 2008). This

sample was chosen because it is the only sample that can accurately represent Ohio's CAA participation rates among Ohioans who are legally able to choose to, and actively engage in participation. Similarly, the number of network partnerships was solely based on the number of agreed upon partnerships that were identified by the ODOD for each program year.

### *Instrumentation*

The data obtained for the sample was retrieved through the public website for the Ohio Department of Development. In order to maintain accuracy and consistency with the comparison of network partnerships and participation, the income levels were analyzed for the years 2004-2008. The data was initially obtained to establish participation numbers needed to explain and report the allocation of federal funds. The data was compiled for accounting purposes only and no statistical analysis of the data was completed. The data consisted of numbers, scale level data, and graphs of those numbers. Appendix A provides a snapshot of this data in its original report form because the raw data could not be retrieved for every year this study evaluated.

### Justification of Method

Secondary data, or data provided in public records and government documents, was used in this analysis (Heck, 2004). Secondary data adds value to quantitative studies because behaviors cannot change and there is no interpretation of the data required (Heck, 2004). While eliminating the interpretation requirement reduces potential bias, secondary data remains somewhat restrictive. Most often, secondary data is designed to answer a specific set of questions which inhibits a researcher's ability to gather all the



information needed from one data set (Heck, 2004). To alleviate this issue, two sets of data were used, state level data obtained from the ODOD and data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau.

An advantage of the secondary dataset in this study was that the participants, a vulnerable population, have already been protected. Further, data storage was not an issue because the data is a public record. No Data Use Agreement form was required for this information.

For the analysis of secondary data, the variables had numeric values representing actual participation, producing scale level data. Scale level data can be used to generate frequency distributions that identify patterns in the data (Faherty, 2008). The Pearson's  $r$  test was selected according to the type of data, the number and type of variables, and the research problem attempted (Faherty, 2008).

Pearson's  $r$  was selected because it is a bivariate analysis capable of measuring the relationship between two sets of scale level data (Faherty, 2008). In sum, the Pearson's  $r$  examines the covariance of the total participation in a single program for each year with the combined total of partnerships for that year. . This parametric test showed the strength of the relationship between the identified variables individually (Heck, 2004).

In the first research question, the independent variable is the number of network partnerships. The dependent variable is citizen participation. It was anticipated that citizen participation would change as the number of partners involved changed.

The second research question used secondary data from the ODOD and U.S. Census to determine if changing socioeconomic conditions were related to increased

participation in antipoverty programs. The independent variable was mean income level. The mean income level was chosen because the ODOD determines eligibility in a number of ways, most often based on the mean income of a few months at a time. For example, if a person needs assistance but fails to qualify based on the income stated on their W2, the ODOD may qualify this person on the basis of their income for the prior three months. Often times, this number is much lower than their overall earnings. This speaks to the changing economic conditions, foreclosures, job losses etc that may very well influence participation rates. While using means is often hazardous because of the potential for skewed data related to outliers, essentially, the ODOD uses outliers where necessary to aid families in poverty.

The dependent variable in the second question was the number of program participants per calendar year. A Pearson's  $r$  test was used to determine how participation changed in comparison with mean income levels over the five most recent years for which data is available (2004-2008). In sum, this was an assessment of the relationship between Ohio's mean income and program participation rates in Ohio. Establishing the strength of this relationship using the Pearson's  $r$  would determine whether network governance or income levels is more strongly related to participation.

According to traditional social science research methods, level of significance was set at .05 (Lewis-Beck, Bryman, & Liao, 2003). This indicates that the same results should occur 95% of the time or alternatively, that there is only a 5% chance that the results are based on a random sampling error (Lewis-Beck et al., 2003). This is essential to any study because other researchers may be interested in using existing models of

study in their environments. As such, the relationship between the variables will be significant if the  $p < .05$ .

Once all data was quantified, SPSS was used for statistical calculations. The findings were assessed using Pearson's  $r$ . The assessment uncovered some qualities that both promote and hinder civic participation. This is useful to practitioners in determining how to best encourage participation as well as how to best utilize the community action agency in network partnerships. The following section provides a summary of the research ethics and the measures taken to protect vulnerable populations.

#### Research Ethics

One ethical concern in this study was the sample population. The entire sample was made up of low income, disabled, and likely minority individuals. These groups are considered to be vulnerable according to the IRB. However, the participants were not named in the data set and no identifying information was provided in the secondary data set. Even though the secondary data contains information about minor children, it was excluded from the study. There was no risk involved for this population.

Lastly, there are professional ethical concerns. My current employer, the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC), works very closely with the overseer of the Community Action Agencies, the ODOD. The OCC serves as an advocate to residential utility consumers (Ohio Consumers' Counsel). As such, any evaluation of the local CAA may be misconstrued as an attempt to assess the ODOD. The OCC accomplishes much of its work through collaboration with the ODOD and cannot afford to lose that alliance.

To minimize bias associated with this relationship, there was no focus on utility related programs administered by the ODOD via the community action agencies. Instead,

the study addressed all of the programs offered, and focused on participation rates and not the performance of the agency or the ODOD. In addition, there was a disclaimer added to the study stating that the findings are in no way associated, nor do they reflect the views of the OCC. This disclaimer was prepared by OCC legal staff.

The social implications for the study include public service, responsibility, and advocacy. Public servants are obligated to maximize public values. The relationship between the OCC and ODOD appear to be dominated by political motives rather than public service. This was a concern because the ODOD oversees the community action agencies. Focusing on political motives rather than public values, results in poor policy that affects the target population disproportionately.

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

### Introduction

This chapter includes a synopsis of the purpose of the study, the participants, and the research findings. The research findings include a secondary data analysis. Findings are arranged according to the research question.

### Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the degree to which network governance is correlated with levels of citizen participation in CAA programs, and whether network governance or variations over time in income level is more strongly related to participation. Participation rates of 10 Ohio programs were identified using the public records and plotted against number of collaborative partnerships and mean state income levels over a 5-year period (2004-2008). The study focused on programs designed to increase self-sufficiency and reduce poverty whose performance measurements were provided in public records.

### Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed to assess the relationship between the number of partnerships involved with a set of programs and the number of citizens participating in those programs. Specifically, 10 program's participation rates were compared to the number of partnerships involved with the programs from 2004 through 2008. The programs covered employment, acquiring a high school diploma and postsecondary education, childcare, transportation, health care, housing, food, financial management, and self-governance programs. A description of these programs is included in the appendix.

The analysis of the existing data set addressed the concerns of the research questions:

1. What is the effect of the number of partnerships as recorded by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) on the number of program participants as recorded by the ODOD?
2. What is the effect of Ohio's mean income as measured by the annual American Community Survey collected by the US Census Bureau on participation rates as recorded by the ODOD?

#### *Relationship between Partnerships and Participation*

The relationship between the number of partnerships and number of program participants was positive overall. Table 3 shows the  $r$  and  $p$  values obtained for the correlations between number of participating citizens and the number of partnerships. The variables with the strongest correlations were transportation, employment, and maximum participation programs. The implications of this finding is discussed in chapter 5.

*Table 3: Relationship between number of partnerships and the number of participants*

Programs	R	Sig.
Employment	.975	.001
GED/Diploma	.910	.012
Post High Ed	.826	.043
Childcare	.876	.022
Transportation	.985	.000
Health Care	.649	.163
Housing	.938	.006
Food	.659	.155
Financial Management	.935	.006
Max Participation	.990	.000

*Explanations of the programs listed are found in Appendix A.*

#### *Descriptive Statistics*

According to the descriptives, the programs most attended were education, employment, and financial management. This information is useful because it identifies the programs that are perceived by the participants to be the most useful. Table 4 provides descriptive statistics for the variables examined.

*Table 4: Program Participation Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Minimum Number of Participants	Maximum Number of Participants	Mean Number of Participants	Std Deviation
Employment	6	8706	97712	32570	33147
GED/Diploma	6	5043	237844	79281	86865
Post High Ed	6	0	614	204	233
Childcare	6	928	10744	3581	3896
Transportation	6	56	724	241	240
Health Care	6	0	10	3.3	5.1
Housing	6	487	5019	1673	1745
Food	6	0	50	16	25
Financial Management	6	5739	58417	19472	20295
Maximum Participation	6	1772	13873	4624	4620
Partnerships	6	2222	13099	4366	4286

*Table 5: Program Partnership Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Minimum Number of Partnerships	Maximum Number of Partnerships	Mean Number of Partnerships	Std Deviation
2004-2008	6	2222	2925	2620	293

With the above stated the conclusion for research question number one is affirmative. Overall, program participation is strongly related to the number of network



partners. A trend has been identified showing that as the number of network partnerships increase, participation also increases. However, there is no absolute causality shown. It cannot be guaranteed that the number of partnerships influenced participation positively. It could be argued that the increased numbers of participants required additional partnerships. This was certainly the case identified in the literature; public administration began their relationship with community action agencies and others because it could no longer accommodate the administrative tasks associated with social programs.

Further, there is the possibility that a third factor contributed to the relationship identified here. As mentioned in the first chapter, there is the possibility that participation was influenced by the change in economic conditions. However, there is no reason to reject any one of these possibilities and argue that with certainty, participation rates were increased because the network partnerships increased or vice versa. The purpose of the study was to identify whether a positive relationship existed. As Creswell (2003) stated, quantitative studies do little to show absolute causality. Therefore, this analysis has successfully accomplished its goal; it has established that there is a positive linear relationship between the number of network partnerships and program participation. The specific basis of this relationship should be examined in future studies of program participation.

#### *Relationship between Ohio's Mean Income and Program Participation Rates*

Variation in mean income over the 5-year period was not significantly correlated with program participation rates. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Subsequent sections provide additional information about this relationship.

*Descriptive Statistics*

The descriptive statistics show that the arithmetic mean income is \$58,418. What is important to note here is that this number is based upon household, meaning, this is the combined income of all residents. For a family of five, this is above the 150% of the federal poverty level. For this study, very few program participants were above this guideline. However, as mentioned previously, this does not make the data incorrect because many participants may have lost income prior to program participation.

*Table 6: Income Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Minimum Income	Maximum Income	Mean Income	Std Deviation
Mean Income	5	54161	62728	58418	3503

Summary

The analysis of the secondary data shows that, with the exception of health care and food assistance programs, program participation was highly correlated with number of network partners. Mean income levels were not correlated with program participation.

Chapter 5 will provide suggestions and recommendations concerning the findings.

## CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the foundation and motivation of this study. A summary of the research findings and their relationship to the literature follows. Lastly, suggestions for future study and practical applications are addressed.

It has been established that program success cannot be calculated by the expansion of the program (Cancian & Meyer, 2007). A better measure, and a measure more aligned with social program intentions, is a measure of how well these initiatives empower the population. This study has shown that few of the programs actually empower the public even though the foundation for empowerment exists.

In sum, analysis of the secondary data set showed the continued dependence on social programs, despite the many efforts to eliminate dependence. In 2002, Beach asserted that this dependence on government programs was almost complete. In essence, these groups are merely being contained, although self-governed, and federally supported, the groups are being contained within their own socioeconomic strata and corresponding culture. What remains to be seen is how individuals successfully remove themselves.

### Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to provide information about the relationship between network governance or network partnerships and participation in CAA programs. The study is based on the theoretical assumption that CAAs function as Moynihan (1969) intended. The mission and goals established for local CAA provided

the foundation for the following questions to gather information about program participation:

1. What is the effect of the number of partnerships as recorded by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) on the number of program participants as recorded by the ODOD?
2. What is the effect of Ohio's mean income as measured by the annual American Community Survey collected by the US Census Bureau on participation rates as recorded by the ODOD?

#### Summary of Findings

The secondary data analysis found positive relationships between [IV} and [DV} for all programs except health care and food assistance programs. This lack of a statistically significant relationship could be attributed to the fact that food and health care programs are mandated under federal TANF programs. These programs are monitored under other jurisdictions and monitored much more closely since the PRWORA Act of 1996. The fact that no statistically significant relationship was evident between health care and food assistance programs and network partnerships cannot be attributed to the number of partnerships.

The fact that maximum participation programs, or those programs related to self-governance, showed a significant correlation is meaningful to the study and to the founding theories. In this study, maximum participation was defined as

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of community action initiative to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community as measured by the number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by community action. (ODOD, 2004-2008)

In Ohio, communities appear to be responsive to self-governance methods as described here by ODOD, which are analogous to Moynihan's original implementation plan. In essence, it shows that one of the CAA's primary goals is working well in the setting of network partnerships.

Moreover, the strong positive relationship between the self-governance programs and the number of partnerships speaks volumes to Moynihan's theory concerning self-governance. Clearly, individuals are interested and capable of self-governance to some extent. However, self-governance seems to also result in containment and generational dependence (Sandel, 2000).

Employment programs were also among the strongest related to network partnerships. Again, this is important to the study because it shows that individuals, when able, will take advantage of opportunities that may increase self-sufficiency. Securing and maintaining employment is often key to moving above the federal poverty guideline.

Also noteworthy, is the strong relationship between transportation programs and the number of network partnerships. Until recently, transportation was often an unexplored variable that prevented many people from overcoming self-sufficiency barriers (Cancien & Meyer, 2007). Practitioners may find focusing network partnerships on transportation programs to be useful.

The fact that there was no statistical significance between changing socioeconomic conditions and participation rates is aligned with information contained in the literature review that states that individuals in this sample become dependent on social programs (Beach, 2002). This group is not affected by income because their

financial conditions tend to be generational and shows dependence on social programs (Sandel, 2000). It would not be surprising to learn that this group also feels no significant influences of recession or economic gains.

Another important notation concerning socioeconomic conditions is that certain financial conditions must be met in order to be eligible for many of the programs. In this study, how the positive relationship between income and participation can be explained remains unclear. Perhaps program dependence is a factor, meaning, the participants are consistently left out of the pool of economic contributors.

Finally, the descriptive statistics established that the most used programs are employment, education, and transportation programs. These three programs may quickly increase individual independence. This indicates that individuals are making a solid effort, even seeking assistance, to increase self-sufficiency. The implication is that if the partnerships can continue to positively influence participation in these programs, then more people overcome the obstacles that are often unconsidered factors in when evaluating whether individuals maintain employment and education programs. These obstacles are, employment, transportation, loosely, the skills learned through civic engagement, such as public speaking skills (Putnam, 2000).

#### Relationship to the Literature

The recurring theme in the literature review is that collaborative governance increases the program quality and maximizes the ability to provide effective and efficient public services (Salamon, 2002). According to this study, the greater the number of program's network partnerships, the higher the program's participation rate. Network governance allows for a great number of programs to be offered and participation in most

of those programs can be directly attributed to the size of the collaborative. The question of effectiveness and efficiency is beyond the scope of this study.

Moreover, the unanswered question or gap in the literature was whether collaborative governance promotes, challenges, or inhibits democratic governance. In other words, it tested the theory of integrative democracy. Roepke (1950) argued that collaboratives may lead to hyper-integration while Salamon (2002) and Moynihan (1969) believed a collective effort was best suited to create empowerment among the self-governed. The study found that maximum feasible participation, the CAA effort to self-govern, is positively related to the number of network partnerships. With this being true in Ohio, similar studies in other states may show that maximum feasible participation promotes democratic activity at the community level. However, how the democratic process as whole is affected by these groups cannot be judged based on this study.

As stated in the literature review, most governments are leaning more towards network governance, which encompasses everything identified in the literature review, integrative, aggregative, deliberative, indirect, and direct governance. The findings from this study would dispute Roepke's (1950) theories of hyperintegration on the basis that the number of networks positively influences participation, especially in areas concerning self governance, and there is no statistical indication that high participation numbers in community governance has any negative impacts. Although, perhaps this may be an area for further research; it could be found that self-containment is the byproduct of hyper-integration.

This reflects the changing paradigm of governance as discussed under the urban regime theory discussed in the literature review. This study supports that notion that

social change is most likely to be achieved through collaborative effort and that the government is best suited to encourage citizen participation (Agranoff, 2003; Sirianni, 2009). It supports Moynihan's view that participation is equivalent to citizen empowerment (Moynihan, 1969; Sirianni, 2009). According to the study, establishing community action agencies and network partnerships to assist with program goals, the government has positively affected citizen participation at a local level.

With the above stated, the respective roles of public administrators and politicians becomes clear. Findings suggest that securing more partnerships will increase program participation, but that additional data is needed to determine if this is the case. Based on these findings, the public administrator should become actively engaged in securing partnerships and collaboratives to achieve common goals. This is true for not only community action agencies but it may also be applicable to governance in general. The role of the public administrator should be to manage the collaborative and ensuring fair and accurate representation of citizens as well as private and public sector members.

Furthermore, the CAA is an instrument for implementing public services (Salamon, 2002). The CAA is functioning as intended, encouraging self-governance in communities and network partnerships support that participation. The one caveat that has not been addressed is the CAA goal to eliminate, if not significantly reduce poverty. Still, the role of the CAA within the network is to ensure that the necessities that encourage participation are met.

Research indicated that socioeconomics have no statistically significant effect on this population. And again, what was not measured in this study is the success and program completion rates. From this study, the inference can be made that community



action agencies have not succeeded in reducing poverty levels in Ohio. However, it can also be assumed that poverty is heavily influenced by extraneous factors that also affect the financial stability of the community action agency.

Conclusions concerning the role of the citizen cannot be ascertained within the scope of this study. The literature review implies that citizens remain dependent on social programs (Beach, 2002). The fact that socioeconomic status was not found to influence program participation supports Beach's theory. Some effort should be made to alleviate the pressures of social dependence but as in other studies, there are no suggestions concerning the best way to achieve this goal. Further, the root cause of poverty has yet to be identified. Yet one could infer that the fact that community action agencies do little to reduce poverty is indicative of some systematic cause which exacerbates poverty as a condition.

#### Directions for Future Research

As a result of this inquiry, certain recommendations can be made for future research. To begin, findings suggest that steps to increase the number of partnerships may increase the number of participants. The context of participation is more likely to influence participation than economic conditions. In other words, people may be more likely to participate in programs when multiple partners are included. Therefore, CAA program administrators might consider focusing resources on obtaining the right collaborative partners and maximizing those relationships.

In addition, future research should consider the gap between the established foundation for empowerment, as exhibited in the CAA, and the actual realization of empowerment. One of the remaining questions is how individuals, who do remove

themselves from what may be considered economic isolation, are able to do so. All of the needed elements for empowerment exist but the success rates of program participation, in any of the programs evaluated is not identified.

To determine how individuals are able to successfully remove themselves from these conditions, future studies should evaluate the program success rates. It is unclear whether success rates are related to participation rates or the number of network partnerships. Success rates are available in the public record used in this study and assessments should be fairly simple to complete.

Economic assessments considering the number of participants whose financial conditions change after having participated in a program would be very useful but are outside the scope of this study. Based on the analysis of existing data, it can be assumed that only a very few of the participants have an increase in income post program participation. Or, if individuals increase income and move to other income brackets then these vacancies must be consistently be filled, almost instantly, by new participants. Otherwise, the number of participants would not increase at the same time the household incomes increase. Either of these conditions is beyond the scope of this study.

Further, future studies should target specific groups of CAA employees, possibly not only leaders but possibly those with the most tenure. A qualitative approach to a similar study, consisting of face to face interviews with not only CAA leaders but also CAA staff, would add to the body of knowledge concerning community action agencies as a network partner. Future research should involve a detailed analysis of not only the CAA operations and staff but also the context in which the interview was conducted. It is imperative to understand whether or not this population is receptive and open to being

research subjects. In addition, obtaining this information may be useful in determining the actual impact in terms of whether participation rates influence the number of partners required or the opposite. A qualitative approach to future studies will assist in determining why participation rates are related to network partnerships.

It should be acknowledged by both academics and practitioners that the government paradigm is shifting to a governance paradigm at a rapid pace. Methods of interaction with the government are changing. In this moment, citizens rely on government to govern as long as they consent to be governed. The reality is that the citizen has the ability and obligation to contribute much more than a vote in democratic governance.

Public administrators should work to rebuild the citizen's trust in government. Doing so may increase participation rates beyond the scope of the local level. It is imperative that each citizen take an active role in their future. Otherwise, decisions about them may be made without them, and suited to the best interests of individuals far removed from their lives and lifestyle.

Academics should consider an evaluation of the established relationship focusing on whether causation can be determined. The research question should address whether increasing the number of partnerships causes participation rates to increase. This question could be approached in a number of ways. One possibility might be a comparison of two sets of programs with comparable levels of participation with differing levels of partnerships at two points in time. If the analysis shows that the high-partnership group has a significantly higher level of participation at the second point in time, then this might suggest that high partnership does cause participation rates to be higher.

An alternative analysis to the income level assessment presented in this study might be to study the variables for a longer time period. Because these reports are fairly new, the first one being 2004, the data set was limited. It's possible that there was no correlation between income levels and participation because of the short period of time evaluated.

#### Recommendations for Action

It is possible that completing the alternative analyses identified above will yield the same results. Should the findings of this study be replicated using the research methodologies noted above, they would suggest the need for the following public policy recommendations:

1. Standardize procedures for establishing and governing CAA collaboratives that maximize number of network partnerships.
2. Incremental assessments of the CAA collaborative to continually monitor participation giving consideration to changing economic conditions.

Doing so might ensure might maximize the role of the CAA within the collaborative. It may be an avenue for the CAA to continue to meet its goals, ultimately increasing self-sufficiency.

#### Implications for Social Change

The appraisal of maximum feasible participation at the community level is meaningful for practitioners and academics alike. With the knowledge that self-governance increases as network partnership members increase, practitioners and academics increase the likelihood of realizing positive social change through collaborative efforts to achieve common goals. Otherwise, positive social change is not a

feat to be accomplished by a single individual, group, or sector. Instead, positive social change may be more likely to occur through empowerment at local levels of government and community.

If program participation can be increased, then more individuals may get the tools they need to obtain self-sufficiency. Maximizing the number of self-sufficient individuals in a community could have significant long term affects for all levels of government and citizens. For example, it could reduce the funds allocated to public assistance programs, add income to the local economy, and possibly begin to address the issue of generational dependence. Moreover, minimizing social program dependence may boost individual morale. If so, this may encourage an individual to be more engaged in civil society and establish stakes in the community.

### Summary

This study was conducted in effort to examine the community action agency capacity to affect the quality of individual and community life through an integrative democratic approach. The findings indicated that as the number of network partnerships increase, participation rates increase. Income levels were not shown to be significantly related to participation.

The study suggests a need to maximize the collaborative relationship. Professional experience indicates that in Ohio, few practitioners recognize the interaction between the state and the CAA as a formal collaborative or a collaborative effort. Public administrators, CAA leaders, and citizens simply acknowledge that this interaction is needed to accomplish goals. This corresponds with the literature which indicates that

although this type of collaboration has been around for some time, formalizing the concept and standardizing the concept, is a new ideology.

Identifying this interaction as a collaborative formally and then evaluating methods and studies that discuss maximizing collaborative interaction is much needed in Ohio. Doing so may lead to positive social change that affects not only the local economy and communities, but may also lead to self-sufficiency. The formal collaborative may be an alternative, yet innovative way to address the increasingly complex demands civil society presents.

## REFERENCES

- Agranoff, R. & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Albertson, B. & Harris-Lacewell, M. (2005). Good Times: Understanding African American misperceptions of racial economic fortunes. *Journal of Black Studies*, 35(5), 650-683.
- Anderson, C.J. & Singer, M.M. (2008). The sensitive left and the impervious right: Multilevel models and the politics of inequality, ideology, and legitimacy in Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(4), 564-599.
- Anderson, J. E. (2003). *Public policy making* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Houghton Mifflin.
- Angelica, M. (2000). *Managing on the boundaries*. Published Extended Study Notes, Bloomington, IN: Tichenour Publishing.
- Ansell, C. & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and in practice. *Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18 (4), 543-571.
- Bamberger, M. (1999). *Integrative quantitative and qualitative research: Lessons from the field*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Barbera, S. & Jackson, M.O. (2006). On the weights of nations: Assigning voting weights in a heterogeneous union. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114 (2), 317-339.
- Barkin, S. (2007). What defines research as qualitative? In D. Prakash & A. Klotz, A. (Eds.), Should we discard the "Qualitative" versus "Quantitative" distinction? *International Studies Review*, 9 (4), 753-754.
- Beach, W. W. (2002). *An overview of the index of dependency*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.
- Bernard, M., Reenock, C., & Sobeck, D. (2007). Regressive socioeconomic distribution and democratic survival. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51 (3), 677-699.
- Bishop, S.W. (2004). Building a profile of Missouri CSBG community action agencies: Capacities, coping strategies, and the new public management. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 15 (1), 71-93.
- Bishop, S.W. (2006). Nonprofit federalism and the CSBG grant program: Serving the needs of the working poor in the post TANF era. *Administration & Society*, 37 (6), 695-718.

- Bogason, P., Kensen, S., & Miller, H. (Eds.). (2004). *Tampering with tradition. The unrealized authority of democratic agency*. New York: Lexington.
- Bolgherini, S. (2007). The technology trap and the role of political and cultural variables: A critical analysis of the e-government policies, *Review of Policy Research*, 24 (3), 259-275.
- Booth, S. (2005). Method, research, science and methodology: Doing, acting, understanding, and committing. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 49 (3), 325-328.
- Boyte, H.C. (2005). Reframing democracy: Governance, civic agency, and politics, *Public Administration Review*, 65(5), 536-546.
- Brettschneider, C. (2006). The value theory of democracy, *Politics, Philosophy and Economics*, 5 (3), 259-278.
- Bryson, J.M. , Crosby, B.C., & Stone, M.M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66 (1), 44-55.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Canavan, J. (2005). Community action in Massachusetts. *New England Journal of Public Administrators*, 20 (1), 199-203.
- Caruso, D. (2010, January 31). Program vulnerable to abuse weatherization projects increase, inspections lag. *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/index.html>
- Caruso, D. (2010, February 23). Ohio number 1 for weatherization. *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/index.html>
- Caruso, D. (2010, March 14). Broken fixes: Inspectors find shoddy work in weatherization program. *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://www.dispatch.com/live/content/index.html>
- Cooper, T. L. (2006). *The responsible public administrator: An approach to ethics for the administrative role*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Cancian, M., Meyer, D. & Nam, K. (2007). Welfare and child support program knowledge gaps reduce program effectiveness, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26 (3), 575 – 598.



- Choguill, C. (2005). The research design matrix: A tool for development planning research studies, *Habitat International*, 29 (1), 615–626.
- Clippinger, J.H. (1999). *The biology of business: Decoding the natural laws of enterprise*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Cohen, J. & Rogers, J. (1995). Secondary associations and democratic governance. In J. Cohen & J. Rogers (Eds.), *Associations and Democracy: The real utopias project* Volume 1. London: Verso.
- Contini, D. & Negri, N. (2007). Would declining exit rates from welfare provide evidence of welfare dependence in homogenous environments? *European Sociological Review*, 23 (1).
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and multi-method approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crowley, R. & Tothero, K. (2008). The presidential timeline of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Retrieved from <http://www.presidentialtimeline.org/html/index.php#timeline>
- Dahl, R. (2003). *How democratic is the American constitution?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dawson, M. (2001). *Black visions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dean, H. & Rogers, R. (2004). Administering rights for dependent subjects. In H. Dean & R. Rogers (Eds.), *The ethics of welfare: Human rights, dependency and responsibility* (pp.111-134). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2005). Deliberative democracy in divided societies: Alternatives to agonism and analgesia, *Political Theory*, 33 (2), 218-242.
- Dwyer, P. (2004). Agency, dependency and welfare: Beyond issues of claim and contribution. In H. Dean & R. Rogers (Eds.), *The ethics of welfare: Human rights, dependency and responsibility* (pp.135-154). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Ellis, K. & Rogers, R. (2004) Fostering a human rights discourse in the provision of social care for adults. In H. Dean (Ed.), *The ethics of welfare: Human rights, dependency and responsibility* (pp.89-111). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Fagan, M.H. (2006). Exploring city, county and state e-government initiatives: An east Texas perspective, *Business Process Management Journal*, 12 (1), 101-112.
- Faherty, V. (2008). *Compassionate statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Gerber, E.R. & Phillips, J.H. (2005). Evaluating the effects of direct democracy on public policy: California's urban growth boundaries, *American Politics Research*, 33 (2), 310-330.
- Giroux, H. A. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature*, 32 (1), 1-19.
- Goldsmith, S. & Burke, T. (2009). Moving from core functions to core values: Lessons from state eligibility modernizations. In S. Goldsmith & D. Kettl (Eds.). *Unlocking the power of networks* (pp. xxx-xxx). Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Goldsmith, S. & Eggers, W.D. (2004). *Governing by network: The new shape of the public sector*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Goldsmith, S. & Kettle, D.F. (2009). *Unlocking the power of networks: Keys to high performance government*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Goldzwig, S.R. (2003). LBJ, the rhetoric of transcendence, and the Civil Rights Act of 1968. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 6 (1), 25-53.
- Gunter, B. (2006). Advances in e-democracy: Overview. *Aslib Proceedings*, 58(5), 361-370.
- Hall, P.D. (2001). Inventing the nonprofit sector: 1950-1990. In J. S. Ott (Ed.), *The nature of the nonprofit sector* (pp.112-125). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Handler, J. (2006). The failure of the workfare: Another reason for a basic income guarantee. *Basic Income Studies, An International Journal of Basic Income Research*, 1 (1), 1-22.
- Heck, R.H. (2004). *Studying educational and social policy: Theoretical concepts and research methods*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heinrich, C. J., Hill, R. J., & Lynn, L. E. (2004). Governance as an organizing theme for empirical research. In P.W. Ingraham & L.E. Lynn (Eds.), *The art of governance: Analyzing management and administration* (pp. 3-19). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Heliwell, J.F. (2006). Social capital and public policy. *The Economic Journal*, 116 (1), 702-719.
- Hetherington, M. J. (2005). *Why trust matters: Declining political trust and the demise of American liberalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Hoffman, M.J. (2007). Blurring the lines. In D. Prakash & A. Klotz (Eds.). Should we discard the “Qualitative” versus “Quantitative” distinction? *International Studies Review*, 9 (4), 753-754.
- Hudson, W. E. (2006). *American democracy in peril: Seven challenges to America’s future* (5th ed). Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Jaeger, P.T. (2005). Deliberative democracy and the conceptual foundations of electronic government. *Government Information Quarterly*, 22 (4), 702-719.
- Kaiser, S. (2005). Community technology centers and bridging the digital divide. *Knowledge, Technology & Policy*, 82 (2), 83-100.
- Katz, B. & Lang, R.E. (2003). *Redefining urban and suburban America: Evidence from the Census 2000 Volume II*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- Klijn, E. & Skelcher, C. (2007). Democracy and governance networks: Compatible or not?, *Public Administration*, 85 (3), 587-608.
- Koontz, T.M. & Craig W.T. (2006). What do we know and need to know about the environmental outcomes of collaborative management? *Public Administration Review*, 66 (1), 111-121.
- Koppell, J.S. (2003). *The politics of quasi-government*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Koteen, J. (1997) *Strategic management in public and nonprofit organizations*. Connecticut: Prager.
- Lamounier, B., Friedman, S., & Tulchin, J. (2002). Toward a new economic paradigm: Crafting a research agenda for the twenty-first century. In J.S. Tulchin & A. Brown, (Eds.), *Democratic governance and social inequality* (pp. 165-172). Boulder: L. Rienner Publishers
- Lawler, J. (2008). Individualization and public sector leadership. *Public Administration*, 86 (1), 21-34.
- Lewis-Beck, M.S., Bryman, A., & Liao, T.F. (2003). *The Sage Encyclopedia of social science research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lowe, J.S. (2008). Limitations of community development partnerships: Cleveland Ohio and Neighborhood Progress Inc. *Cities*, 25 (1), 37-44.
- Marshall, G.S. & Ozawa, C. P. (2004). Mediated negotiation, a deliberative approach to democratic governance: Theoretical linkages and practical examples. In P.

- Bogason, S. Kensen, & H. Miller (Eds.), *Tampering with tradition*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Maurer, R.A. (2000). Hypothesis testing. Retrieved from PPPA 8437 Research Seminar 3.
- Mayer, I, Edelenbos, J. & Monnikhof, R. (2005). Interactive policy development: undermining or sustaining democracy? *Public Administration*, 83 (1), 179-199.
- McNabb, D.E. (2008). *Research methods in public administration and nonprofit management: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Mead, L.M. (2004). *Government matters: Welfare reform in Wisconsin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mettler, S. & Soss, J. (2004). The consequences of public policy for democratic citizenship. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2 (1), 55-73.
- Miller, H. (2004). Extra formal democracy: A reflection. In P. Bogason, S. Kensen, & H. Miller, (Eds.), *Tampering with tradition*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Milward, H.B. & Provan, K.G. (2001). Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public sector organizational networks. *Public Administration Review*, 61 (4), 414-423.
- Milward, H.G. & Provan, K.G. (2006). *A manager's guide to choosing and using collaborative networks*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/ProvanReport.pdf>
- Moore, M.H. (2009). Networked government: Survey of rationales, forms, and techniques. In S. Goldsmith & D. Kettl (Eds.). *Unlocking the power of networks*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Morcol, G. & Wachhaus, A. (2009). Network and complexity theories: A comparison and prospects for a synthesis. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 31 (1), pp. 44-58.
- Morgan, G.A. & Gliner, J. (2000). *Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Moynihan, D.P. (1969). *Maximum feasible misunderstanding: Community action in the war on poverty*. New York: The Free Press.

- National Association for State Community Services Programs. *Community Services Network: The Community Services Block Grant in Action*. Washington, DC.: NASCSP, 2000.
- Nemon, H. (2007). Community action: Lessons from forty years of federal funding, anti-poverty strategies, and participation of the poor. *Journal of Poverty*, 11 (1), 1-23.
- Nyborg, K. (2003). The impact of public policy on social and moral norms. *The Journal of Consumer Policy*, 26 (1), 259-277.
- Office of Economic Opportunity. (n.d.). *CAP management guide: Planning for community action*.
- Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies. (n.d). Mission. Retrieved from [www.oacaa.org](http://www.oacaa.org)
- Ohio Consumers' Counsel. (n.d.). Mission. Retrieved from [www.pickocc.org](http://www.pickocc.org)
- Ohio Department of Development (2004). CSBG Annual report. Retrieved from [www.odod.state.oh.us](http://www.odod.state.oh.us)
- Ohio Department of Development (2005). CSBG Annual report. Retrieved from [www.odod.state.oh.us](http://www.odod.state.oh.us)
- Ohio Department of Development (2006). CSBG Annual report. Retrieved from [www.odod.state.oh.us](http://www.odod.state.oh.us)
- Ohio Department of Development (2007). CSBG Annual report. Retrieved from [www.odod.state.oh.us](http://www.odod.state.oh.us)
- Ohio Department of Development (2008). CSBG Annual report. Retrieved from [www.odod.state.oh.us](http://www.odod.state.oh.us)
- O'Leary, R., Gerard, C., & Bingham, B. (2006). Introduction to the Symposium on Collaborative Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, 66 (Supplement): 6-9.
- O'Leary, R. & Bingham, L.B. (2007). *A managers guide to resolving conflicts in collaborative networks*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/OlearyBinghamReport.pdf>
- Pascale, R., Millemann, M., & Gioja, L. (2000). *Surfing the edge of chaos: The laws of nature and the new laws of business*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

- Perry, J.L. , Brudney, J.L., Coursey, D., & Littlepage, L. (2008). What drives morally committed citizens? A study of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 68 (3), 445-458.
- Posner, P. (2009). Networks in the shadow of government: The Chesapeake Bay Program. In Goldsmith & Kettl (Eds.). *Unlocking the power of networks*, Washington DC.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Power, M., Knowlton, G., & Alwin, R. (2004). *The community services block grant statistical report–FY2002*. Washington, DC: National Association for State Community Services Programs.
- Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone*. New York; Simon & Schuster.
- Reich, R.B. (2002). *Policy making in a Democracy*. New York: Longman.
- Rethemeyer, R.K. (2007). The empires strikes back: Is the internet corporatizing rather than democratizing policy processes? *Public Administration Review*, 67 (2), 199-215.
- Roepke, W. & Spencer-Fox, C. (1948). *Civitas humana*. London: W. Hodge.
- Roepke, W. (1950). *The social crisis of our time*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Salamon, L. (2002). *The tools of government: A guide to new governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salamon, L. (2003). *The resilient sector: The state of nonprofit American*. Washington DC: Brookings
- Sandel, M.J. (1997). Democracy's discontent: The political economy of citizenship. In S. B. Greenberg & T. Skopcol (Eds.), *The new majority* (pp. 133-148). New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press.
- Sandel, M.J. (2000) Democracy's discontent: The procedural republic. In D.E. Eberly, *The essential civil society reader* (pp.269-303). Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sandel, M. (2002). Liberalism, consumerism and citizenship. In D. Allman & M.D. Beaty, (Eds.), *Cultivating citizens* (pp.139-149). Lanham, MD.: Lexington Books.
- Schneider, M. & Somers, M. (2006). Organizations as complex adaptive systems: Implications of Complexity Theory for leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17 (4), 351-365.

- Schorr, L.B. (1997). *Common purpose: Strengthening families and neighborhoods to rebuild America*. New York: Doubleday.
- Schudson, M. (1996). What if civic life didn't die? *American Prospect*, 25 (1), 17-20.
- Scott, J.K., Adams, G.B. & Weschler, B. (2004). Deliberative governance: Renewing public service and public trust. In P. Bogason, S. Kensen, & H. Miller, (Eds.), *Tampering with tradition*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Sehested, K. (2004). Democratic consequences of urban governance-What has become of representative democracy? In P. Bogason, S. Kensen, & H. Miller, (Eds.), *Tampering with tradition*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Shafritz, J., Hyde, A. & Parkes, S.J. (2004). *Classics of Public Administration*. Shafritz, J., Hyde, A. & Parkes, S.J. (Eds). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sirianni, C. (2007). Neighborhood planning as collaborative democratic design. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73 (4), 373-387.
- Sirianni, C. (2009a). *Investing in democracy: engaging citizens in collaborative governance*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Sirianni, C. (2000b). The civic mission of a federal agency in the age of networked governance: U. S. environmental protection agency. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52 (6), 933-952.
- Skelcher, C. (2006). Does democracy matter? A transatlantic research design on democratic performance and special purpose governments. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17 (1).
- Smeeding, T. (2005). Public policy, economic inequality, and poverty: The United States in comparative perspective, *Social Science Quarterly*, 86 (1).
- Smith, A. (1776). *The wealth of nations*. Hoboken, NJ: Bibliobytes.
- Smith, S. R. (2002). Social Services. In L. M. Salamon (Ed.), *The state of nonprofit America* (pp. 149-186). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Social Security Administration. (n.d). *History of the Social Security Act of 1935*. Retrieved August 13, 2007 from [www.ssa.gov](http://www.ssa.gov)
- Solt, F. (2008). Economic inequality and democratic political engagement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52 (1), 48-60.

- Stasavage, D. (2007). Polarization and publicity: Rethinking the benefits of deliberative Democracy, *Journal of Politics*, 69 (1), 59-72.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (2002). *Economics of the Public Sector* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) New York: W.W. Norton.
- Trochim, W. (2006). Research methods knowledge base. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/index.php>
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R. & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18 (4), 298-318.
- Weakliem, D.L., Anderson, R., & Heath, A, (2005). By popular demand: The effect of public opinion on income inequality. *Comparative Sociology*, 4 (3), 261-284.
- Weick, Karl E. and Kathleen M. Sutcliffe (2001) *Managing the unexpected—Assuring high performance in an age of complexity*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wildavsky, A.B. (2006). *Cultural analysis: Politics, public law and administration*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Winston, C. (2006). *Government vs. market failure*. Washington DC: Brookings Institute.
- Wolin, S.S. (2003). Democracy without the citizen. In A. Hess (Ed). (2003). *American social and political thought*. New York: New York University Press.
- Wright, B.E., Manigault, L.J. & Black, T.R. (2004). Quantitative research measurement in public administration: An assessment of journal publications. *Administration & Society*, 35 (6), 747-764.



## APPENDIX A: SECONDARY DATA SET AND PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

### Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2004

#### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

National Performance Indicator 3.2

\* **Community Empowerment Through Maximum Feasible Participation**

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of community action initiative to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Total Number of Low-Income People (#)
A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy setting through community action efforts.	7	967
B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of community action assistance.	4	86
C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own homes in their community as a result of community action assistance.		
D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by community action.	2	782

### Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2005

#### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

National Performance Indicator 3.2

\* **Community Empowerment Through Maximum Feasible Participation**

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of community action initiative to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Total Number of Low-Income People (#)
A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy setting through community action efforts.	6	141
B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of community action assistance.	5	88
C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own homes in their community as a result of community action assistance.	3	26
D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by community action.	5	1517

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2006

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

National Performance Indicator 3.2

#### \* Community Empowerment Through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of community action initiative to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Total Number of Low-Income People (#)
A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy setting through community action efforts.	23	1096
B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of community action assistance.	6	48
C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own homes in their community as a result of community action assistance.	11	119
D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by community action.	13	1620

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2007

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

\* National Performance Indicator 3.2

#### Community Empowerment Through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of community action initiative to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Total Number of Low-Income People (#)
A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy setting through community action efforts.	25	1359
B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of community action assistance.	7	38
C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own homes in their community as a result of community action assistance.	10	94
D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by community action.	12	2709

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2008

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.  
 National Performance Indicator 3.2

#### \*Community Empowerment Through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of community action initiative to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Total Number of Low-Income People (#)
A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy setting through community action efforts.	20	1948
B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of community action assistance.	7	33
C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own homes in their community as a result of community action assistance.	10	92
D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-government community activities or groups created or supported by community action.	8	1110

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2004

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved.

National Performance Indicator 4.1

#### \*Expanding Opportunities Through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, community action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes.

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Organizational Partnerships (#)
Number of organizations community action agencies work with to promote family and community outcomes.	45	2222

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2005

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved.

National Performance Indicator 4.1

#### \* Expanding Opportunities Through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, community action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes.

Eligible Entities Reporting (#)

Number of Organizational Partnerships (#)

Number of These Partnerships That Were With Faith-Based Organizations (#)

Number of organizations community action agencies work with to promote family and community outcomes.

51

2411

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2006

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved.

National Performance Indicator 4.1

#### \* Expanding Opportunities Through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, community action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes.

Eligible Entities Reporting (#)

Number of Organizational Partnerships (#)

Number of These Partnerships That Were With Faith-Based Organizations (#)

Number of organizations community action agencies work with to promote family and community outcomes.

51

2729

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2007

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved.

National Performance Indicator 4.1

#### \* Expanding Opportunities Through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, community action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes.

Eligible Entities Reporting (#)

Number of Organizational Partnerships (#)

Number of These Partnerships That Were With Faith-Based Organizations (#)

Number of organizations community action agencies work with to promote family and community outcomes.

51

2925

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2008

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: OhioGoal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved.National Performance Indicator 4.1

## \* Expanding Opportunities Through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, community action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes.

Eligible Entities Reporting (#)

Number of Organizational Partnerships (#)

Number of These Partnerships That Were With Faith-Based Organizations (#)

Number of organizations community action agencies work with to promote family and community outcomes.

48

2812

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2004

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: OhioGoal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.National Performance Indicator 1.1

## \* Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants in community action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
A. Unemployed and obtained a job.	19	6205	4243	3920	92.4%
B. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income.	19	2497	1319	1049	79.5%
C. Achieved "living wage" employment and benefits.	1	4	10	4	40.0%

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2005

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: OhioGoal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.National Performance Indicator 1.1

## \* Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants in community action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
A. Unemployed and obtained a job	16	3990	1448	1357	93.7%
B. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income	19	11444	4375	3913	89.4%
C. Achieved "living wage" employment	1	46	42	42	100.0%



## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2006

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.1

## \* Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants in community action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
A. Unemployed and obtained a job	15	3932	1733	1250	72.1%
B. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income	9	1053	841	679	80.7%
C. Achieved "living wage" employment	19	10294	10294	10294	100.0%

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2007

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.1

## \* Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants in community action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
A. Unemployed and obtained a job	13	15351	11038	13127	118.9%
B. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income	16	3795	1417	1064	75.1%
C. Achieved "living wage" employment	16	15721	16868	15721	93.2%

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2008

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.1

## \* Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants in community action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
A. Unemployed and obtained a job	13	12289	13761	13608	98.9%
B. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income	14	5196	2008	2026	100.9%
C. Achieved "living wage" employment	15	10895	7873	10985	139.5%

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2004

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.2

#### \* Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from community action as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Obtained pre-employment skills/competencies required for employment and received training program certificate or diploma.	15	4264	2288
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma.	9	779	152
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma.	2	293	189
D. Enrolled children in "before" or "after" school programs, in order to acquire or maintain employment.	2	4176	4139
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant in order to acquire or maintain employment.	3	1305	331
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license in order to acquire or maintain employment.	3	171	46
G. Obtained health care services for themselves or a family member in support of employment stability.			
H. Obtained safe and affordable housing in support of employment stability.	8	1086	494
I. Obtained food assistance in support of employment stability.			

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2005

### National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.2

#### \* Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from community action as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Obtained pre-employment skills/competencies required for employment and received training program certificate or diploma	14	15256	12377
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma	10	455	104
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma	2	230	140
D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs, in order to gain or maintain employment	1	78	69
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant in order to gain or maintain employment	4	1655	425
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license in order to gain or maintain employment	2	56	11
G. Obtained health care services for themselves or a family member in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	0	0	0
H. Obtained safe and affordable housing in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	7	740	446
I. Obtained food assistance in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	0	0	0

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2006

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.2

## \* Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from community action as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Obtained pre-employment skills/competencies required for employment and received training program certificate or diploma	19	114960	46345
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma	9	1068	750
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma	1	91	78
D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs, in order to gain or maintain employment	1	121	94
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant in order to gain or maintain employment	1	1439	428
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license in order to gain or maintain employment	1	149	67
G. Obtained health care services for themselves or a family member in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment			
H. Obtained safe and affordable housing in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	1	577	274
I. Obtained food assistance in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment			



## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2007

## National Performance Indicators

State Name:

Ohio

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.2

## \* Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from community action as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Obtained pre-employment skills/competencies required for employment and received training program certificate or diploma	20	45613	18878
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma	11	1022	427
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma			
D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs, in order to gain or maintain employment			
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant in order to gain or maintain employment	4	928	835
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license in order to gain or maintain employment	2	176	74
G. Obtained health care services for themselves or a family member in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment			
H. Obtained safe and affordable housing in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	5	487	170
I. Obtained food assistance in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	1	50	

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2008

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.2

## \* Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from community action as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Obtained pre-employment skills/competencies required for employment and received training program certificate or diploma	24	52984	25414
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma	10	1443	558
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma			
D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs, in order to gain or maintain employment			
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant in order to gain or maintain employment	4	1042	895
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license in order to gain or maintain employment	4	172	112
G. Obtained health care services for themselves or a family member in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	1	10	1
H. Obtained safe and affordable housing in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment	9	2129	1808
I. Obtained food assistance in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment			

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2004

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.3

## \* Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of community action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits or Savings)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who identify any type of Federal or State tax credit and the aggregated dollar amount of credits.	6	1424	731	715	\$1,136,028.00	97.8%
Enhancement 2. Number and percentage obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments.	1	14	6	7	\$55,000.00	116.7%
Enhancement 3. Number and percentage enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings.	1	935	935	935	\$138,791.00	100.0%
Utilization 1. Number and percent demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days.	2	3277	3277	3277	\$4,095.00	100.0%
Utilization 2. Number and percent opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account and increased savings, and the aggregated amount of savings.	5	89	82	53	\$27,100.00	64.6%
Utilization 3a. Number and percent capitalizing a small business due to accumulated savings.						0.0%
Utilization 3b. Number and percent pursuing post-secondary education due to savings.						0.0%
Utilization 3c. Number and percent purchasing a home due to accumulated savings.						0.0%

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2005

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.3

\* Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of community action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits or Savings)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who identify any type of Federal or State tax credit and the aggregated dollar amount of credits	5	2050	1625	1160	\$2,664,836.00	71.4%
Enhancement 2. Number and percentage obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	0.0%
Enhancement 3. Number and percentage enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings	1	212	81	81	\$1,180.00	100.0%
Utilization 1. Number and percent demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days	11	22046	1026	1026	\$159,500.00	100.0%
Utilization 2. Number and percent opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account and increased savings, and the aggregated amount of savings	8	138	67	49	\$86,516.00	73.1%
Utilization 3a. Number and percent capitalizing a small business with accumulated savings	1	5	2	2	\$7,200.00	100.0%
Utilization 3b. Number and percent pursuing post-secondary education with savings	1	9	9	9	\$13,300.00	100.0%
Utilization 3c. Number and percent purchasing a home with accumulated savings	1	18	10	9	\$32,400.00	90.0%

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2006

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.3

\* Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of community action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits or Savings)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who identify any type of Federal or State tax credit and the aggregated dollar amount of credits	7	5133	2719	3544	\$5,289,425.00	130.3%
Enhancement 2. Number and percentage obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments						0.0%
Enhancement 3. Number and percentage enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings	1	158	0	0	\$0.00	0.0%
Utilization 1. Number and percent demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days	10	1033	936	649	\$1,521,014.00	69.3%
Utilization 2. Number and percent opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account and increased savings, and the aggregated amount of savings	6	108	71	61	\$35,541.00	85.9%
Utilization 3a. Number and percent capitalizing a small business with accumulated savings	2	14	3	4	\$1,425.00	133.3%
Utilization 3b. Number and percent pursuing post-secondary education with savings	2	38	20	19	\$6,004.00	95.0%
Utilization 3c. Number and percent purchasing a home with accumulated savings	3	115	44	44	\$12,120.00	100.0%



## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2007

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 1: Low-income people become more self-sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.3

## \* Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of community action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits or Savings)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who identify any type of Federal or State tax credit and the aggregated dollar amount of credits	10	6822	4233	3702	\$5,085,840.00	87.5%
Enhancement 2. Number and percentage obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments						0.0%
Enhancement 3. Number and percentage enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings	3	266	360	216	\$27,640.00	60.0%
Utilization 1a. Number and percent demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days	8	715	514	524	\$164,929.00	101.9%
Utilization 2. Number and percent opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account and increased savings, and the aggregated amount of savings	8	243	188	105	\$135,389.00	55.9%
Utilization 3a. Number and percent capitalizing a small business with accumulated savings	2	10	2	1	\$100.00	50.0%
Utilization 3b. Number and percent pursuing post-secondary education with savings	2	23	22	10	\$3,423.00	45.5%
Utilization 3c. Number and percent purchasing a home with accumulated savings	3	169	45	38	\$113,425.00	84.4%

## Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2008

## National Performance Indicators

State Name: Ohio  
 Goal 1: Low-income people become more self-sufficient.

National Performance Indicator 1.3

## \* Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of community action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Eligible Entities Reporting (#)	Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits or Savings)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who identify any type of Federal or State tax credit and the aggregated dollar amount of credits	24	11173	9039	8092	\$11,063,875.76	89.5%
Enhancement 2. Number and percentage obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments						0.0%
Enhancement 3. Number and percentage enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings	2	989	150	88	\$0.00	58.7%
Utilization 1. Number and percent demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days	11	913	723	622	\$171,072.94	86.0%
Utilization 2. Number and percent opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account and increased savings, and the aggregated amount of savings	9	142	71	51	\$101,555.35	71.8%
Utilization 3a. Number and percent capitalizing a small business with accumulated savings	1	5	2	1	\$6,000.00	50.0%
Utilization 3b. Number and percent pursuing post-secondary education with savings	1	2	3	1	\$1,470.00	33.3%
Utilization 3c. Number and percent purchasing a home with accumulated savings	2	129	49	21	\$54,000.00	42.9%

Programs	Variable Id	Report ID
Employment	EmpProg	Employment
Employment Supports	EmpSuppH	GED/Diploma
Employment Supports	EmpSuppPH	Post High Ed
Employment Supports	EmpSuppCC	Childcare
Employment Supports	EmpSuppTrans	Transportation
Employment Supports	BasicN-HC	Health Care
Employment Supports	BasicN-Hsg	Housing
Employment Supports	BasicN-F	Food
Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization	AsstPrg	Financial Management
Community Empowerment Through Maximum Feasible Participation	Max Part	Maximum Participation
Expanding Opportunities Through Community-Wide Partnerships	Partners	Partnerships

## Employment

The number and percentage of low-income participants in community action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed as measured by one or more of the following:

- A. Unemployed and obtained a job
- B. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income
- C. Achieved “living wage” employment

## Employment Supports

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from community action as measured by one or more of the following:

- A. Obtained pre-employment skills/competencies required for employment and received training program certificate or diploma
- B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma
- C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma
- D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs, in order to gain or maintain employment
- E. Obtained care for child or other dependant in order to gain or maintain employment
- F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver’s license in order to gain or maintain employment
- G. Obtained health care services for themselves or a family member in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment
- H. Obtained safe and affordable housing in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment

- I. Obtained food assistance in support of family stability needed to gain or retain employment

#### Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of community action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as

measured by one or more of the following:

Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who identify any type of Federal or State tax credit and the aggregated dollar amount of credits

Enhancement 2. Number and percentage obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments

Enhancement 3. Number and percentage enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings

Utilization 1. Number and percent demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days

Utilization 2. Number and percent opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account and increased savings, and the aggregated amount of savings

Utilization 3a. Number and percent capitalizing a small business with accumulated savings

Utilization 3b. Number and percent pursuing post-secondary education with savings

Utilization 3c. Number and percent purchasing a home with accumulated savings

#### Community Empowerment Through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of community action initiative to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community as measured by one or more of the following:

- A. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by community action.

#### Expanding Opportunities through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, community action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes. Number of organizations community action agencies work with to promote family and community outcomes.

Ohio Department of Development (2004-2008). CSBG Annual report. Retrieved from [www.odod.state.oh.us](http://www.odod.state.oh.us)

## APPENDIX B: PRESIDENTIAL TIMELINE

---

### Lyndon B. Johnson 1963-1969

1963	November	Johnson becomes the thirty-sixth president of the United States following the assassination of John F. Kennedy
1964	January	Johnson calls for a War on Poverty
	May	Johnson delivers a speech at the University of Michigan calling for a Great Society
	July	Johnson signs the Civil Rights Act of 1964
	July	Summer riots begin in Harlem, followed by riots in Rochester, New York; Jersey City; Chicago; and Philadelphia
	August	The North Vietnamese attack a U.S. destroyer in the Gulf of Tonkin; five days later, Congress enacts a resolution expanding presidential powers to respond
	November	Johnson defeats Barry Goldwater to retain his presidency for a full term
1965	January	Johnson calls for reforms to create his Great Society
	March	The Appalachian Program authorizes \$1.1 billion to fight poverty in eleven state areas
	April	Johnson makes his Johns Hopkins speech, announcing that the U.S. is ready to start discussions to end the war
	July	Johnson signs the Medicare Act into law
	September	Congress establishes the Department of Housing and Urban Development
1966	January	Johnson asks Congress for a record \$112.9 billion for fiscal 1967 to wage war in Vietnam and to build the Great Society
	September	The Civil Rights Bill, aimed at ending housing discrimination, fails in Congress
1967	February	The Twenty-Fifth Amendment (presidential succession) is ratified by the states
	June	Johnson appoints Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court, the first African-American justice; Marshall is sworn in on October 2
	July	A race riot in Detroit kills forty-three
1968	March	Johnson announces he will not run for another term
	April	Martin Luther King Jr. is assassinated
	June	Robert F. Kennedy is assassinated

### Richard Nixon 1969-1974

1970	May	Antiwar war protests; 4 die at Ohio's Kent State University
------	-----	---

---



---

1971	April	Busing allowed to desegregate schools
	July	Nixon reduces voting age from 21 to 18
	August	To stabilize economy, Nixon announces price and wage controls
1972	June	Watergate
	August	US withdrawal from Vietnam
1973	January	Roe v Wade
	October	Energy Crisis, fuel allocation
1974	June	Supreme Court orders equal pay for women performing equal work
	August	Nixon resigns

#### Jimmy Carter 1977-1981

1977	February	Signs Emergency Natural Gas Act
	August	Department of Energy Established
	October	International Covenant on Human Rights
1978	October	Congress passes first energy package
1979	April	Addressed nation on energy
	June	Carter proposed national health plan to Congress

#### Ronald Reagan 1981-1989

1981	February	Budget proposes large tax & spending cuts
	March	President Reagan is shot
1982	June	Equal Rights Amendment fails
	December	Unemployment hits 10.8%, worst recession since the Great Depression
1984		AIDS virus is introduced
1985		US becomes the worlds largest debtor nation owing \$130 Billion
1986	October	Tax Reform Act
	November	Iran Contra Scandal
1987		First trillion solar budget introduced in US
	October	Black Monday Stock Market Crash

#### George H. Bush 1989-1993

1990	June	North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) negotiations begin
------	------	--

---

---

	July	Americans w/Disabilities Act signed
1991	January	Operation Desert Storm begins
	November	Civil Rights Act of 1991
Bill Clinton		
1993	December	NAFTA is signed
1996	August	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA) is signed
1998	January	Monica Lewinsky
George W. Bush 2001-2009		
2001	April	\$1.65 Trillion tax cut for large corporations
	September	World Trade Center Attacks
	October	Patriot Act
2003	March	US invades Iraq
	April	\$97 Billion for war in Iraq approved by Congress
2004	September	Federal deficit hits record high
2005	August	Hurricane Katrina
2007	May	Signs presidential directive giving the president control of all 3 branches in case of disaster

---

## APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY

---

*Collaborative governance:* A type of governance in which public and private actors work collectively in distinctive ways, using particular processes, to establish laws and rules for the provision of public goods (Ansell & Gash, 2008, p. 545).

*Collaborative public management:* The process of multiorganizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved or easily solved by a single organization (O'Leary, Gerard, & Bingham, 2006, p. 7).

*Direct democracy:* In direct democracy citizens act outside of traditional representative political institutions to replace elected officials, ratify or reject legislation, or circumvent representative government altogether and pass laws directly (Gerber & Phillips, 2005, p.310).

*Direct government:* Delivering or withholding a good or service by public employees alone (Salamon, 2002, p.49).

*Governance:* Refers to the acts of a group which addresses public problems that governments alone cannot solve while promoting general welfare (Boyte, 2005, p. 536).

*Network governance:* Governance that relies less on public employees and hierarchical bureaucratic structure and more on partnerships and nongovernmental organizations designed to complete public work (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

*New governance:* A new approach to public problem solving defined by the term governance in place of government, emphasizing the new collaborative nature of government and by the term 'new' recognizing the need for a new approach to considerable tests (Salamon, 2002, p. 8).

*Tool of public action:* An identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem (Salamon, 2002, p. 19).

## CURRICULUM VITAE

Angelique Goliday  
4721 McFadden Rd  
Columbus, Oh 43229  
614 987-6487  
[agoliday@insight.rr.com](mailto:agoliday@insight.rr.com)

### EDUCATION

---

#### **2010 - Ph.D., Public Policy**

Walden University, Minneapolis, MN. (4.0 GPA)

Dissertation title: *Identifying the Relationship Between Network Governance and Community Action Program Participation*

Committee: Dr. Anthony Leisner, Ph.D. (chair), Kirk Elliot, Ph.D., and Raj Singh, Ph.D.

#### **2008 - M.P.A., Public Administration**

Walden University, Minneapolis, MN. (4.0 GPA)

Masters project: *Identifying the Roles & Responsibilities among Citizens & Government*

#### **2004 - M.B.A., Business Administration**

Franklin University, Columbus, OH. (3.7 GPA)

#### **1999 – B.A., English Literature**

Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. (3.0 GPA)

### AREAS of SCHOLARSHIP

---

Public Policy  
Social Programs  
Social Dependence  
Poverty  
Community Development  
Citizen Participation  
Network Governance  
Democratic Governance

### AWARDS/FELLOWSHIPS

---

**2004** - Ohio House of Representatives Community Service Award

**2009**- Employee of the Month, Office of the Consumers' Counsel, Columbus, OH

## RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

---

**Regulatory Analyst, Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel, Columbus, OH (March 2010-present):** Assists in the development of analytical work, policies and guidelines for utility case analysis especially in the areas of energy efficiency, renewable energy and related matters; Serves as technical member on cases and/or projects as assigned; Assists in research and investigation in major utility applications for rate and fuel costs and other regulatory proceedings; Serves as analyst responsible for specific assigned areas. Prepares spreadsheets used to analyze various issues. Responsible for compiling data and statistics, such as return on equity calculations, revenues, expenses, customer usage information, and bill calculations. Assists in the preparation of written reports and testimony before the PUCO, FERC, FCC, and legislative committees describing the results of utility investigations and expert opinions on utility issues; prepare written reports and testimony; Present oral expert testimony before the PUCO, subject to cross-examination. As assigned, organizes, directs and conducts studies and special investigations regarding complex utility issues; Represents agency at meetings of state and federal agencies and at technical hearings and conferences; Prepares and presents written and oral reports of conclusions; Work in collaboration with consultants regarding utility cases.

**Compliance Investigator, Ohio Consumers' Counsel, Columbus, OH (December 2007-March 2010):** Responsible for conducting investigations concerning alleged residential utility issues and noncompliance. Responsible for researching, analyzing, and documenting issues concerning utility non-compliance. Serve on industry and legal case teams to determine trends in noncompliance or questionable activity concerning utility regulation and policy. Required to build and maintain relationships between the public, private, and nonprofit sectors in effort to ensure reliable and cost efficient utility services are available and supplied to Ohio citizens. Participate in Low Income Dialogue Group comprised of public, nonprofit, and private sector members across Ohio designed to address the issues of low income citizens.

**Training Coordinator, ODJFS Office of Child Support, Columbus, OH (2006-2007):** Plan, schedule, and conduct training programs. Required to provide training to state and county staff in the area of program delivery. Responsible for conducting workshops. Prepared reports on the evaluation forms completed by training participants. Maintained records of training programs. Responsible for operating audio/visual equipment. Prepared, coordinated, and maintained training materials for training programs. Responsible for analyzing, and communicating the results of data compilation and success of specific areas of program training. Responsible for providing monthly reports on training activities using personal computer and applicable software applications. Assisted county administrative staff and responded to inquires to resolve issues related to program training and delivery. Required to serve on departmental committees often compromised of cross-sector members designed to enhance program delivery.

**Intake Representative, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Columbus, OH (2004-2006):** Required to respond to inbound calls, letters and email in order to document

information to determine if investigation is necessary for utility disputes. Position requires working knowledge of the utility rules as documented in the Ohio Revised Code. Position required building and maintaining relationships with private sector company representatives.

**Administrative Assistant, Communication Options, Columbus, OH (2002-2003):**

Provided administrative support to the VP of sales as needed, including developing proposals for account executives, customer service and general office duties, generate and maintain spreadsheets and legal documents viewed by leadership teams. Required to provision orders for local service, long distance and complex communications equipment. Maintained legal documents, spreadsheets and databases viewed by management, and resolving complex customer service issues. Required working knowledge of Ohio Administrative Code and telecommunications regulatory compliance.

**TEACHING INTERESTS**

---

American Government  
Public Policy  
Public Administration  
Public Administration Networking &  
Collaboratives

**CURRENT PROJECT(S)**

---

Dissertation title: *Identifying the Relationship Between Network Governance and Ohio's Community Action Program Participation Using Pearson's r*

**PREVIOUS PROJECT(S)**

---

Knowledge Area Module: *Democratic Governance*  
Knowledge Area Module: *Public Sector Leadership*  
Work Product: *Disconnect & Credit Rule Revisions: Comments from the Consumer Services Division*

**TECHNOLOGY**

---

Possess advanced skills in computer technology gained the specializing in Management of Information Systems in the Masters of Business Administration Program. Proficient in Microsoft Word, Outlook, and PowerPoint with intermediate skills in Excel and Access. Proficient in statistical software such as Statistical Products for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

**MEMBERSHIPS**

---

Pi Alpha Alpha National Honor Society for Public Affairs & Administrators

American Society for Public Administrators  
National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates

## REFERENCES

---

***Reginald Taylor, Ph.D.***

3603 Running Ranch  
San Antonio, TX. 78261  
Phone: (210) 488-2287 (cell)  
[taylorphd07@mac.com](mailto:taylorphd07@mac.com)

Tony Leisner, Ph.D.

School of Public Policy & Administration  
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Walden University  
155 Fifth Ave, South, Suite 100  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
[anthony.leisner@waldenu.edu](mailto:anthony.leisner@waldenu.edu)

Jim Williams, Senior Outreach & Research Specialist  
Office of Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
10 W. Broad St.  
Columbus, Oh 43215  
614 466-8574