

Jihoon Jeong, Hee Soun Jang

Department of Public Administration, University of North Texas, Denton, TX USA

ABSTRACT

This study aims to understand the forms of network governance in homeless service networks and identify key factors affecting the choice of *Network Administration Organization* (NAO) network governance. This research defines network governance as an institutional arrangement that is chosen by diverse network participating organizations for effective coordination of decision-making and communication. The choice of network governance is a rational choice of members based on benefits and costs expected from collective actions within their unique community characteristics and network context. To understand the choice of network governance forms, I examine HUD-funded Continuum of Care local homeless service networks and identify two major network governance choices; *NAO* vs. *Lead Agency* and discuss key features of these choices.

RESEARCH PURPOSES

- Understand the forms of network governance in homeless service networks
- Identify key factors affecting the choice of network governance
- Propose models to explain the variation of choice of network governance

HOMELESS SERVICE NETWORKS

Continuum of Care (CoC) is the homeless service networks to respond to continuum of homeless needs in the United States. In the local level, many organizations across sectors voluntarily participate in building CoCs to provide certain services in the context of homeless policy such as housing, clinics, criminal justices, and so on. According to Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act (HEART) of 2009, local service actors are encouraged to create collaborative networks that address homeless problems in their areas. Federal government financially support the network services or the programs. Networks compete federal funding annually by submitting detailed proposal to the US department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

FORM OF NETWORK GOVERNANCE

Under institutional collective action framework (Feiock, 2009; 2013), this study assumes that network participating organizations choose form of network governance for the effective coordination. Form of network governance is chosen by network members based on decrease of cost and increase of benefit in their community characteristics.

This study takes three forms of network governance and focuses on the NAO choice, devised by Provan and Kenis (2008).

- Network Administration Organization Form
: Separate and management focused organization, not as a service provider
- Lead Agency Form
: One of service providers with many capabilities then others
- Shared governance Form
: Full participation by all network members

DATA AND METHODS

For empirical analysis, this study uses national data of 346 CoC homeless service networks out of 397 CoC networks, excluding statewide, US territories, and no-data-cases. Most data was collected by HUD sources.

To get individual data of CoC networks such as form of network governance and network members, I visited the websites of every CoC network or identified documents such as memorandum and meeting records.

This study presents descriptive analysis to demonstrate their sector orientation, membership, homeless service demand. This poster is mainly shows the descriptive data analysis for CoC networks. But, by employing the logit regression, I will empirically test key factors that affect the choice of network governance and discuss how coordination costs and benefits affect networks to choose NAO.

COG NETWORKS IN THE US (2019)

	M	SD	Min	Max	N
Form of Network Governance (1=NAO, 0=Lead agency)	0.58	0.495	0	1	346
Network size (#) Network members	43.32	33.466	4	250	300
Federal funding (\$)	5734845.31	12659325.09	2962	133611222	346
Service demand Total Homeless population	1398.15	5330.97	12	78604	346
Community characteristics					346
Total population	656309.33	899992.375	29810	9231259	346
Total Civilian Labor Force	333718.95	463491.772	14820	4725972	346
Education (Bachelor)	81408.88	121738.513	1851	1223715	346
Service job (%)	10.8229	1.6244	6.19	16.89	346
Poverty rate	15.3817	5.16644	4.02	40.29	346
Unemployment rate	8.4683	2.38105	3.7	24.88	346

FORM OF NETWORK GOVERNANCE in COCs

Form of Network Governance	N	%
Network Administration Organization Form		
Coalition	74	21.4
Government	21	6.1
Nonprofit	105	30.3
Lead Agency Form		
Government	86	24.9
Nonprofit	60	17.3
	346	100

CoC GEOGRAPHICAL CATEGORY

Category	N	%
Largely Rural CoC	76	22.0
Largely Suburban CoC	163	47.1
Major City CoC	47	13.6
Other Largely Urban CoC	60	17.3
	346	100%

FINDINGS

- **Form of Network Governance:** NAO and Lead agency forms of network governance are mainly existent in the homeless service networks. NAO form constructed as coalition, government department, and nonprofit organization. Lead agency form is usually managed by government department and nonprofit organization. Since it is difficult for all network members to participate in decision-making and communication, I may not able to find the shared form of network governance.
- **Network size:** Depending on geographical size and homeless population, there are diverse organizations to participate in homeless networks. Network members range from 4 to 250.
- **Federal Funding:** Funding from federal government support networks' homeless services or programs. All networks have received certain portion of funding from federal government depending on their necessity, performances, and capabilities to provide effective services and programs.
- **Service Demand:** Total homeless population as service demand can be the key factor that network members make decisions for the more programs and services to respond to needs (Jang, Valero, & Jeong, 2020). There are 109 NAO form of network governance (30%) over 500 homeless areas.
- **Community Characteristics:** Diverse community characteristics can be found in the geographical area of each network.
- **Geographical Category:** CoC networks are categorized as Rural (22%), suburban (47%), major city (13.6%), and urban (17.3%).

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

Form of network governance in CoC homeless networks suggests that there are two major forms of network governance: NAO and Lead agency form in rural, suburban, city, and urban area.

- **First**, form of network governance in CoC homeless networks can be identified by the model of Provan and Kenis (2008) to capture the choice by network participants.
- **Second**, network size, federal funding, and service demand can be the key factors to influence the choice of form of network governance. Future research could help explain the variation for the choice of Network Administration Organization (NAO).
- **Third**, diverse community characteristics and geographical differences can be the additional factors to understand selection of network governance by network members for NAO form.

Contact: Jihoon Jeong, JihoonJeong@my.unt.edu