

## **The Challenges Non-Profit Community Action Agency Leaders Face in Collaborating with Non-Profit Human Services Organizations**

**Tyrone Chase, Ph.D.**  
University Maryland Eastern Shore  
United States

### **Abstract**

*While there has been research on the topic of collaboration among nonprofit organizations, little or no studies have been conducted on the challenges Community Action Agency (CAA) leaders encounter when joining forces with other non-profit organizations. This qualitative phenomenological study examines, describes and unearths such challenges. The sample was drawn from one multi-service agency spanning seven counties on the east coast of the United States. An interview consisting of semi-structured interview questions was used to guide the researcher during the interview process. Eight leaders from the organization participated in this study. As the results of individual interviews and data analysis, the findings were clear. Three major themes emerged that lead to rich descriptions of the challenges organizational leaders faced when collaborating with nonprofit organizations that provide similar services. The implications were clear that leaders did not fully collaborate due to the lack of trust or where they willing to share trade secrets, resources or territory. Future studies on anti-poverty agencies were recommended.*

**Keywords:** Collaboration, Community Action Agency, Organizational Leaders, Non-Profit

### **1. Introduction**

“Collaboration is essential to the joint production of human services organizations, yet what is meant by collaboration is seldom specified” (Mayhew, 2012, p.113). While collaboration is defined in many ways, for the purpose of this article, it is not only when two or more organizations work together; it signifies an agreement between organizations to align support activities such as human resources, planning, and financial management (Mayhew, 2012; Shortell, Gillies, Anderson, Erickson, & Mitchell, 2000) as well as other opportunities that benefit organizations. The underlying push towards collaboration is the belief that by working together human services agencies can integrate their services and resources resulting in a more effective and efficient way of delivering services addressing the needs of customers in a more comprehensive manner (Konrand, 1996; Bunger 2012)). Yet, there are perceived risks involved in collaboration between nonprofit organizations. Leaders of nonprofit Community Action Agencies (CAAs) face the risks that collaboration and competition can undermine coordination because the success of one organization in obtaining funding, employees and customers may come at the expense of a partner, leading to failure and dissolution (Bunger, 2012; Baker, Faulkner, & Fisher, 1998)

Despite the risks, evidence demonstrates that competition between nonprofit organizations do collaborate (Valente, Corognes, Stevens, & Cousineau, 2008) and trust may offset the risks of collaborating with the competition (Bunger, 2012; Uzzi, 1997). It is widely accepted that trust figures prominently in inter-organizational collaboration (Bunger, 2012). Little is known about the challenges non-profit CAA leaders face and degree to which the collaborations impact non-profit organizations. This qualitative study was designed to describe the challenges non-profit community action agency leaders face in collaborating with other non-profit human services organizations.

## **2. Collaboration**

Collaboration can be defined as two or organizations or entities working together to achieve an expected outcome. However according to (Byrne & Hansberry, 2007). “such overuse of the term can serve to dilute the power of true collaboration, which has been defined as mutually beneficial and well defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals” (p. 75). The relationship includes a commitment to the definition of mutual relationships and respect; shared development of goals and structure; shared responsibilities, mutual authority and responsibility, sharing resources and rewards (Mattessich & Monsey 1993).

Collaboration is the backbone of a multi-layer service delivery system, with inter-organizational relationships occurring at different levels among a variety of organizations (Mayhew, 2012). The focus of collaboration is evident in the fact that governmental funding streams often required of ongoing human service collaboration in order for communities to secure funding (Sandfort, 1999). The idea of collaboration is embraced in the field of human services since policy makers and practitioners realize that on single organization is in the position to successfully address the multifaceted problems that face society (Mayhew, 2012). Yet, organizational leaders are challenged with the concept of collaborating with similar service delivery organizations.

Matthews (2014) quoted President Lyndon B. Johnson – “We strengthen the ability of free nations everywhere to develop independence and raise their standard of living, and thereby frustrate those who prey on poverty. To do this the rich must do our part. President Johnson declared unconditional war on poverty”. The term unconditional war on poverty refers to a set of initiatives by the Johnson administration, passed by congress and implemented by his Cabinet agencies (Matthews, 2014). President Johnson said in his 1964 State of the Union Address that our purpose is not relieve the symptoms of poverty, but to cure it and to prevent it. No single piece of legislation is going to suffice (American Rhetoric, Online Speech Bank - Lyndon Baines Johnson – First State of the Union Address). [www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/b/1964stateoftheunion.htm](http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/b/1964stateoftheunion.htm)

The economic opportunity act of 1964 (EOA) was the centerpiece of President Johnson’s War on Poverty, which in turn was a major thrust of the “Great Society” legislative agenda of the Johnson administration, The EOA was passed in August 1964. It provided for job training, adult education, and loans to small businesses to attack the roots of unemployment and poverty. In addition the EOA established over a thousand of Community Action Agencies (CAA’s) at the local level to implement Great Society programs. CAAs varied, some were nonprofit groups, some being city agencies, while others where community controlled groups. The Green Amendment of 1967 stipulated that the local elected officials had the authority to designate the official CAA for their areas – Economic Opportunity Act (1964) (Source: G. David Garson– [wps, prehall.com/wps/media/objects/751/769950/Documents-Library/eoa1964.htm](http://wps.prehall.com/wps/media/objects/751/769950/Documents-Library/eoa1964.htm))

The Economic Opportunity Act provided funding for Community Action Agencies which are local private non-profit and public government organizations that have directly served the needs of the low-income. Act of August 20, 1964 (Economic Opportunity Act of 1964), Public Law 88-452, 78 SAT 508, mobilized the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States ([research.archives.gov/id/299896](http://research.archives.gov/id/299896)). United States Public Law 88-452, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Sec. 202. Title II Urban and rural community action programs. Part A-General Community Action Programs ([uscode.house.gov/statutes/pl/85/425.pdf](http://uscode.house.gov/statutes/pl/85/425.pdf)).

## **3. Collaboration Challenges Facing Non-profit Community Action Agency Leaders**

Why should nonprofit organizations collaborate? Byrne and Hansberry (2007) asserted that funding sources want to ensure efficient and effective programs and organizations. Thus, collaborating and coordinating service delivery, organizations reinforce their resources to help move individuals and families toward independence. Reisch & Sommerfeld (2003) stated “the three common reasons for collaboration were joint advocacy, training and technical assistance, and resource sharing” (p 311). In addition, the combining of limited resources strengthen nonprofits ability to deliver services and reduce the duplication of benefit pay outs (Reisch & Sommerfeld, 2003). The National Network for Collaboration (1995) argued that collaboration, in contrast to coordination and cooperation, requires a commitment to mutual relationships; jointly developed structure and shared responsibilities; joint authority and accountability for success; and shared rewards.

## *The Challenges Non-Profit Community Action Agency Leaders Face in Collaborating.....*

As a result of engaging in collaborative efforts, nonprofit organizations faced greater internal and external challenges in serving the public (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention 1999). The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (1999) also asserts that nonprofit groups identified the following challenges that must be addressed in order to effectively manage the organizations:

1. Lack of shared information and communications among systems.
2. Limited evaluation/effectiveness data regarding currently existing programs
3. Fragmented delivery systems and duplication of efforts.
4. Lack of information of programs and services currently available in the community.

Competition between agencies is always an issue (Bengtsson & Kock, 2000). It occurs when two or more organizations that operate within the same territory depend on the same resources to provide goods and services for the same client base (Hunt, 2007). With a limited number of available resources an organization that is effective, efficient and successful in obtaining resources, reduces the likelihood of similar agencies for obtaining the same assets. Therefore, competition emerges when an organization's success in winning new funds, hiring qualified staff, or cornering a new market niche of clients comes at the expense of another agency (Bengtsson & Kock, 2000).

### **According to Bunger (2012):**

Nonprofit human service organizations operating within the same regional network are often faced with dual pressure to compete as well as coordinate administrative operations (by sharing funding, staff, or space) to enhance efficiency. Emerging quantitative research evidence has demonstrated that competing organizations coordinate, despite the risks. Trust or perceived trustworthiness between two organizations may mitigate the negative influence of competition on coordination (p.1155).

In an era of greater dependency on government funded programs, policies that require increased collaboration amongst human services agencies have become more complex to establish and even harder to implement. While proponents of resource mobilization echo the need for inter-organizational cooperation, there are some who recognize competitive tendencies between nonprofit organizations such as turf, legitimacy, problematic (Zald & McCarthy, 1987).

As funding for nonprofits is increasingly targeted toward the costs of service delivery, rather than agency operations (Smith, 2010), nonprofit organizations are under pressure to reduce administrative costs. "The contracts and grants funding relationships between government and nonprofit agencies have been instrumental in essential delivery of services for individuals, families and communities in need since the 1950's. However, several dynamics inhibit successful collaboration today" (Norris-Tirrell, 2014 p.317). Evidence of coordination among competitors has emerged in the nonprofit human services field (Valente, Coroges, & Stevens, 2008). For example, it has been well-documented that human service organizations that share similar funding sources, geographic proximity, age (Shumate, Fulk, & Monge, 2005), and service sector (Bolland & Wilson, 1994; Rivard & Morrissey, 2003) fears competitors.

Organizational leaders are repeatedly confronted with a predicament to collaborate with agencies competing for the same resources (Smith, 2010). Sharing administrative resources like space, funding, or staff expertise may promote efficiencies that help organizations survive in resource-scarce environments, or secure a competitive advantage when applying for grants and contracts from funders that value coordination, and low administrative costs (Bunger, 2012). Competition can undermine coordination and increase tension between organizations because one organizations' success in obtaining needed funding, clients, or staff may come at the expense of a partner, leading to partnership failure or dissolution (Baker, Faulkner, & Fisher, 1998).

Yet, many researchers proposed that nonprofit organizations competing with one another, like those in the for-profit sector, coordinate with the competition (Tsasis, 2009; Bunger, 2012). However, unlike the for-profit sector, this simultaneous cooperative-competitive dynamic among nonprofit agencies has not been explicitly and empirically examined (Tsasis, 2009).

#### **4. Conceptual Framework**

While the existing literature points to a deep examination and understanding of collaboration, cooperation, and competition between for-profit organizations, there is a scarcity of research on the challenges of Community Action agency leaders face when collaborating with other human services nonprofit organizations, for this reason organizations are unaware of this topic from a qualitative vantage point. To address this gap, this study was designed to describe the challenges non-profit community action agency leaders face in collaborating with other non-profit human services organizations.

#### **5. Research Questions**

1. What challenges do organizational leaders of Community Action Agencies face when collaborating with similar service delivery organizations?
2. How can the challenges be address in order to strengthen Community Action Agencies and non-profit agencies collaboration?

#### **6. Method**

This study is a qualitative phenomenological research design with the accompanying method of semi-structured interviews. The purpose of qualitative research is to discover, explore and describe phenomena (Norwood, 2000; Sayre, 2001). Phenomenology is a specific type of qualitative research that attempts to provide information and develop understanding about lived experiences (Norwood, 2000). As a type of qualitative research, a phenomenological study is guided by the generic question, what is the structure and essence of the experience? (Norwood, 2000; Robson, 2002). According to Golanfshani (2003), all qualitative research is phenomenological in nature; however, because phenomenology focuses on experience and understanding, it stands alone as a method of qualitative research. Cassell and Symon (2004) asserted that phenomenology is a philosophical tradition that has made a substantial impact on the social sciences, especially on the development of qualitative research.

The phenomenological approach was used to describe the lived experiences of non-profit community action agency leaders regarding inter-organizational collaborations. The phenomenological approach involves analyzing phenomena in real life settings using a range of different types of evidence (Gopinathan, Lewin and Glenton, 2014). For purpose of this study leaders are defined as individuals within the CAA having the title of Administrator, which in other environments equate to the position of a Vice President. The data does not represent the entire population of all nonprofits that operate in the region however it does represent all of the administrators in the agency. In describing the experiences of the participants, common themes emerged revealing their perceptions. Thus, the richness of the lived experiences adds depth to this study.

##### **6.1 Participant Selection**

The selection of participants for research is the first step in the data collection process. “In a phenomenological study may be located at a single site, although they need not be” (Creswell, 1998, p. 111). The sample for this study was drawn from a non-profit CAA with a 501 © 3 Internal Revenue Service (IRS) income tax designation. At the time of conducting this research, the CAA had a 50 year history of providing direct services to individuals and families through various programs and projects. The agency’s foundation was laid by President Johnson’s declaration of war on poverty.

Participants were recruited for this study through in-person, face-to-face personal contacts followed by email conformations. By using the personal contact approach, a rapport with the participants as well as with potential key informants was established. Each of the participants were invited because they met the same eligibility criteria in that they were:

1. In the position of an Administrator;
2. Involved in working with the collaborative efforts of the agency; and
3. Employed at the nonprofit agency under investigation for at least five years.

Program directors, coordinators and managers were excluded from the sample. They were excluded because of factors that would likely have prohibited them from access to “high level” documents, such as across the board program requirements.

The sample size in a phenomenological study varies from 2 – 25, however there is no agreed upon number of participants required (Klenke, 2008). Thus, eight individuals consented to be the sample size in this study. In this saturation was reached at six participants. However, it was important for this researcher to interview the entire group of administrators. Therefore the total number of participants for this research was eight.

## **6.2 Pre-Data Collection**

Prior to the data collection, interview protocols were established and an Interview Guide developed and evaluated for content validity. A panel of experts (3 individuals) should be used to evaluate the content of a questionnaire to ensure content validity (Sayre 2001; Wengraf 2001). For the purpose of this study 3 experts were used to evaluate the interview guide and research questions for content validity. The experts included a CEO from human services agency with over thirty years of experience aiding individuals and families in becoming self-sufficient; a professor from a southern university who possessed a keen knowledge in qualitative research and organizational leaders; and a clinical psychologist who has expertise in interviewing techniques and strategies. An Interview Guide consisting of semi-structured interview questions was developed and used to help guide the researcher through the interview process.

Study participants were not identified by their actual names nonetheless synonyms or codes were used to conceal their identities. Anonymity is critical when conducting phenomenological studies and must be taken seriously throughout the process. Informed consent forms were provided for each participant, giving the researcher written consent to interview the participants. Participants were informed that they had the right to stop the interview at any time they needed. The interviews were conducted in a private and natural setting to add comfort to and anonymity for the informants.

Each participant was asked if they would be willing to be interviewed for this research study. They were informed that the interviews could go beyond an hour and would be recorder for the interviewee to reflect on the responses and descriptions of the phenomenon. Secondary data such as inter and intra-agency reports and program requirements were examined to give the researcher an understanding of the depth of collaborations.

## **7. Data Collection**

The most appropriate data collection strategy for a phenomenological research is the interview (Padilia-Diaz, 2015). For this study the researcher was the main instrument for data collection. Data were collected through one-on-one; face-to-face; semi-structured interviews designed to describe the experiences of non-profit CAA leaders who were involved in inter-agency collaborations. The open-ended questions asked participant to reflect on their experiences in collaborating with other human services non-profit agencies and to the best of their abilities, give in-depth responses. Additional probing questions were asked to gain clarity of the participants’ responses. The average duration of the interviews was sixty minutes.

Audio recorders were used which allowed the researcher to revisit the responses and make meaning of the content. Multiple audio devices were used to record the informants’ response. This strategy was use to safeguard against malfunctions of any one device thus reducing the likelihood of interruptions and delays in collecting data. Once the experiences of each participant was shared and there was no need for further examination the interview ended. Once all of the interviews were completed, interviews were transcribed verbatim.

## **8. Data Analysis**

Data analysis began at the time of the interview. The researcher formed initial assumptions by identifying key terms that emerged during the interviews. Field notes and observations are critical for the analysis process. As with the interviews, according to Bronstien, Ball, Mellin, Wade-Mdivanian, and Andrews-Butcher (2011) notes serve as raw data. The researcher immersed himself in the data by reading and rereading the verbatim transcripts to get a sense of not only the information but also to become familiar with the participants. While reading and evaluating the transcripts, the research was able to identify key statements.

While qualitative software such as MAXQDA could have been used for the analysis process, hand analysis data was the method used to analyze data in this phenomenological study. A hand analysis may be preferred when the researcher is analyzing a small database, less than 500 pages of transcripts and field notes, and can easily keep track of files and locate text pages (Creswell, 2005). Creswell postulates, that hand analysis of qualitative data means that researchers read the data, mark the data by hand and divide it into parts. He further stated analyzing text data involves using color-coding to parts of the text or cut and paste text sentences on cards.

## **8. Results**

As a result of the data analysis, major themes emerged describing the challenges non-profit community action agency leaders face in collaborating with non-profit human services organizations. To response to research question #1- What challenges do organizational leaders of Community Action Agencies face when collaborating with similar service delivery organizations? The most prevalent was trust. Organizational leaders felt that they could not trust leaders of other organizations for fear of losing the competitive edge over the competition.

1. P1 stated “if share our resources other agencies will be able to use our stuff to improve their organizations”.
2. P4 stated “by trusting others we open ourselves up to become vulnerable. Thereby setting us up for losing programs.”
3. P5 reported “Um, trust is not only a major issue between our agency and other agencies, we hardly trust our own intra-agency programs.
4. P3 said, “Um, yes we share resources and information with other organizations that are doing the same things as some of the program that I oversee. I can name one which we are in competition with them. I personally don’t trust them. They want our customers as well as our money. No I don’t trust them.”
5. Competition was also a resounding theme when it came to identifying the challenges or barriers for collaborating.
6. P3 reported, “Absolutely! We are definitely in completion with other agencies. That is one of the chinks in the armor of welfare reform. It becomes inherent upon the agency to want to collaborate because in lots of instances these programs were designed to be performance based. Which means if I help them [customers] I made the money, if you helped them [customers] you got the money - so it doesn’t make sense to send them to you if I can provide the help, maybe in a smaller capacity than you can? It becomes a money making venture.”
7. P8 indicated that “We are in competition with other organizations as long as there is money involved. Other organizations will compete with us for customers and funds when it is beneficial to them.”
8. P5 reported, “Are you kidding? We are definitely in competition with agencies for customers but with an organization as large as ours, we sometimes compete against ourselves for the same customers. What I mean is when to similar programs like Head Start and two other early childhood education programs under separate “umbrellas” the customer pool is diminished. As a result, trust becomes a major issue especially when we begin talking about money”
9. P7 indicated that “It’s hard because it’s very competitive now. For instance, the organization where I work provides a lot of the same services that the welfare to work does.” “With such duplications trust becomes an issue.”
10. The third major theme that emerged was shared governance. Organizational leaders were not willing to concede to other organizations power. There appear to be an apprehension to agree to allow one organization to have more authority than the other. This presented a major challenge as relationships have become strained and inter-organizations communications failed.
11. P7 stated, “My experience collaborations don’t work. I can’t think of any time that we’ve collaborated with another agency that we didn’t fall flat on our face – that it [collaboration] didn’t work. Every collaboration effort that we’ve had, even if that collaboration didn’t continue after a certain period of time, I still feel like all of the collaborations have been negative and have not worked with no benefits to our customers. This is because we nor they are willing to give up our positions of power.”
12. P8 asserted that “If we can’t trust them how can we work with them. Even when attempts have been made to come to the table, sort of speak, we fail to agree on which of us will take the lead on the initiative.
13. Research question 2 asked, how can the challenges be address in order to strengthen Community Action Agencies and non-profit agencies collaboration?

## *The Challenges Non-Profit Community Action Agency Leaders Face in Collaborating.....*

The responses were consistent in that the major themes varied little. Amongst the responses was the need to engage in serious conversations about the term Collaboration. What does it mean? What's needed to make it work?

14. P8 said, "We need to bring all of the major players to the table to have a serious discussion on how we can actually collaborate and how we can help our customers.
15. P6 noted, "If we can establish rapport up front rather than waiting to engage in and develop relationship when funders mandate we do so, it will go a long way in establishing trust.
16. P3 reported "we must avoid the fear of one agency being better positioned than the other. This where the E.D.s need to come together and develop realistic plans that will be beneficial for all".

### **9. Discussion**

This study intimates that organizational leaders had similar experiences when working in collaboration with other human services organizations. Sharing resources like employees, knowledge, customers, and funding caused concerns for leaders. While these findings may be consistent with the findings from other studies, what makes this research unique is the type of organization from which the data is collected. Literature is very clear, many studies concentrate on non-profit organizations as a single entity, an investigation non-profit organization through the lens of Community Action Agencies (CAA) was paramount for organizational leadership literature.

When organization leaders from a multi-service CAA, which serve customers from multiple jurisdictions, attempt to collaborate with other non-profits that provide similar services to the same customer population multiple challenges emerge. The attempt to share customers, leverage funds and establish relations challenged leaders to give up their perceived power and become susceptible to a weakening of the organization. As organizations enter into collaborative contractual agreements, trust, competition and shared governance becomes increasingly problematic. Despite funding sources expectations as prescribed in contractual agreements, memorandums of understanding as well as program guidelines, leaders struggled with maintaining compliance with the regulatory expectations. In fact, it was discovered after reviewing many of the funding contractual agreements those organizations were mandated to engage in partnerships and collaboration.

To address the challenges non-profit community action agency leaders face in collaborating with other non-profit human services organizations, leaders must change their mindsets and allow themselves to become vulnerable. Vulnerable in that there must be a willingness to have serious discussions about each organizations role in the collaborative effort. Such discussions could help mend relationships, improve trust, reduce the perception of the competitive edge, and establish share governance. But more importantly, as a result, the efficiency and effectiveness by which services are delivered will be improved as organizations work toward a shared goal; moving customers toward self-reliance and possibly eliminating the duplication of services. Finally, organizational leaders will be able to strengthen their agencies which could lead to organization longevity and sustainability.

### **10. Conclusions**

Many of the conclusions drawn from this study could be beneficial to organizational leaders across of the spectrum of organizations. Investigating organization leader's perceptions of collaboration through the lens of community action agency (CAAs) is new, yet it contributes to the limited research on CAAs. By researching leaders' perceptions of collaborations provided an insight into how collaborations are perceived and how organization leaders face the challenges of collaboration. While facing the challenges and creating avenues by which to address them, the extent of establishing strong relationships with other organization becomes critical for the survival of non-profit and more specifically CAAs.

By sharing resources (funding, customers, and human resources) organizations understand the importance of working closely with other organizations that provide similar services to the same customer base. In doing so, in order to maintain a level of compliance with the regulations set-forth by funding entities, organizations would position themselves for future funding. Finally, it is evident, based on the data, genuine challenges exists as collaborating is very problematic. The data also revealed the need to begin serious conversations about the importance of working collaboratively with each other.

## **11. Recommendations**

This study has its limitations. Investigating one organization does not mean the findings can be generalized across all CAAs throughout the country. Replicating this study in other communities throughout the United States would be beneficial to add to the growing body of research. The following are potential areas for investigation:

1. The perceptions of organizations leaders in CAAs on intra -agency partnerships;
2. An investigation into workload of workers when collaborating;
3. Workers perceptions of intra-agency competition; and
4. The barriers that mid-level managers face when collaborating both intra and inter-agency; and
5. An investigation using a different methodology would be beneficial.

## **References**

- American Rhetoric, Online Speech Bank - Lyndon Baines Johnson – First State of the Union Address. (Online) Available: <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/b/1964stateoftheunion>.
- Baker, W. E., Faulkner, R. R., & Fisher, G. A. (1998). Hazards of the market: The continuity and dissolution of interorganizational market relations. *American Sociological Review*, 63(2), 147-177.  
doi: 10.2307/2657321
- Barnes, J.E., Fisher, S.G. (2006). A recipe for success: The blending of two disparate nonprofit cultures into a successful collaboration – A case study. The Haworth Press, Inc. (Online) Available: <http://jfor.haworthpress.com>. doi: 10.1300/J369v09n02\_07
- Bengtsson, M., & Kock, S. (2000). “Coopetition” in business networks-to cooperate and compete simultaneously. *Industrial marketing management*, 29, 411-426. Doi: 10.1016/S0019-8501(99)00067-X
- Bischoff, U. M. (2001). The impact of welfare reform on collaboration among nonprofit community-based organizations in west Philadelphia. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(02), p. 771. (UMI No. 3003596).
- Bolland, J. M., & Wilson, J. V. (1994). Three faces of integrative coordination: A model of interorganizational relations in community-based health and human services. *Health Services Research*, 29, 341-366.
- Bronstien, L., Ball, A., Mellin, E.A., Wade-Mdivanian, R., & Andrews-Butcher. D., (2011). Advancing collaboration between school-and agency-employed school-based social workers: A mixed-methods comparison of competences and preparedness.
- Bunger, A.C. (2012). Administrative coordination in nonprofit human service delivery networks: The role of competition and trust. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.
- Burner, C. (2001). Thinking collaboratively: ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children’s services. (Online) Available: <http://www.cyfernet.org/research/thinkco.html>. (December )
- Burnley, C., Matthews, C., & McKenzie, S. (2005). Devolution of services to children and families: The experience of npos in Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. Vol. 16. No.1. March 2005
- Byrne, A and Hansberry, J., (2007). Collaboration: Leveraging resources and expertise. *New Development For Youth Development*, No 114, Summer 2007, Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
- Cassell, C., & Symon, G. (2004). *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Caudill, P. J. (2000). Welfare reform two years later: The impact of caseload decline and development of policies for those still receiving assistance (Maryland). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(07), p. 3834 (UMI No. 9977696).
- Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. (1999). Collaboration: A strategy for prevention practitioners. (Online)Available: <http://www.northeastcapt.org/products/strategies/collaboration/collaborationpaper.html>
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.



*The Challenges Non-Profit Community Action Agency Leaders Face in Collaborating.....*

- Creswell, J. W. (2005). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964), Public Law 88-452, 78 STAT 508; research.archives.gov/id/299896 Garson, D. D. Economic opportunity act of 1964. wps, prenhall.com/wps/media/objects/751/769950/Documents-Library/eoa1964.htm)
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 4, 597 – 607. (Online) Available: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf>.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 4, 597 – 607. (Online) Available: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf>.
- Gopinathan, U., Lewin, S., & Glenton, C., (2014). Implementing large-scale programmes to optimize the health workforce in low-and middle-income settings: A multicountry case study synthesis. *Topical Medicine and International Health*. Vol 19, No 13, PP 1437-1456 December 2014.
- Iceland, J. (2006). *Poverty in America: A handbook*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Klenke, K., (2008). *Qualitative research in the study of leadership – Emerald Group Publishing Limited*. – Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 IWA, UK).
- Kolodny, K. A. (2000). Collaborating in support of inner city children: the relationships between urban families and community agencies and organizations in poverty- level neighborhood. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(02) p. 560 (UMI No. 9963282)
- Konrad, E. (1996). A multidimensional framework for conceptualizing human services integration initiatives. *New Directions Evaluation*, 69, 5-19.
- Kosny, A.A., & Eakin, J.A. (2008). The hazards of helping: Work, mission and risk in non-profit social service organizations. *Health, Risk & Society* vol. 10, No. 2
- Lyndon B. Johnson: “Annual message to the congress of the state of the union, January 8, 1964. The American presidency project: Johnson addresses (January 8, 1964). Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Wooley, The American Presidency Project. (Online) Available: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=26787>
- Matthews, D., (January 2014). Everything you need to know about the war on poverty. (Online) Available: [www.washingtonpost.com/news/work/wp/2014/01/08/everything-you-need-to-know-about-the-war-on-poverty/?utm\\_term=.b293fb73dc90](http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/work/wp/2014/01/08/everything-you-need-to-know-about-the-war-on-poverty/?utm_term=.b293fb73dc90)
- Mayhew, F. (2012). Human service delivery in a multi-tier system: The subtleties of collaboration among partners.
- Mattessich, P., & Monsey, B. (1993) *Collaboration: What makes it work*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation}.
- Milbourne, L. & Murray, U. (2010). Negotiating interactions in state-voluntary sector relationships: Competitive and collaborative agency in an experiential workshop. *International Society for Third Sector Research and The John’s Hopkins University*.
- National Network for Collaboration. (1995). *Collaboration framework: Addressing community capacity*. Retrieved February 14, 2005, from <http://www.cyfrenet.org/fargo,ND>.
- Norris-Tirrell, D., (2014). The changing role of private, nonprofit organizations in the development and delivery of human services in the United States. *JHSA*, winter 2014.
- North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (2003). Putting the pieces together: Comprehensive school-linked strategies for children and families. (Online) Available: <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/environment/css/ppt/chap1.htm>.
- Norwood, S. L. (2000). *Research strategies for advanced nursing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Padilia-Diaz, M., (2015). Phenomenology in educational qualitative research: Philosophy as science or philosophical science?) *International Journal of Educational Excellence* (2015) Vol, 1, No. 2, 101-110, ISSN 2373-5929).
- Pantazis, C. (1997). Welfare reform: One year later. *Public Management (U.S.)*, 79, 6-11.
- Reisch, M., & Sommerfeld, D. (2003). Inter organizational relationships among nonprofits in the aftermath of welfare reform. *Social Work*, 48, (3). (Online) Available: [http://web7.epent.com/citation.asp?tb=1&\\_ug=sid+08DA67AE%2D4A91%2D4CFC%2D...](http://web7.epent.com/citation.asp?tb=1&_ug=sid+08DA67AE%2D4A91%2D4CFC%2D...)
- Rivard, J. C., & Morrissey, J. (2003). Factors associated with interagency coordination in a child mental health service system demonstration. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 30, 397-415. doi: 10.1023/A.10246416300430.

- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sandfort, J. (1999). The structural impediments to human service collaboration: Examining welfare reform at the front lines [Electronic version]. *Social Service Review*, 73, 314-39. November 1, 2004, (Online) Available:  
<http://search.epnet.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie.ir.url.uid&db=qs&an=BSS199033501>.
- Sayre, S. (2001). *Qualitative methods for marketplace research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shortell, S. M., Gillies, R., Anderson, D. A., Erickson, K. M., & Mitchell, J. B. (2000).
- Remaking health care in America: The evolution of organized delivery systems. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, S. R. (2010). Chapter 8: The political economy of contracting and competition. In Y. Hansenfeld (Ed), *Human services as complex organizations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 139-160). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tsasis, P. (2009). The social processes of interorganizational collaboration and conflict in non-profit organizations. *Non profit Management and Leadership*, 20, 5-21. doi: 10.1002/nml.238 United States Public Law 88-452, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Sec. 202. Title II Urban and rural community action programs. Part A-General Community Action Programs for  
[muscode.house.gov/statutes/pl/85/425.pdf](http://www.uscode.house.gov/statutes/pl/85/425.pdf).
- Uzzi, B. (1997). Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 35-67, doi: 10.2307/239808.
- Valente, T.W., Corognes, K. A., Stevens, G. D., & Cousineau, M. R. (2008). Collaboration and competition in a children's health initiative coalition: A network analysis. *Evaluation and program planning*, 31, 392-402. Doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2008.06.002.
- Wengraf, M., (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic narrative and semi-structured methods*. Sage: London, 424 pages,
- Zald, M, N., & McCarthy, J., D. (1987). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, No. 6 (May, 1977), pp. 1212-124.