WOMEN PROGRAM PLANNERS:

USING THE PLANNING TABLE TO NEGOTIATE FOR

THE INTERESTS OF WELFARE RECIPIENTS

by

SANDY LANE JENNINGS

(Under the Direction of Laura Bierema)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine how women program planners design programs for predominately women learners in Welfare to Work programs. The following questions guided this research: 1) How does a woman program planner's gender-based understanding impact power relations within the organizational process of program planning? and 2) How do women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with emphasis on the power and politics of the process? The sample for this study was comprised of eleven women program planners and five Department of Family and Children's Services representatives who work with welfare recipients.

This study revealed women educational program planners shape the form and content of the programs they plan. One factor that affects the planning process is the gender of the program planner. Individuals bring their own ideas of needed educational program content to the process based on prior experiences and these factors affect how women program planners negotiate for the inclusion of women's learning into the educational or training context of the programs they plan. Based on an analysis of the findings, two conclusions were drawn from this study. They

are: 1) Women define themselves based on past experience which gives them a basis for contextualizing the work and striving to change lives through shared understanding; and 2) Women program planners use relational negotiations to get things done.

The planners possess personal gender based domains that intersect with socially constructed beliefs. These domains include the way the planners experience empathy for the participants, feel it is necessary to foster self-esteem in the participants, have an internal need to give back to society, and exhibit a passion for the job that is instrumental in accomplishing established goals. The women also possess unique social and organizational domains that bring a distinctive decision-making style to the planning process based on who and what they are as individuals. Race, economic situations, gender, and life circumstances all affect the planning process. Because the planners interviewed were women, feelings for the clients that are unique to women understanding women affected the way the planners got things done.

INDEX WORDS: Adult Education, Employment and Training, Program Planning, Welfare, Welfare Reform, Welfare to Work, Women

WOMEN PROGRAM PLANNERS:

USING THE PLANNING TABLE TO NEGOTIATE FOR

THE INTERESTS OF WELFARE RECIPIENTS

by

SANDY LANE JENNINGS

B.S., The University of Georgia, 1988

M.B.A., Brenau University, 1992

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2007

WOMEN PROGRAM PLANNERS:

USING THE PLANNING TABLE TO NEGOTIATE FOR

THE INTERESTS OF WELFARE RECIPIENTS

by

SANDY LANE JENNINGS

Approved:

Major Professor: Laura Bierema

Committee: Juanita Johnson-Bailey
    Ronald Cervero
    Helen Hall
    Clifton L. Smith

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2007

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family and friends:
To my parents who instilled in me the courage to be different and to my friends
who accept and support my differences.

I make a special dedication to those I have lost: Tom, Joe, and Pam.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely grateful to my major professor, Laura Bierema, who supported and encouraged me though the good times and the bad times of this process. Her ability to ignore my tantrums and her frequently telling me to "take a deep breath" allowed me to complete this project and this degree. Her editing skills are to be applauded.

I also want to thank my committee members, Drs. Juanita Johnson-Bailey, Ronald Cervero, Helen Hall, and Clifton L. Smith for their support and feedback and their willingness to share their insights and love of learning with me. Each of them provided wisdom well beyond what could have ever learned in a book. A special thanks to Ron Cervero who helped me to give a name to what I love to do.

This project would not have been possible without the research participants who freely and generously gave of their time. They believe in what they do and they are truly the unsung heroes of our society.

Thank you to my many friends in South Georgia who still do not understand why I do the things I do but nonetheless support me and encourage me.

Thank you to my North Georgia friends who supported me through the peeks and valleys of this experience. An especially big thank you to RL for the many weekends he allowed me to spend at the cabin in solitude and write and study. To my Foxz friends who helped me to forget school when my mind was so overwhelmed I wanted to quit. To Grace, the best friend I could have asked for during this period in my life. And, of course to Lisa, a tremendous thank you for

being the best PBF anyone could ever ask for after these many years. The Lord does work in mysterious ways.

I also have to thank Diane Campbell, one of the most extraordinary supervisors I could have asked for during three and one-half years of this process. I needed her great sense of humor and wisdom to help me balance the many new tasks I had to learn and the patience I had to find.

I also must thank the many mentors, both teachers and supervisors, who pushed me to be a better student of life. I am even grateful to Ms. Richardson's red pen.

And finally, to my parents who have moved me so many times they need to open their own moving company. I promise, one day I am going to make the chicken house Sandy-free. Without you, I would not be what I am today. I love you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Women face problems in society such as low wage employment, inferior employment status, unequal occupational skills, and an indirect devaluation of skills associated with female jobs. Even with a dramatic increase of women into the labor force during the twentieth century, gender equality in the workforce has not been achieved and women are concentrated in low-paying, traditionally female occupations such as clerical and retail sales (Bartholomew & Schnorr, 1994; Sandercock & Forsyth, 1992). Specifically, over 55% of women are employed in "pink-collar" occupations such as clerical, service and teaching jobs, while women only account for 5.7% of workers in nontraditional employment fields, including trades and crafts (Negrey, 2001).

The fact that women continue to be clustered in areas of employment with subordinate status and lower financial rewards is a concern that can be addressed by educational program planning professionals. Therefore, gender should be an important focus in program planning practice. By determining the content and form of the program, the program planner shapes the learner's interpretation of the educational experience. This is particularly true when the learners, such as welfare recipients who are predominately women, are part of a disadvantaged population. The focus of program planning practice becomes critical when the goal is self-sufficient, long-term employment opportunities for welfare recipients.

Individuals bring their own ideas of needed educational program content to the process of program planning. How women program planners work for inclusion of women's learning into the educational or training context through the negotiation of power, interests, and politics will impact the outcome of the program. The needs and social structure of women in the workplace,

as well as in the learning environment, must be taken into account when the training participants are primarily women. This is a particularly critical focus when planning employment-training programs for welfare recipients who represent one of our most economically disadvantaged populations. This chapter gives a brief overview of how welfare legislation, combined with individual ideas of what constitutes practical education and training efforts for the welfare population, addresses the role of these individuals in American society. It also outlines the purpose and rational of this study.

The Welfare System

Welfare was not created with the idea of helping individuals to find jobs and become self-supporting but rather to help single mothers care for their children. A substantial revision of ideas of what welfare should and should not be over the past decades has resulted in a shift that focuses on employment. The crux of this change is that welfare recipients must participate in education or training programs to gain the skills necessary to find jobs or risk losing their benefits. An awareness of workplace inequalities is integral to the goal of Welfare to Work educational and training program planning if the programs are to provide opportunities that enable welfare recipients to achieve and maintain meaningful and self-supporting employment. Work-directed mandates have been the focus of welfare reform for the past thirty years and have played a critical role in the success and failure of reform efforts. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) was created in 1935 for the purpose of helping a group of single mothers, primarily widows, stay out of the labor force to care for their children. The goal of AFDC at the time was to reduce child poverty. The public accepted the possibility that these single mothers might be long-term welfare recipients (Gueron, 1995). Many developments have changed the initial premises of welfare since 1935, such as the influx of women into the workforce, the

attitude of the American people that parents should work and support their children, and the debate that public assistance perpetuates poverty. These ideas have shifted support for the original idea of welfare resulting in work programs being included in the receipt of cash benefits. They have also affected a change from AFDC being an entitlement program to being a reciprocal obligation where, to receive full income support, individuals either work or participate in some work-directed activity (Abramovitz, 1995; Gueron, 1995).

The Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 eliminated the status of welfare and created block grants called Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), which replaced AFDC (Abramovitz, 1995; Kellner, Haddad, & Forcier, 2001). Unlike AFDC, in TANF spending is capped and states receive a lump sum of funds rather than open-ended entitlement funds (Abramovitz, 1995; Kellner, Haddad, & Forcier, 2001). Some of the major provisions of the Personal Responsibility Act include: lifetime limits of welfare to five years (although states were given the choice to impose lifetime limits from two to five years); a requirement that the head of every family find work within two years or the family loses benefits; and, the requirement that at least half of all single parents on welfare in any state work or be in work-related activities by 2002 or the state will lose some of its federal block grant (Abramovitz, 1995; Tang & Smith-Brandon, 2001). Overall, the main emphasis of the act is to de-emphasize long-term education and emphasize short-term job-readiness training that leads to immediate employment (Abramovitz, 1995; Gueron, 1995), and thus the discontinuance of public cash assistance.

Women in the Welfare System

Since PRWORA was passed, fewer of the hard-to-employ welfare population have been able to access meaningful job training (Abramovitz, 1997; Goldberg, 2002; Negrey, 2000).

Additionally, subtle biases that limit women's ability to achieve positions of greater status and financial reward exist in employment case management services that seek to assist participants in finding jobs. For example, in an October (2002) article about welfare in the *New York Times*, the participants discussed as being "successfully employed" were all located in traditional female occupations such as clerical and childcare. Although reports show that the emphasis of short-term job readiness training programs have "reduced the welfare rolls from 4.4 million people in 1996 to about 2.7 million today,…it has too often lead welfare recipients into short-term jobs, with little chance for advancement" (Hardi, 2000, p. 1). A careful look at the job placements of welfare recipients into the workforce shows a "stark mismatch between many welfare recipients' skills and the skills required to get, and successfully perform in, the 'good' jobs the new economy is creating—jobs that lead to self-sufficiency" (Carnevale & Desrochers, 1999, p. 1). For example, "[w]omen entering nontraditional employment typically earn 20 – 30% more than those in female-dominated occupations, including the female-dominated service industry in which most former welfare recipients are concentrated" (Negrey, 2001, p. 4). Careful attention then must be paid to matching the skills welfare recipients receive in training programs to those needed in the workforce and getting them into higher paying jobs.

At the broadest level, the average employment skills of women in the welfare population are significantly lower than the skills of women in the general population (Carnevale & Desrochers, 1999; Fremstad, Goldberg, Guyer, Johnson, Lazere, Schott, Super, & Sweeney, 2000). There is a contradiction between present economic trends that indicate education and training levels of workers should be raised, and current public assistance policies that have greatly reduced access to education and training for hundreds of thousands of women who are entering the workforce (Kates, 1999). This is compounded by the fact that 95-percent of those

receiving public assistance are women (Kates, 1999). Without the education or training necessary to raise the skill levels of these individuals, they will continue to work in low-paying, dead-end jobs without benefit of advancement opportunities. This leads many to debate the issue that the system of public assistance perpetuates poverty. For example, research shows that gendered roles are learned through such sources as the family, society, the media, and the educational system that in turn socializes women to perpetuate the patriarchal structures and ideology of their pasts (Hayes, 2000). This results in women remaining in jobs that continue to keep them firmly entrenched in gendered employment roles. Gendered education, therefore, must address the individual learning needs of students and take into account the social and cultural beliefs and practices that program planners bring into the classroom in order to realize advantageous employment placements for welfare recipients.

<div align="center">Gendered Learning</div>

Gendered learning is defined by Hayes and Flannery (2000), as placing women's experiences in a context where they live that includes "prevailing interactive and dynamic social structures (economic, political, social, and cultural) as well as institutions that influence women's learning and their participation in educational activities" (p. xiii). This includes one's interpretation of the values and conventions that guide our lives and defines how we view the world and learning. For instance, men and women are socialized with different attitudes toward accomplishment and relationships and therefore will seek different prospects and expectations in employment. These gendered expectations in turn perpetuate a separateness that is reproduced in presentations of knowledge that include men and exclude women in the classroom. Consequently, if gender is not viewed as an expression of power and used in the planning

process to incorporate women's learning into the educational experience the outcomes of the training or education can be affected.

Many welfare recipients have received some type of employment skills training, but have continued to cycle back through the welfare system even after completion of the educational experience (Sweeney, et al., 2000). Therefore, a much closer look must be made at how work programs can be designed to be more effective in assisting welfare recipients in achieving sustained employment and financial independence as well as assist in examining other factors that contribute to this problem. In Sheared's (1998) study that looked at race, gender, and welfare reform, she discovered that adult educators should seek out and examine knowledge about the women they serve and that programs should reflect an understanding of the women they serve. Assuming educational program planning is concerned with negotiating interests as a social activity then, the needs and social structure of women in the workplace, as well as in the learning environment, must be taken into account when the training participants are primarily women. This leads one to consider where the accountability lies in providing training programs to welfare recipients that achieve the result of long-term employment that leads to self-sufficiency without the need of cash assistance. Do program planners have a social obligation or responsibility to provide results-oriented Welfare to Work programs to the population they serve? To answer this question one must consider the role of program planning theory in welfare reform.

<div align="center">Program Planning in Welfare Reform</div>

Educators have introduced many theories of educational program planning. Cervero and Wilson (1994) characterize program planning as a social activity in which individuals negotiate political, personal, and organizational interests. What planners do and how planners execute

their practice is the critical aspect of the program planning process. Therefore, in educational

program planning, the individual who determines the form and content of the program must be

aware that his or her ability to negotiate power shapes the construction of the program. Because

welfare recipients are predominately women, it is important that program planners recognize the

existence and causes of gender inequality, understand the specific needs of women that stem

from this inequality, and determine whether they have a professional commitment to advocating

changes in the current system of educational program planning for predominately female

populations (MacGregor, 1994).

To resolve what is required to best serve the education and training needs of the welfare

population, it must first be determined what constitutes a quality program that meets the needs of

the participants as well as society as a whole. Only by studying how planning for programs is

conducted can this be accomplished. Women's experiences in the classroom cannot be separated

from their experiences in society and so program planners should recognize and seek to change

educational settings that replicate biased structures. Programs and program content are not

neutral presentations of knowledge but rather are expressions and reflections of what the

program planners feel is legitimate learning. Thus, an approach to providing equal educational

outcomes for women is not to address how learners might integrate themselves into a traditional

system of education, but rather to address how program planners can use power, politics, and

promote interests to change inequities in the learning environment.

Program planners do not act alone, hence "planning practice [is] a social process in which

many different people with varying needs, wants, and interests meet at the planning table to

negotiate whose needs and interests the program will address" (Cervero & Wilson, 1996, p. 21).

Cervero and Wilson (1996) take the ethical stance "that all people who are affected by the

program should be involved in the real choices of constructing the program, not just called upon as information sources or used to justify already-made decisions" (p. 22). The program planner cannot view herself as a detached professional providing only technical expertise, but must instead view herself as a change agent who can make a substantial impact on the planning process. The program planner is both part of the planning collaborative and a stakeholder in the planning process and therefore is responsible for negotiating for the best interests of the learner. When planning programs for women, then, it is the responsibility of the program planner to allow the participants to have ownership of the programs by giving them a voice in the planning process. "There is a sense of empowerment and ownership when the women do the talking for themselves" (Scott & Schmitt-Boshnick, 1996, p. 75). Program planners, then, can work within the normal constraints of the planning process while attempting to further the interests of those directly and indirectly affected by the program.

<div align="center">Author's Perspective</div>

My interest in educational program planning originated when I began working for the Georgia Department of Family and Children Services, a social services agency, in the late 1980's. Raised as a sheltered member of a middle class family, this employment quickly introduced me to the concepts of privilege, poverty, power, and politics evidenced in assorted ways in multiple layers of bureaucracy. One of my primary job duties was contracting for training programs that provided welfare recipients with job skills. Another was working closely with private vendors, as well as state and local agencies, to determine job training needs and feasible ways of administering employment skills training to welfare recipients. During this period, I observed how various individuals negotiated within their own work environment, the

participant's environment, the systems of local, state, and federal government, and with me, the contractor.

I observed programs that were beneficial for the participants that also achieved the goal of the State—transforming a receiver of tax monies into a payer of tax monies—as well as programs that did not meet the goal of long-term employment and self-sufficiency for the participants. I believe that program planners who were passionate about their jobs used negotiation tactics to provide meaningful programs that took participant concerns into account which in turn allowed, to the extent possible within the existing system, for a limited number of successful and long-term employment placements for the participants. Based on my personal observations and experiences during this period, I feel that several factors contributed to the success of the programs, one being the female gender of the program planner. I believe that how women program planners use power, negotiate politics, and promote interests in the program planning process has a significant impact on the process of educational program planning and therefore an impact on the program participants themselves.

Problem Statement

Cervero and Wilson (1994) characterize program planning as a social activity conducted within a complex set of personal, organizational, and social relationships of power. When learners, such as welfare recipients who are predominately female, are part of a disadvantaged population, the educational program planner will shape the form and content of the program. One factor that may affect the planning process is the gender of the program planner. Individuals negotiate power, politics, and interests in specific ways when planning for educational programs. In addition, because individuals bring their own ideas of needed educational program content to the process, how women program planners negotiate for

inclusion of women's learning into the educational or training context through the use of power, interests, and politics should be considered.

Instructors or planners of educational programs may inadvertently consider male and female students differently, and therefore it must be recognized that women's experiences and continuity with the past must be incorporated into the design process to allow for identity formation and conceptions of developmental maturity (Chodorow, 1974; Douvan & Adelson, 1966; McClelland, 1975; Tanton, 1994). Hence, it should be considered that training for a predominately-female population be structured so that women are able to maximize the differences they bring to the learning environment. Specifically, programs could be designed to place women's learning in contexts that include such elements as their past and present social positions, culture, diversity, and past experiences in educational settings. How incentives for behaviors that promote independence and self-sufficiency are incorporated into the program content is critical to raising the standard of living for welfare recipients and their families.

<div align="center">Statement of Purpose</div>

The purpose of this study was to determine how women program planners design programs for predominately women learners in Welfare to Work programs.

<div align="center">Research Questions</div>

The research questions addressed by this study were:

1) How does a woman program planner's gender-based understanding impact power relations within the organizational process of program planning?

2) How do women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with emphasis on the power and politics of the process?

Significance of the Study

Women comprise the majority of individuals in the United States who are single heads of households, live in poverty, and are welfare recipients. Although little attention has been given to women's learning in the literature of adult education prior to the past decade, wherein more research has been conducted than ever before, they also comprise the majority of individuals enrolled in formal adult educational activities. An understanding of women's diversity is critical to the outcomes of education and training programs and therefore social equality. Additionally, the manner in which the gender of the program planner affects the planning process may contribute to further understanding and value of educational opportunities. Individuals bring varied experiences to the learning environment that characterize their knowledge and determine both their instructional and learning styles. Therefore, studying how women program planners create adult education and training programs will aid in the future development of programs that address women's concerns and provide a research base for addressing inequities in the learning environments of welfare training programs.

Various studies have been conducted using the Cervero and Wilson (1994) model of program planning (for example, Archie-Booker, 1996; Carter, 1995; Hendricks, 1996 & 2001; MacLean, 1996 & 1997; Scott & Schmitt-Boshnick, 1996). None of the studies, however, have specifically addressed women in the role of program planner as this one does. Cervero and Wilson first presented their viewpoint of program planning theory in 1990 and have since written numerous publications on the topic. In addition to article publications, book chapters, and conference presentations their work has culminated in three books, *Planning Responsibly for Adult Education: A Guide to Negotiating Power and Interests* (1994), *Power in Practice: Adult Education and the Struggle for Knowledge* (2001), and *Working the Planning Table:*

Negotiating Democratically for Adult, Continuing, and Workplace Education. Cervero and Wilson's program planning framework represents a shift in theorizing about program planning and it is my hope that this study addressing women in the role of program planner will add to the literature base and assist in clarifying the use of power, politics, and negotiation in the planning process. Additionally, it is anticipated that this study will provide research for scholars to use in determining how women use power, negotiate politics, and promote interests in specific ways when making program-planning decisions. It is thought that the findings of this study can be disseminated to those in the field for use to inform their practice and provide adult educational programs that not only move recipients from Welfare to Work, but that also are effective in assisting these individuals to achieve sustained employment and financial independence.

<center>Definition of Terms</center>

For this study, the following definitions will be used:

1. Gender. Defined by Collard and Stalker (1991, p.72) as a sociocultural interpretation of, and norms and values attached to, sexual differences that guide how we live our lives based on gender definitions that are arbitrarily tied to sexual differences.

2. Gendered/Women's Learning. Defined by Hayes and Flannery (2000), as placing women's experiences in a context where they live that includes "prevailing interactive and dynamic social structures (economic, political, social, and cultural) as well as institutions that influence women's learning and their participation in educational activities" (p. xiii).

3. Interests. Defined by Cervero and Wilson (1994. p. 29) as motivations and purposes that lead people to act in certain social ways when they must decide what to do or say.

4. Negotiation. Defined by Cervero and Wilson (1994. p. 29) as the bargaining between individuals to reach agreement with others while haggling with specific interests and power to construct a program. It is the "central form of action planners undertake in constructing programs."

5. Politics. The use of organizational savvy and diplomatic skills that a planner must recognize and use within a particular setting to get things done.

6. Power. Defined by Cervero and Wilson (1994. p. 29) as defining what individuals are able to do in any particular situation based on the social relationships in which they participate.

7. Program Planner. Defined by Cervero and Wilson (1996), as one of "a broad array of people who are involved in deliberating about the purposes, content, audience, and format of educational programs" (p. 6).

8. Program Planning. Characterized by Cervero and Wilson (1994) as a social activity in which individuals negotiate political, personal, and organizational interests.

9. Stakeholder. Any individual who has an interest in the outcome of an instructional training program.

10. Training/Educational Program. These terms are used interchangeably and refer to short-term programs designed to provide welfare recipients with the skills necessary to achieve and maintain long-term, self-sustaining employment.

11. Welfare recipient/participant/client/student. These terms are used interchangeably and refer to individuals who receive public financial assistance in the form of welfare benefits and may be involved in Welfare to Work training programs.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This literature review is divided into three sections. The first section covers Welfare to

Work and the impact of education, economic trends, and collaboration on reform efforts. The

second section provides a history of program planning theory with a specific look at Cervero and

Wilson's (1994) theory of program planning. The third and final section includes a view of

women through a liberal feminist lens and addresses women's multiple roles in society. It also

includes an examination of the construction of programs for women. These topics provide a

perspective for viewing how welfare legislation, combined with individual ideas of what

constitutes practical education and training efforts for the welfare population, addresses the role

of economically disadvantaged women in American society.

Welfare to Work

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA),

passed in August 1996, ushered in the most significant welfare reform in six decades. Partly

because the law's enactment coincided with a rapid expansion of the economy, many welfare

recipients quickly moved off welfare and into employment (Sweeney, et al., 2000). PRWORA,

which emphasizes work requirements, is nothing new to welfare legislation. Work directed

mandates have been the focus of welfare reform for more than thirty years and have played a

critical role in both the success and failure of reform efforts. As mentioned previously, Aid to

Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) was created in 1935 for the purpose of helping a

group of single mothers stay out of the labor force and care for their children. Its goal was to

reduce child poverty. Due to issues such as the influx of women into the workforce, the mind-set

of United States citizens that parents should work and support their children, and the idea of

some that public assistance perpetuates poverty, support for the original idea of welfare has changed. This has resulted in work programs being included in the receipt of cash benefits and a public outcry that AFDC change from an entitlement program to a reciprocal obligation where, to receive full income support, individuals either work or participate in some work-directed activity (Sweeney, 2000; Gueron, 1995).

Since 1967 there have been several revisions to the law to compel the participation of welfare recipients in activities designed to assist them in securing unsubsidized employment, mainly through pursuits such as job skills training, education, job search, and unpaid work experience in the public sector. Under the Work Incentive Program (WIN) during the 1980s, the emphasis was on getting women with school-age children to look for work. Research conducted through agencies such as the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities for example, has shown that the resulting relatively low-cost job search programs, such as WIN, were cost effective but that many individuals remained on welfare and those who went to work got low-paying jobs (Gueron, 1995). In part, because of the disappointment of the WIN program, the Family Support Act of 1988 and the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program was established that mandated welfare recipients with younger children be provided a variety of employment related services that would lead to employment and decrease long-term dependency on the welfare system of cash assistance.

The JOBS program was a mixed bag of success and failure as the states had little knowledge of how to implement a successful work program due to ill-defined goals, a lack of resources, and the implementation of the program during a recession (Gueron, 1995). Further, the JOBS program actually perpetuated marginalization within American society because it failed to adequately address independence and did not pragmatically address factors such as

childcare, transportation, education, and an inadequate supply of job opportunities (Sheared, 1998). Unlike past practices, the JOBS program gave the states ownership of the outcomes and encouraged collaboration between social service agencies, education, the labor departments, and other allied agencies. Based on this need to shift priorities, as well as very real barriers to successful implementation of the program, a different strategy was called for where goals were uniform and an appropriate and proportionate balance could be achieved between human capital investment and employment. Additionally, it was recognized that work programs had to be innovative and beneficial while being cost effective and fiscally responsible.

PRWORA was passed in 1996 and includes a work program component. This eliminated the entitlement status of welfare and created block grants called Temporary Assistance for Needy Children (TANF) (Kellner, Haddad, & Forcier, 2001). The main emphasis of PRWORA is to de-emphasize long-term education and emphasize short-term job readiness training that leads to immediate employment. There is an unfinished agenda of welfare reform, however, and it is reflected in three realities. The first is that many families remaining on welfare have unmet needs such as problems of substance abuse, physical or mental health problems, incidences of domestic abuse, and learning disabilities. The second reality is that due to sanction polices for individuals who do not participate in employment related activities, many families are left with neither public assistance benefits nor employment. The third reality is that parents who do leave the welfare rolls for work earn too little to support their families and this is due to limited job skills and educational levels (Goldberg, 2002; Gueron, 1995; & Sweeney, et al., 2000). This third reality has accounted for an average monthly disposable income for the poorest fifth of all single-parent families of only $580—a decline of 6.7 percent since 1997 (Sweeney, et al., 2000). It seems clear then that without opportunities for education and training, these individuals will

find it difficult to move up the economic ladder and move their families out of poverty.

Interestingly enough, because caseloads have declined and less emphasis is placed on education,

many states now have a surplus of funds that can be used to support new initiatives or to expand

programs that have shown positive benefits. Currently these funds are being held in reserve for

future economic turndowns and to provide assistance in maintaining benefits for those deemed

unable to work for various reasons (Sweeney et al., 2000).

Table 1: Selected Overview of Welfare Legislation

Year	Legislation	Overview
1935	Social Security Act—Creation of Aid to Dependent Children (ADC)	• Provided financial assistance to children who lacked support or care because of the absence, incapacity, or, under certain conditions, unemployment of a parent
1962	Social Security Act—Renamed ADC to Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	• Goals included strengthening family life and self-support. • Began as a program to enable single mothers to remain at home
1967	Amendment to the Social Security Act—Creation of the Work Incentive Program (WIN)	• AFDC policy became more punitive by reintroducing behavioral standards as a condition of aid • Participation in a work program became a condition of aid • Emphasis was on getting women with school-aged children to look for work
1988	Family Support Act—Creation of the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program (JOBS)	• Legitimated the use of government funds to leverage behavioral change and paved the way for a second round of welfare reform focused on the marital, childbearing, and parenting behavior of poor women • Transformed AFDC from a program to help single mothers stay home with their children into a mandatory work program

Year	Legislation	Overview
1988	(Continued) Family Support Act—Creation of the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program (JOBS)	• Required mothers to go to work or school or to enter a job-training program in exchange for benefits, employment, education, and social services
1996	Personal Responsibly and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA)	• Eliminated the entitlement status of welfare (AFDC) and created block grants called Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) • Emphasis was on short-term job-readiness that leads to immediate employment • Major previsions: ○ Lifetime limit on welfare of five years ○ Requirement that the head of every family find work within two years or the family loses benefits ○ Required that half of all single parents return to work or be in a work related activity

Note. From Temporary assistance for needy families, by M. Abramovitz, 1997, *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed., 1997 supplement), pp. 311 - 327. Copyright 1997 by NASW Press. Also from Aid to families with dependent children, by M. Abramovitz, 1995, *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed.) pp. 183 – 192. Copyright 1995 by NASW Press.

Welfare, Education, and Training

There is an economic and workforce development system in the midst of the welfare reform issue, as well as an educational system, that is being called upon to share the responsibility of Welfare to Work participant training and the influx of these individuals into the workforce once they complete training.

During the 19th and 20th centuries, a complex system of education…developed in this country. Over a considerably shorter period—since the early 1960s—a different system of workforce development has begun to emerge, including various programs intended to

prepare individuals for the labor force. The programs include vocational education,

short-term job training, adult education, specific programs for certain populations (like

welfare recipients and dislocated workers), state-funded training for specific employers,

and the training employers provide themselves—creating a complex and ill defined

system, often charged with overlap, duplication, waste, and sheer confusion" (Grubb,

Badway, Bell, Chi, King, Herr, Prince, Kazis, Hicks, & Taylor, 1999, p. iii).

Workforce development programs are intended to provide individuals with the skills and

competencies necessary to achieve employment. Unlike traditional education programs,

workforce development or training programs "…are usually unconcerned with political, moral,

and intellectual purposes" (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 2).

"Manpower," or workforce development programs, were established in the early 1960s

by the federal government to combat unemployment and poverty. "Establishing a pattern that

has contributed ever since to the complexity of the system, the early manpower programs viewed

schools and community colleges as inadequate for providing short, job-specific training for

individuals who had not done well in their formal schooling" (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 2). Given

this view, it was deemed necessary to provide the programs outside the educational systems,

generally by community-based organizations on a local level. Due to such issues as political

practices, the view of colleges as vendors—not partners, the unwillingness of colleges to share

the risks of reform efforts, and public education funding remaining outside of states' workforce

development funding, a division remains between education and training. This division between

training and education causes a serious problem for both education and training—namely, that

each has strengths and weaknesses from which the other could learn. One thing that might be

done to strengthen training programs is to create more substantial programs to meet the needs of populations that did not do well in the traditional educational system.

> [S]hort-term job training programs usually generate very small benefits for their participants, in the range of $200 to $500 per year; and even these paltry benefits tend to vanish after four or five years, so any benefits are temporary. The reasons for these discouraging results include the low intensity of these programs (since most last only 10 to 15 weeks), the provision of a limited range of services to individuals with multiple barriers to employment, the poor quality of training, and the inattention to teaching issues—for populations who have often failed to learn basic academic skills in ten to twelve years of schooling (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 111).

Education's primary purpose is to provide preparation prior to entrance into the labor market. Workforce development or training, however, includes four primary types of job preparation, some of which overlap with those of education, which further complicates the issue of boundaries and service delivery (Grubb et al., 1999; Harrison & Weiss, 1998). The four areas of workforce development include: (a) pre-employment education and training that is designed to prepare individuals for entry into employment, (b) training that is intended to assist individuals advance in their current employment, (c) retraining that serves dislocated workers or those who seek new careers, and (d) remedial training that

> provides education and training for individuals who are in some way at the margins of or out of the mainstream labor force—typically those who have been unemployed for long periods of time, those who are underemployed and in poverty despite employment, and welfare recipients (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 5).

This variety and purposes of programs is hard to comprehend and therefore difficult to access in meaningful ways without full knowledge of what is available where, when, and for whom. The following sections discuss the need for integration between education and training programs as well as alternatives to traditional job readiness programs as possible solutions to participant access.

Integration Between Education and Training Programs

One solution to the problem of inaccessibility might well be integration between existing education programs and training programs that relies on the best practices of each. "More and more education and training reformers agree on the motivational power of active learning that emphasizes an individual's own experiences and provides opportunities for students to discover, create, explore, and find meaning through self-directed efforts" (Kazis & Kopp, 1997, p. 6). Like most federal programs, the early "Manpower" programs have evolved based on the needs of society and most recently, the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) that was signed into law in late 1998. However, because other

> [W]orkforce development programs have developed in largely unplanned and
> uncoordinated ways, the boundaries of the system are unclear. In addition, there is
> substantial overlap between workforce development and education, particularly in
> community colleges, technical institutes, and area vocational schools that participate in
> both. Indeed, boundary issues—what's in and what's out of workforce development—
> are very much at stake, particularly in considering local and state governing mechanisms
> (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 5).

What this means for the hard-to-employ welfare population is that since PRWORA was passed, fewer recipients have been able to access meaningful job training based on the wording

of the legislation (Kates, 1999; Negrey, 2000). While reports show that the emphasis of short-term job readiness training programs have "reduced the welfare rolls from 4.4 million people in 1996 to about 2.7 million today,…it has too often lead welfare recipients into short-term jobs, with little chance for advancement" (Hardi, 2000, p. 1). It is understandable then, that "[a] recent Urban Institute study found that three in 10 parents nationally who have left welfare return within two years" (Sweeney, et al., 2000, p. 15). As a specific example, in my current employment at a local technical college, I continue to encounter students who were once clients receiving welfare and were part of my employment services caseload over ten years ago. This leads me to believe that the training these individuals received years before is either not adequate for today's job market or that the training itself was not sufficient to ensure meaningful employment at the time it was received.

Job Readiness

During 1999, the Educational Testing Service (a student-testing company that also conducts the National Adult Literacy Survey for the Education Department and Congress) grouped welfare recipients into three categories determined by their readiness to work based on studies began prior to enactment of the 1996 legislation. Their research showed that "[a] third had "advanced" skills equivalent to those of the upper 50 percent of high-school graduates; a third had "basic" skills similar to those of the rest; and a third had "minimal" skills equivalent to those of high-school dropouts" (Hardi, 2000, p. 2). With such a diverse group of learners it is difficult to determine what can be done to meet the needs of this population when welfare legislation severely restricts access to long-term education and training and research shows that the bottom third of this population is at least two years away from being able to compete in even the most supportive learning and work environments (Hardi, 2000). "There is remarkably little

research—and no consensus—on effective strategies for improving job opportunities for disadvantaged adults or youth" (Kazis & Kopp, 1997, p. 6). That solving this problem will take considerable research as well as practical application of best practices from both education and training is indisputable. It is hoped that continued research and integration of best practices from all disciplines will make a difference in the quality of opportunities offered to disadvantaged populations.

Further complicating the matter is a contradiction between present economic trends that indicate education and training levels of workers should be raised and current public assistance policies that have greatly reduced access to education and training for hundreds of thousands of women who are entering the workforce (Kates, 1999; Negrey, 2001). Both of Hudson Institute's landmark studies, *Workforce 2000* and *Workforce 2020* (Judy & D'Amico, 1997), emphatically endorse and emphasize that all new workforce entrants—including women and minorities—need to be better skilled. Ninety-five percent of those who receive public assistance are women (Kates, 1999), and without the education and/or training necessary to raise the skill levels of these individuals, they will continue to work in low-paying, dead-end jobs without benefit of advancement opportunities. Comprehensive studies on welfare conducted by various agencies have shown, however, that the likelihood of making it off welfare depends as much on punctuality and attitude (generally referred to as life skills training in welfare training programs) as on education levels or technical skills. Further, only four-percent of individuals on welfare have four or more years of work experience (Shapiro & Murray, 1997) through which these skills can be developed. "Work is a powerful motivator and catalyst for learning and effort when provided in a supportive, learning-rich context. Work experience and academic rigor must be combined if work based learning is to be of maximum benefit to [participants]" (Kazis & Kopp,

1997, p. 6). Without prior work experience or various training that enables these individuals to earn a living wage, or a combination of both, this population cannot be expected to become self-sufficient through employment alone.

Remedial training seems an obvious solution, especially as many job training and Welfare to Work training programs provide remedial education either before specific skills training or as a part of job training.

> But, remedial education within the world of job training is incredibly haphazard: many programs use the worst kinds of computer-based programs, very few pay any attention to the pedagogy of basic skills instruction or to the training of instructors, and even the most careful of these efforts show no results. The effects are not any better in adult education programs, on the average, which also tend to be too short, to have extremely high dropout rates, and to pay little attention to appropriate teaching methods (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 112).

If remedial education or adult education alone does not work, what may be needed is a ladder of connecting programs that link remedial education with job skills training in such a way that a variety of teaching methods is used to keep learners motivated and keep them from becoming discouraged. As long as these programs stay disjointed and do not attempt integration there is little chance of information sharing and improvement of practice.

Coordination and Collaboration

Segregation of programs is especially detrimental for welfare recipients. "Work First," the battle cry of welfare reform, has only been partially successful in building the skills of this population to the degree necessary to allow them to achieve a living wage without the benefit of public cash assistance. Due to federal time limits on training options available to welfare

recipients, there is a conflict of goals between developing human capital, providing benefits to taxpayer's in the form of reduced welfare rolls, and educating a workforce that has an opportunity for future advancement in the labor market (Grubb et al., 1999; Negrey, 2001; & Sweeny et. al., 2002).

> Welfare recipients who have some of the lowest academic and occupational skills and the least work experience are offered the least intensive services and sent off into the low-skilled, low-wage labor market. A recent Economic Policy Institute study has estimated that the implication of federal time limits on welfare may lead to a 10 – 12% decline in real wages, due for the most part to large numbers of poorly prepared, low-skilled women being forced into the labor market (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 84 - 85).

Collaboration between programs is needed to raise the effectiveness of training and to build the skills of welfare recipients affected by Welfare to Work legislation. Without collaboration, the systems that are designed to help these individuals will only continue to harm them by serving their needs in disadvantageous ways. Some examples of this include the continuation of referrals into traditional female occupations and sustained difficulty in accessing programs and resources that best meet the needs of recipients.

It must be determined how this population can be best served, with welfare dollars competing with those of education and economic or workforce development. The goal is to provide customized job skills rather than mainstreaming recipients into a population of learners who have very different needs. This is a difficult issue to tackle. One reason is that just when states had become serious about making changes in their workforce development systems, federal legislation (1996) was passed that called for the most massive restructuring of the welfare system since the 1930s. A second reason is that more than 13 million jobs were created in the

United States between 1990 and 1997 (Grubb et al., 1999), most in the low-paid service sector. Based on these circumstances there seemed little need to focus attention on this population's ability to secure employment when the mindset of legislators was that anyone who wanted a job could find one.

Coordination of Service Delivery

PRWORA challenged states to coordinate efforts with other similar and complimentary agencies providing comparable programs. Viewing this matter in its broadest terms we can look at how the delivery of services is coordinated between federal, state, and local agencies. North Carolina began looking at their training and education programs in 1992 and discovered that "the state spent $800 million on 49 different education and training programs administered by eight separate agencies, and that no one agency [had] authority over or information about all of these programs" (Grubb et al., 1999, pp. 4 – 5). North Carolina is not a unique case. "Arizona counted 26 major state and federal programs, under four federal and at least six state agencies, with both the number and funding of programs increasing substantially" (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 5). This confusion of numerous programs administered by multiple agencies is not limited to the states. On the federal level, "[t]he U.S. General Accounting Office (1994) identified more than 150 employment and training programs administered by 14 federal agencies" (Kazis & Kopp, 1997, p. 6). Due to incompatible and sometimes contradictory eligibility requirements, as well as multiple operating cycles, it is virtually impossible for local service providers to integrate resources and coordinate planning. "In any city in the country, there are dozens, even hundreds, of private and not-for-profit vendors providing all manner of training services on contract to businesses, either directly or through a federal or state-subsidized program" (Harrison & Weiss,

1998, p. 28). This massive number of programs with numerous administrative agencies means overlap and duplication of services, especially between education and training.

With such an array of programs and funding sources, it is no wonder that those who attempt to access these programs find the system cumbersome and confusing. Further, with such a huge number of existing programs, as well as the creation of new programs to meet both funded and unfunded federal mandates, the use of public funds often results in duplication and turf-guarding by those who administer the programs. In addition to duplication of services and the subsequent wasting of public funds, "policymakers are understandably disconcerted when they see several programs providing similar job training, or when adult education, community colleges, and job training programs all provide remedial education in different forms" (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 6). Another concern is the inability of individuals to access multiple programs in one place. When individuals need an array of programs and these programs are attempting to adhere to both federal and state legislative directives, it makes access and coordination nearly impossible for many. A final concern is a lack of competition between programs to provide quality services as well as consistent accountability measures between programs. In other words, when similar programs are not held to the same performance standards, there is inconsistency of purpose and therefore inconsistency of outcomes.

Inconsistencies

Based on legislation that puts the majority of responsibility for administering education and training programs on the states, it is critical that a coherent and easily accessible system be structured through active participation at all levels of state and local governments. Some examples of inconsistencies between state and local governments of service delivery are: (a) states continue to: proliferate traditional categorical programs despite a commitment to

coordination and consolidation which further divides funding; create new political entities; and confuse those who wish to access programs as well as employers who attempt to hire those being served by the programs; (b) the creation of new programs, even the creation of one-stop centers that attempt to consolidate services and referral methods, which mean new programs in new locations with new layers of bureaucracy; (c) the inability of states to determine the composition of state-level coordinating agencies; (d) continued turf battles and competition between programs who want to be the lead agencies rather than part of the principal system; (e) the inability of some states to impose a uniform policy on different programs receiving federal funding and the development of interagency agreements to allocate funds to local programs; (f) the evolution of volunteer efforts to develop and coordinate with established practices; and (g) the inability to coordinate between welfare-to-work mandates and workforce development systems (Grubb et al., 1999). These inconsistencies illustrate only a few of the challenges that states and local governments must address in order to adequately serve the individuals they were designed to help. It will, however, take time and a great deal of coordination and information sharing to overcome the disjointed policy management of these programs that have taken years to tangle.

Advisory Boards

One way that states have been addressing the problem of service delivery coordination with local community interests is through advisory boards. This has only worked to a limited degree as independent programs continue to maintain separate advisory boards with little overlap of members from one board to another. This means that multiple programs with the same goals compete for the same funding sources within the same communities. In addition, individuals who comprise boards continue to protect their own interests, jobs, and the political and financial interests of their specific programs. This inability to coordinate interests has resulted in the

continued existence of multiple sub-state regions with inconsistent boundaries that, while making

coordination difficult for all concerned, particularly adversely affects many rural area programs.

There are so many self interests at the planning table, comprised of different groups of

individuals competing for the same funding sources, members of advisory boards are pushing

agendas that may potentially drive programs in different directions that conflict with the goals

and missions of similar programs. An example of this overlap can been seen where basic

literacy skills are being taught through DFCS, local technical schools, public education, and

religious organizations all within the same community.

Restructuring

Another factor affecting coordination of service delivery between state and local

government is the restructuring of job duties to meet federal laws dictating coordination efforts.

Examples of restructuring include the states' move from simply monitoring programs to the role

of providing technical assistance, development and dissemination of information in a timely

fashion to meet and/or beat federal mandates, the move toward a market driven program of

employment services, and staff development to make restructuring flow in a smooth and

coordinated fashion. These systemic problems are not surprising considering that many of these

programs have been in place since the 1960s and little, if anything, has changed in the way of

program administration. "They are all rooted in the underlying problem; thirty years of

proliferating education and training programs have created programs with different clients,

different purposes, and inconsistent forms of administration" (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 51).

Because thirty years of bureaucracy cannot be undone quickly and without political turmoil,

patience and stability is crucial to these needed reform efforts.

Policy

There is an uncertainty at all levels about the correct interpretation of policy in the middle of restructuring and attempted coordination. There are instances when policy is drafted and expected to be implemented before it even reaches those who must execute and monitor the policy. Although different state, regional, and local officials are determining what is allowable under legislative guidelines, they are making pronouncements on particular regulations that many times are inconsistent with one another.

> Unlike entitlement programs like [Unemployment Insurance] and Social Security, which
>
> have developed a system of administrative laws and judges to interpret them, there is no
>
> record with the force of law to rely on. Instead, there are a series of [Department of
>
> Labor] "clarifying" documents, without the force of law or regulation, that seem to be
>
> used randomly and inconsistently (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 52).

Some examples of these inconsistencies include different poverty levels for program eligibility, overlap of support services, governing eligibility, reporting periods and requirements, planning procedures, and contract periods and boundaries of contracting areas. Although it is clear that these inconsistencies cause substantial barriers to coordination and consolidation of service delivery it is unlikely that the federal government will be able to streamline regulations based on the many levels of bureaucracy and different political agendas that are continually shifting to accommodate the next election or political appointment.

Coordination with Employers

Based on recent studies of interactions between local and state governments, it seems that the structure of local and state efforts is moving in the direction of greater coordination (Grubb et al., 1999). That this coordination is moving slowly, fitfully, and with complaints on

both sides still does not detract from the fact that state and local governments are moving in the right direction. One driving force behind this effort seems to be the recognition that employers must play a central role in welfare reform efforts. More and more it is recognized that if employers do not sit on coordinating boards and are not allowed to offer input into employment training efforts (therefore buying into the idea of welfare reform) there will be no jobs for participants regardless of the training they receive. Some possible employer roles include: (a) policymaking and governance to help define and shape workforce polices; (b) identification of training occupations and industries to serve as the basis of participant training programs; (c) the identification of "soft" skills such as problem solving, integrity and responsibility, work ethic, and basic thinking skills; (d) curriculum development to meet the individual needs of the specific employment setting; (e) setting skill or performance standards based on labor market expectations; (f) employer based training such as on-the-job-training or cooperative education; and (g) consumers of training participants (Grubb et al., 1999). Employer involvement is crucial to the success of both training and employment opportunities for participants and is relatively easy to secure when employers perceive there are direct benefits from the relationship.

Employers want to hire employees who are dependable and will be around long enough so that dollars spent to train individuals to fulfill the needs of the organization will be realized in productivity. Considering that almost half the jobs in the marketplace today did not exist ten years ago, it is clear that job training and job retraining is critical to employers and employees alike (Grassley, 2001: Judy & D'Amico, 1997). Employers are constantly defining the skills they require from their workforce so as to meet the needs of their companies. Consequently, there must be collaboration between those who need the commodity of labor, and have defined the required minimum skills of those they hire, and those who want to provide human capital.

Summary

If there is to be more than a band-aid cure to the problem of poverty, collaboration at all levels of government and in the community is necessary to fulfill the mission of meaningful and self-supporting employment for welfare-to-work individuals. However,

> [p]ublic debate has been hampered by the lack of convincing research on effective practices and on impacts. At the same time, more field-based research on what makes some programs succeed and others not is also critically important. We need to learn more about design and implementation challenges of work preparation strategies that demand higher standards, deeper relations with other economic and social institutions and systems, and an emphasis on both work preparation and [individual] development (Kazis & Kopp, 1997, p. 73).

This need for research of public policy, and how it affects those the programs should serve, has never been more important than now as legislatures and the public alike demand an overhaul of our education and training systems as they relate to the training, and eventual employment, of this disadvantaged population. Further, how training programs are planned that these systems will provide is critical to the success of welfare families as they transition from welfare to work.

Program Planning

According to Sork's (2000) overview of program planning theory outlined in the *Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education*, the origins of adult education planning theory in North America can be traced to the work of Ralph Tyler and Malcolm Knowles whose earliest works on program planning theory were published in 1949 and 1950 respectively. Much of the earliest work, and some recent work, views program planners as problem solvers who apply a prescriptive set of steps to the process of planning. In recent years other researchers have begun

to view program planning as a social process in which societal issues can be addressed and systems changed to make the world a better place to live. One issue is the training and education of welfare recipients who are directed to participate in employment related activities. This section discusses the evolution of program planning theory and offers discussion of how program planning can be used to benefit humankind.

The Classical Viewpoint

Tyler's (1949) theory of program planning, mainly intended for elementary and secondary education, outlined in *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* is founded on four basic questions that focus on purpose, content, method, and evaluation. Tyler's viewpoint of program planning, commonly known as the classical viewpoint, is a prescriptive set of steps by which curriculum and programs can be planned. Tyler's classical viewpoint, however, does not take into account factors such as the learner's involvement in the planning process nor does it acknowledge "…the dimensions and variability of planning contexts, the nature of practical judgments, or the values that influence how judgments are made" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 17).

Knowles's (1950) book, *Informal Adult Education*, was one of the first efforts that attempted to separate the learning needs of adults from those of children. Knowles postulated that the needs, interests, and experiences of the learners should be considered and given high priority when attempting to formulate learning programs for adults (Cervero & Wilson, 1994; Sork, 2000). Between 1950 and 1970 only a handful of books on program planning were produced, most of which focused on either training in business and industry (for example, Bass and Waughan, 1966; Lynton and Pareek, 1967; Rose, 1964; Warren, 1969) or general adult education (for example, Bergevin, Morris and Smith, 1963; Berner and Booth, 1964; Shaw,

1969). A notable exception to this pattern was *Social Action and Interaction in Program Planning* (Beal, Blount, Powers, and Johnson, 1966), which was unique because of its sociological orientation and focus on agricultural extension programs related to rural life. Although it did not raise critical questions about existing social structures, it did foreground social and political aspects of planning that had largely been ignored by other authors (Sork, 2000).

Knowles expounded upon and amended his views of adult education from his earlier works in *The Modern Practice of Adult Education* (1970). At that time, Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) introduced the idea that planning is not a neutral activity but rather one that should take politics and participant empowerment into account in order to change the social structure by helping individuals understand, and therefore challenge, the constraints of oppression. For example, Freire felt that learners should have a voice in what and how they learn and not simply be given information to "bank" in their minds based on what others felt they should learn. In this way, individuals could become aware of what they needed and wanted in order to change their worlds for the better. Walker (1971) expand on the idea of program planning as a social activity by suggesting that planners must consider the individual circumstances of each planning situation and work within those parameters to the best of his/her ability. For example, Walker believed that planners must choose the most defensible alternative among choices when faced with such issues as a lack of financial resources or unrealistic time constraints.

The Naturalistic Viewpoint

Walker (1971) attempted to shift the focus of program planning from one of ideal principles for use in practice to one where actual planning situations were considered. Known as

the naturalistic viewpoint, this theory focuses on three primary elements that include platform, design, and deliberation. The naturalistic viewpoint begins with a bottom up approach that includes all decisions and choices made in designing the program, and culminates in the actual design process. The naturalist viewpoint considers that planners are constrained by specific circumstances of their organizational structure and that these constraints are often imprecise and vague. It also considers that the constraints will not be uniform in any planning process and therefore the constraints and inconsistencies will not provide a proven theory or guide for future planning. The naturalistic viewpoint is primarily descriptive and allows for considerable deliberation, trial and error. For example, often times planners have incomplete information, limited time, limited financial resources, a shortage of staff, and may lack the specific skills needed to thoroughly implement each component of the process. Because each planning situation is not identical to any other, planners must become aware of how to make sound judgments in specific situations and become astute in justifying those decisions.

The platform portion of the process is the most critical in the naturalistic viewpoint as this is the basis on which all of the program planning process will reside. Just as the name implies, the platform is the base and support of all decisions and choices made in designing the program. The platform will include the designer's values, beliefs, and judgments of what the program should encompass and how the process will be carried out. In the platform stage of planning the planner will make decisions based on past experience, literature, and any other tools at hand that can be utilized to defend and justify the planner's decisions. The premise of the naturalist viewpoint is that there are no right answers or right ways of planning. There is, however, a best way based on deliberation of actual data and the constraints imposed on the situation.

After the platform has been established and data gathered, the next step in the naturalistic planning process is deliberation. In this stage, the planner will formulate decisions, establish objectives, develop alternative choices, consider arguments for and against the choices and decisions, and choose the most defensible arguments. This is an information gathering stage where relevant facts and data are considered and decisions and possible consequences of the decisions will be evaluated. The program planner will determine what the criteria of the program is to be and attempt to formulate an action plan based on previous efforts and alternatives. Above all else, this is the time the program planner will evaluate and deliberate the constraints and determine the role of the specific contexts and perspectives that he/she brings into the process.

After deliberating and considering the policies and precedents established by the organization, the program planner will begin the design phase of the process. This stage is the ends to the means and is the culmination of all other considerations that have gone into the planning process. The design process will include both explicit and implicit designs. Explicit designs will be implemented after thought and consideration of the alternatives. Implicit designs will be implemented without any consideration and will be adopted automatically. How both explicit and implicit designs are employed will be decided based on the issues that define the planner's interests and concerns. The underlying rationale is that these decisions must be consistent with the program's platform and be made through justification of collected data and past precedent. For example, if the platform of the program begins with the mission of designing programs that incorporate women's learning, program decisions must include a consideration of the female gender of the learner.

The Critical Viewpoint

Another viewpoint of program planning is the critical viewpoint (Forester 1989). It suggests that program planners are not only problem solvers but also individuals who structure learning experiences that affect all classes, races, and genders. The critical viewpoint attempts to make the program planner aware of these different categories of individuals and to plan programs that enable all to learn and participate in an equal environment. This is not a value neutral theory as it must be recognized that some learners have power and some do not. It further stipulates that these differences in our social and economic status must be taken into account when planning learning experiences. The critical viewpoint dictates that the program planner, "anticipate and reshape relations of power and powerlessness" (Forester, 1989, p. 7) and access and challenge the structures that could hinder effective planning and learning. The critical viewpoint also directs that planners cannot treat all learners equally or the learners then end up not having the same, or equal, opportunities as other learners.

The critical viewpoint requires that program planners not only have the practical skills needed for program planning, but also that they have the political skills to create a more equal and unoppressive learning environment. The program planner must have a clearly defined set of moral and ethical standards that are adhered to and must use a value system to implement programs. In some instances this means that program planners must manipulate the information they have so that a more just program can be implemented. This may mean, for example, that planners share sensitive information with those who could use it for socially beneficial purposes. In other instances program planners must manipulate the system so that imposed structural constraints can lead to positive action. This may mean intentionally interpreting a policy in different ways in different situations. The critical viewpoint also directs the program planner to

seek opportunities and use these opportunities to create a more equal learning environment.

Above all, the program planner must acknowledge that power relationships structure the

planning process and therefore actively seek to improve the systems in which they work.

During the 1980s there was little new work recognized as significant contributions to

program planning theory besides Forester's (1989) *Planning in the Face of Power*, although

numerous books were published during this period (for example, Boone, 1885; Boyle, 1981;

Caffarella, 1988; Green, Lreuter, Deeds, and Partridge, 1980; Knowles, 1980; Nadler, 1982).

None of these authors addressed both general and specific audiences but rather continued to base

program planning theory on a technical-rational tradition (Sork, 2000). Likewise, the early

1990s was considerably void of significant work with the exception of Cervero and Wilson's

(1994) book, *Planning Responsibility for Adult Education: A Guide to Negotiating Power and

Interests*, which made a revolutionary shift from a focus of program planning driven by

technique to a focus of program planning driven by negotiation.

The Cervero and Wilson Framework

Using the classical, naturalistic, and critical viewpoints as guides to develop a theory of

program planning that both made sense of the empirical realities that planners face, and

accounted for the way educational programs are actually constructed, Cervero and Wilson (1994)

developed a model that defines program planning as a social activity in which people negotiate

personal and organizational interests. Their theory of program planning proposes that,

> planning is always conducted within a complex set of personal, organizational, and social
>
> relationships of power among people who may have similar, different, or conflicting sets
>
> of interests regarding the program. The planners' responsibility, and the central problem

of their practice, center on how to negotiate the interests of those people to construct a

program (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 4).

What planners do and how planners execute their practice is the critical aspect of the program

planning process. Program planning is more than a technical or rational set of steps and

procedures an individual goes through to plan, design, and/or implement programs. Power,

politics, and individual interests impact what and how decisions are made. The Cervero and

Wilson model recognizes these factors are a part of the process and must be considered,

acknowledged, anticipated, and managed. The program planner must first take into account the

social relations among people working in institutional settings and grant that there are multiple

interests at work in any program planning process. Planning, therefore, must be viewed as a

social activity in which people negotiate with each other in determining a programs'

configuration, function, content, audience, and design (Cervero & Wilson, 1994).

According to Cervero and Wilson (1994), there is much at "stake in attempting to

understand not only how planner's practices shape educational programs but also what planners

can do to recognize problems and seize opportunities" (p. 3). The programs planned and

developed by adult educators impact the abilities of those they plan programs for and therefore

influence how the adult educator's influence over the world is viewed and changed to make it a

better place for all individuals. "The planners construct educational programs from the

judgments they make [and] the struggles that occur in everyday practice are part of the terrain in

which educational opportunities for adults are provided" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 4). Adult

education is not a neutral activity. Therefore, the manner in which program planners negotiate

power, interests and politics that structure their practice, and decisions they make impact the type

of world their practice will help to shape. "[P]lanning must be seen as a social activity in which

educators negotiate personal and organizational interests. In this view, planners could

significantly improve the quality of education by learning how to anticipate and deal with such

interests" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 6).

Power in Practice

Cervero and Wilson expound upon their views of program planning as a socially

responsible activity in their book *Power in Practice: Adult Education and the Struggle for*

Knowledge and Power in Society (2001). Specifically, the authors call the attention of the reader

to the fact that the struggle for knowledge and power is fundamental to adult education practice

and therefore to the way in which programs are planned. To be socially responsible, adult

educators and planners of adult education programs must "replace the innocent images of adult

educators as facilitators, process experts, mentors, andragogues, and individual empowerers with

the politically astute and ethically charged image of adult educators as knowledge and power

brokers" (Cervero & Wilson, 2001, p. 271). Further, because adult education always benefits

some more than others, adult educators must actively use adult education to transform relations

of power and the access to knowledge to those who are marginalized and otherwise would not

have opportunities for learning. To do this, adult educators and planners of adult education

programs must understand who benefits, determine based on their own principles who should

benefit, and use this knowledge to distribute learning to those who have previously been denied

access to education. Politics are always embedded in our actions and this calls for a strategic

response to the redistribution of educational access that lies in the specific analysis of the

situation before us and how we choose to act to change who benefits in a given situation

(Cervero & Wilson, 2001). This could be as simple as sharing information to others of how and

where to access needed resources who otherwise would not benefit from such services.

Working the Planning Table

The most recent work by Cevero and Wilson is their book *Working the Planning Table:*

Negotiating Democratically for Adult, Continuing, and Workplace Education (2006). In this

volume, the authors have further developed their approach to planning from their 1994 work and

amassed a variety of material that can be used in everyday program planning practice. The key

questions that drive this (2006) work are: who benefits most from educational programs, why

should they benefit, and what kind of difference should the programs make? In order to answer

these questions, Cervero and Wilson use a social, political, and ethical lens to connect the

technical and political decisions that people make at the planning table (2006). "This book offers

a theory that accounts for planners' lived experience and provides a guide for their practical

action in developing educational programs" (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, p. vii).

Cevero and Wilson provide the "planning table" metaphor as the centerpiece of their

program planning theory and feature this difference in *Working the Planning Table*.   They also

show a connectedness of the theory to everyday practice and application through the use of lived

experiences based on observations in the field.   The planning table metaphor draws attention to

the fundamental idea that people make judgments with others in social and organizational

contexts and these venues determine the specific features of a program's content (Cevero &

Wilson, 2006).   Cevero and Wilson also illustrate the timing of when planning decisions are

made influences the features of the programs essence and affects the social and political

character of educational planning. Lastly, Cevero and Wilson discuss the ethical dimensions of

planning using the planning table metaphor.   These dynamics are linked to provide a definition

of program planning "as a social activity in which people negotiate with and among interests at

planning tables structured by socially organized relations of power" (Cevero & Wilson, p. 85, 2006).

Empirical Studies

Cervero and Wilson first presented their viewpoint of program planning theory in 1990 and have since amassed numerous publications on the topic. In addition to article publications, book chapters, and conference presentations their work has culminated in two books, *Planning Responsibly for Adult Education: A Guide to Negotiating Power and Interests* (1994) and *Power in Practice: Adult Education and the Struggle for Knowledge* (2001). Several book reviews have been completed of *Planning Responsibly for Adult Education: A Guide to Negotiating Power and Interests* (Hogan, 1997; Sork, 1996; Holt, Milton, & Matson, 1995; Mazinanian, 1995), with favorable critique. In addition to book reviews, other publications using the framework have been printed in the form of book chapters and journal articles by other authors. There are also a number of unpublished dissertations available that employ the Cervero and Wilson framework of program planning. There are not, however, any studies using the Cervero and Wilson framework which specifically address women in the role of program planners.

Several studies have addressed women in the role of primary learner in the program planning process. A recent publication, in conjunction with co-authors Cervero and Langone, Archie-Booker (1999) addresses program planning practice in "The politics of planning culturally relevant AIDS prevention education for African-American women." Archie-Booker's research found that in community-based AIDS education programs African-American women were not defined as specific learners but rather were treated as generic entities. That these organization's image and financing did not include a focus on African-American women showed

undifferentiated educational programs being offered—thus not addressing the needs of women learners. Her research shows a trend that appears to be common in many learning environments.

Sork (1996), in a critique of Cervero and Wilson, states that their framework provides a new lens for viewing and understanding program planning. Sork elaborates by adding that Cervero and Wilson "would have us discard the technical-rational lens through which we have viewed planning for nearly five decades and replace it with a lens that bring into focus the social dynamics, or "people work", of planning" (1996, p. 81). Clearly, this view is needed to allow for addressing the needs of a multitude of diverse and multifaceted learners. While Sork asks to be viewed as a friendly critic, he does address several issues of concern. For example, he asks the reader to consider that while program planning is negotiation, one must be aware of the danger of only seeing planning in this light. Sork (1996) cautions that "we may miss events and decisions that are not strictly tied to negotiations but that have an important impact on the program" (p. 83). Overall, however, Sork's review suggests that Cervero and Wilson's program planning framework represents a turning point in theorizing about program planning. And, while much work remains to be done to extend their analysis and to understand its implications, current works provide "ample evidence that the optics they [supply] reveal new and exciting features of the terrain of program planning" (Sork, 1996, p. 89). It is this author's hope that this study addressing women in the role of program planner will add to this literature base and assist in clarifying the use of power, politics, and negotiation in the planning process.

Women

Men and women are different and one only has to observe the interactions of males and females in any setting to see this for themselves. "[F]eminist research—for instance, the works of Gilligan (1982), Jordan and others (1991), and Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule

(1986)—suggests that there may be a difference in the ways that women and men know and learn" (Loughlin & Mott, 1992, p. 79). Women are taught from an early age they should act and behave in specific ways. For example, women are expected to be nurturing and keep the "home fires burning" while men are taught to be the protectors and providers of the home. These expectations begin in infancy and continue into and through adulthood. So much of a child's learning occurs in school and oftentimes gender expectations are reproduced in the learning environment and follow women into adulthood. "As gendered persons, we learn who we are as girls and women; we learn how to act, how to interact with others, how we are valued because of our gender, and what place and power we have as women in various groups of societies" (Hayes & Flannery, 2000, p. 4). To break the cycle of gendered expectations based on societal norms, those involved in the education and training of women must be aware of gender biases. They should attempt to involve and engage students by allowing them to develop and express a wide range of behaviors that will help them to define themselves and allow for identity formation so they can make sense of their place in the world. Specifically, women's learning should be placed in a context "where women live—namely, the prevailing interactive and dynamic social structures (economic, political, social, and cultural) and institutions that influence women's learning and their participation in educational activities" (Hayes & Flannery, 2000, p. xiii).

Research on the training and education of women shows a direct correlation between women's education and the status of women and seeks to reform school practices in the hope that the schools could be made a force for equality (Kelley & Nihlen, 1996). Lacking a mission that focuses on the learning needs of this population, however, the best interests of the learner will not be served. Because women's learning cannot be understood if the social contexts in which it takes place are not taken into account (Hayes, 2000), it must be recognized and understood that

more than subject matter must be addressed in the learning environment. Without the input of

gender specific learning practices into the curriculum, programs will continue to filter the

knowledge to students they deem best serves the mission of the program—not the needs of the

learner.

Confusing messages in any curriculum can cause conflict and uncertainty for the learner.

One basic role conflict common to many women, especially single mothers on the welfare rolls,

is that of nurturing parent concerned with meeting the needs of her children versus meeting her

own needs for economic, social, and educational fulfillment. This conflict is further intensified

when women place incomprehensible expectations on themselves based on social expectations.

An agenda that excludes the unique views and beliefs that women bring to a learning

environment restricts women's ability to have control and authority over their unique place in

society and therefore in the economic structure of employment. Welfare Reform efforts are

concentrated on empowering women to achieve and maintain self-supporting employment,

programs that do not attempt to change, or at the very least acknowledge, the stereotyping of

women's place in the world and do not allow for women's identity formation only perpetuate

traditional sex roles. It is imperative then that program planners for women's programs

understand, appreciate, and incorporate women's past and current experiences into the learning

environment so they can shape their own learning experiences to meet their own unique and

personal needs. Women building identity development is critical as a part of the learning

process.

Women through a Feminist Lens

Feminist theory recognizes that women face problems in society, such as limited access

to male dominated occupations and unequal pay for comparable employment, that cannot be

ignored and therefore gender should be an important focus in program planning practice. For example, a feminist analysis of the work structure will show that gender equality in the workforce has not been achieved and that women are concentrated in low-paying, traditionally female occupations such as clerical and retail sales (Bartholomew & Schnorr, 1994; Sandercock & Forsyth, 1992). Feminist theory, as it relates to the education and employment of women, should address and attempt to change the gender bias that pervades our educational systems through the curricula, instruction, and role models it provides. "As Hoyt (1988) observed: "Education is the primary means available for reducing bias, helping persons move out of poverty and preparing persons for employment (p. 37)" (Bartholomew & Schnorr, 1994, p. 2).

Although women's studies are somewhat in their infancy in the field of adult education, there have generally been two types of challenges from feminists. The first type of challenge is critical because its major concern is with questioning the present order of things, asking for more clear justification of existing practices, and suggesting that there are social, psychological, moral, and philosophical reasons for considering alternatives (Parsons, 1990). In this feminist critique of education, researchers are more concerned with understanding how women's personal and social interactions form their gender identity. The second challenge of feminist scholars is constructive. "In this area feminists are concerned to develop new practices, to think more open-mindedly and laterally about methods and resources, and to create new areas of inquiry which may redraw the map of traditional academic disciplines altogether" (Parsons, 1990, p. 49). Within the constructive challenge is the hope that practices can be realized that will allow more fulfillment of human potential. Liberal, radical, and Marxist or socialist feminism are three approaches that can be used to look at these challenges. For the purposes of this study, a liberal

feminist perspective will be used to look at the position of women in multiple roles of society as it is the mostly closely aligned with the perspective of this author.

Liberal Feminist Theory

Liberal feminism is based in the belief that the acceptance of women into the world of men in a nonsexist manner would allow not for a restructuring of society, but for an alteration in which equal opportunity would be available for all regardless of gender (Johnson, 1997; Lindsey, 1994). The objectives of liberal feminism include a "search for equality of treatment, of opportunity, and of status between men and women" (Parsons, 1990, p. 54). The ambition of the liberal feminist is not to change the social order where any one or another dominant group has most of the power and privilege, but to allow women to do the same things as men in all avenues of life that they so choose. "By working within a system which is seen as pluralistic with no single group dominating, women can organize and compete with other groups" (Lindsey, 1994). And,

> [b]ecause education is an event, and a responsibility, as well as a field of study, feminist education scholars have linked their analyses of domestic, political, aesthetic, and institutional cultures to strategies for change. This approach, sometimes characterized as liberal feminism, is based on an analysis of rights and access (Grumet & McCoy, 1997, p. 7).

Women who have no real disagreement with the system as it operates but see a need for a society that is non-sexist and allows for equal competition and equality embrace liberal feminist theory.

Liberal feminist theory holds that women must compete for jobs, money, and power (Brown, 1993; Friedan, 1974) in order to eradicate domination of women based on their gender. To be competitive, women must achieve the freedom to undertake whatever job appeals to them

and in which they have the desire and capabilities to pursue. Class and race distinctions are ignored in this model. What is important is that all women—not women from specific backgrounds, cultures, or races—are given equal opportunities to learn and grow in directions of their choosing. Proponents of liberal feminism argue that gender-neutral standards allow for equal opportunity between the sexes. In addition, liberal feminist theory is most useful for determining the rate of advancement for women because there is a starting point from which to measure changes. "Liberal feminism thrives in educational studies because it is situated in observable reality and points to actions that can be taken to provide access to educational resources. Instances of favoritism can be counted" (Grumet & McCoy, 1997, p. 8). For example, the presence of women in mathematics and science courses can be quantified and tracked over time. Further, attainment of education levels and corresponding pay structures for women and men can be compared. The concerns of liberal feminism provide a lens through which the daily politics, aspects of negotiation, and preservation of self-interests, as related to program planning, and identified by Cervero and Wilson (1994), can be viewed.

As noted earlier, there are three types of feminist approaches that can be used to look at the challenges of gender equality in education.

> What distinguishes the other feminist approaches from the liberal agenda is a dialectical understanding of identity, which recognizes that every identity is a partial and tentative expression of both maleness and femaleness and that maleness and femaleness themselves, are terms that depend on each other for their very existence. As a result, whereas liberal feminism tends to address change in public structures, other forms of feminism link that change to the social, cultural and psychological experiences in

everyday life that constitute actors' sense of their gendered identities and life possibilities

(Grumet & McCoy, 1997, pp. 9 - 10).

What this means for program planners who wish to address the needs of women in education and

training, especially program planners of Welfare to Work training programs, is that they must

design, execute, and implement programs that address all needs of the learner including life or

coping skills, basic educational and employment training, and gender and family issues while

planning the programs in a manner that will meet the requirements of the participant, economy,

society, and legislative mandates. Because liberal feminist theory is situated in observable

reality and points to actions that can be taken to provide access to educational resources, the

program planner must understand the specific needs of women which stem from this inequality

and determine whether she or he has a professional commitment to advocating changes in the

current system (MacGregor, 1994). This compels planners to assess how a planning situation is

socially and politically constructed and to determine how relationships of power can be exercised

to nurture substantively democratic and socially responsible planning (Cervero & Wilson, 1994,

2006).

Women as Program Planners

Feminist theory asserts that women—whether in the role of program planner or receiver

of training and education produced by the program planner—are marginalized at all levels in the

hierarchy of society. For example, women program planners continue to be a minority in

Canada even considering the profession has grown steadily since the early 1970s (Rahder &

O'Neill, 1998). Specifically, "in 1976, women comprised about 10% of planners in Canada,

increasing to [only] 19% in 1981" (Rahder & O'Neill, 1998, p. 2). Furthermore, compensation is

significantly higher for men than for women in the program planning profession. "In Ontario,

[Canada] the average salary of female planners is 16.6% lower than that of males" (Rahder & O'Neill, 1998, p. 3). This is close to wage differences reported in the United States which show that women program planners average 85% of what male planners earn (Rahder & O'Neill, 1998), and makes it apparent that gender discrimination is not limited to just social economic factors.

Educator and Teacher

The program planner may assume many roles. One may be that of educator and teacher. The dual role of educator and program planner is indistinguishable when the teacher has any input into the curriculum and program processes of the learning situation. A contradiction to this multiple role, however, is that "[m]ost individuals think of teaching as an apolitical, even neutral profession" (Kinsler, 1997, p. 13) while, according to Cervero and Wilson (1994), program planning is highly political and requires the negotiation of power, politics, and interests. Indeed, some scholars feel that because instructors may inadvertently treat male and female students differently, it must be recognized by program planners that women's experiences and continuity with the past must be incorporated into the design process to allow for identity formation and conceptions of developmental maturity (Chodorow, 1974; Douvan and Adelson, 1966; McClelland, 1975; Tanton, 1994). Therefore, the dual role of program planner and educator is one that can neither be divided nor ignored in the program planning process, particularly as related to the education of women. Nor, can the role of educator or teacher be seen as a neutral or apolitical activity. However, "[t]he history of public and professional awareness and efforts to influence the school and teacher preparation in these matters have been cyclic, characterized by periods of self-serving inattention, liberal quixotism, and disappointing regressions" (Kinsler, 1997, p. 14).

Education is always and unavoidably intertwined to what happens in every other aspect of an individual's life, so it is necessary for educators to understand that the institutions of one's public life impact one's private life and vice versa. Educators must recognize that there are cultural, historical, and experiential factors that influence the way women respond to the world and the knowledge systems that determine it.

> The project of feminist education is to enlarge our culture's concept of personhood for both males and females and to explore the ways that teaching and learning can be constructed so that schooling is a vehicle of that enlargement. Because schooling is as deeply drenched in cultural history as family life and gender expectation, feminist education requires a thorough critique of the sex/gender system and its presence in schooling, in the discourses of the academic disciplines, and in the institutions of family, work, religion, art, and government that are linked to the institution of the school (Grumet & McCoy, 1997, p. 1).

Therefore, feminism in education makes a commitment to equity and social action and by extension the female program planner assumes the same obligation.

In must be noted that if women program planners do not bring the attitudes, behaviors, experiences, and educational knowledge to the planning table that include women's perspectives they will not help to create a more equal society. Further, if program planners do not use this information to negotiate the politics, power, and interests of the organization, as well as the agendas of those involved in the planning process, meaningful programs will not be constructed that promote fairness in training and educational opportunities for Welfare to Work participants. There are multiple interests at work in any organization and therefore by extension in any program planning process. This means that program planners must have the ability to negotiate

for the context and content of the programs they feel will provide the most meaningful educational opportunities. How adult educators, and program planners in particular, view and interpret the world is the same view they will advance in their programs.

Administrator

In a second context, program planners may assume the role of administrator and simply oversee the planning process rather than assuming the dual role of planner and educator. This position also recognizes that program planners should be aware of the needs of women and therefore plan programs to meet the individual needs of the learners that in turn will change society for the better. To do this, the program planner must determine his or her agenda for change from the beginning. If the program planner is a woman one might assume this to be a given. However, "Greed (1991) cautions one to consider that having more women in the planning profession [or in planning education] doesn't necessarily make it better, particularly if the attitudes, behavior and professional subculture are the same as those of men" (Rahder & O'Neill, 1998, p. 3). While women should be aware of the role they play in the planning process, they must also be conscious of the role they play in society itself. Specifically, women program planners are part of the workforce and are therefore disadvantaged themselves. For example, women typically earn less than men even when they are employed in similar positions. "In 1999, full-time women wage and salary workers earned 76.5% of men's median weekly earnings. In other words, they earned 23.5% less than men" (http://www.dol.gov/dol/wb/public/wb_pubs/www.htm). And, although this wage gap is, in part, related to women's concentration in lower paying jobs, the same pay structures exist further up the hierarchy.

Dual Roles

It must be noted then, that women program planners bring multiple roles—those of planner, administrator, and teacher for example—and beliefs into the planning process. They must be aware that how they negotiate power, politics, and interests in the planning process directly impacts the individual stakeholders of the program. Liberal feminist theory recognizes that women face inequality in society and so programs must be planned that incorporate both critical and constructive challenges into the design process. Further, because all feminists seek to end women's oppression and subordination, a common goal can be embedded into the planning process. There is a social obligation by those involved in the planning process to provide training programs to welfare recipients that achieve long-term and meaningful employment that leads to self-sufficiency. Therefore, unless a lens of feminist theory is used to plan programs for this population, little if any meaningful change will occur for those who need it the most.

<div align="center">

From Welfare to the Workforce

</div>

Being aware of workplace inequalities is integral to the goal of Welfare to Work educational and training program planning if the programs are to provide opportunities that enable welfare recipients to achieve and maintain meaningful and self-supporting employment. However, "[a] recent Economic Policy Institute study has estimated that the implication of federal time limits on welfare may lead to a 10 – 12% decline in real wages, due for the most part to large number of poorly prepared, low-skilled women being forced into the labor market" (Grubb et al., 1999, p. 84). "One primary and often overlooked reason that welfare recipients earn such low wages is that they enter a labor market that is grossly segregated by sex" (Negrey, 2001, p. 3). Nontraditional job training programs might be viewed as a solution to this problem

as they would facilitate women's access to jobs and industries where they have previously been denied access. And, although the mid-1960's anti-discrimination laws and affirmative action programs were enacted to increase the number of women and minorities in nontraditional employment, many employers are

> unprepared to deal with the specific concerns of single parents who, unlike other workers, are restricted in their ability to stay behind after normal work hours or on weekends for education and training, because they have no one else to pick up children from child care, attend school meetings, prepare meals and supervise homework (Kates, 1999 p. 5).

Furthermore, based on a survey of case managers and vocational counselors who work with welfare recipients, "…job training and education referrals have tended to exhibit traditional patterns of gender discrimination" (Negrey, 2001, p. 6).

Feminists assert that the sexual division of labor helps cement poor women's inferior position in the economy (Sparks, 1999). What this means is that underemployment has direct negative impacts on women as heads of households as they are the poorest in the country. Because knowledge and language are viewed as integral components of a pervasive system of power and regulation (Mizen, 1998), the patterns of non-referral to nontraditional employment and training can only be viewed as a means of keeping women out of these occupations and training programs and therefore in a continued state of poverty, even when not subsidized by public assistance. A careful look at the job placements of welfare recipients into the workforce will show a "stark mismatch between many welfare recipients' skills and the skills required to get, and successfully perform in, the "good" jobs the new economy is creating – jobs that lead to self-sufficiency" (Carnevale & Desrochers, 1999, p. 1). "Women entering nontraditional employment typically earn 20 – 30% more than those in female-dominated occupations,

including the service industry in which most former welfare recipients are concentrated"
(Negrey, 2001, p 4). And, in addition to better wages, nontraditional employment allows women
to close the education gap with men of comparable education levels as they progress in
knowledge, tenure, and position on the job.

The placement of women welfare recipients into nontraditional jobs, however, is not an
infallible answer to the problem of self-sufficiency and long-term employment. Promoting job
stability and retention, as well as life skills training, are critical components of the training
process and therefore must be addressed. "More than 30% of former welfare recipients lose their
jobs within one year of employment, and dissatisfaction with working conditions is a major
factor in this high turnover" (Negrey, 2001, p. 4). Program planners must, therefore, design and
implement employment and training programs that are not only efficient and effective at
assisting welfare recipients to achieve and maintain long-term employment, but also meet the
needs and skill levels of the participants in such a way that financial independence and job
satisfaction can be obtained and retained by the individuals.

Program Planning and the Construction of Programs for Women

If program planning is concerned with negotiating interests as a social activity, then the
needs and social structure of women in the workplace, as well as in the learning environment,
must be taken into account when the training participants are women.

Because of different pressures and assessments of relative cost and benefits of
participation, male and female participants tend to differ in their response to particular
program designs. Programs should consider customizations to address the different life
situations, needs, attitudes, and goals of participating males and females (Kazis & Kopp,
1997, p. 7).

This means that program planners must be politically astute in order to negotiate for the best interests of the learners and must take into consideration the product of the programs. This is accomplished by anticipating personal and organizational interests and planning so that the result is one in which the outcomes change society for the better. Therefore, the program planner must create and focus on implementing training programs that create systematic change and impact the learner in positive, socially responsible ways. "The lack of women's heritage in knowledge, the importance of relationships, and ways of talking are well documented, and should be considered in the design and implementation of any course which women will be attending" (Tanton, 1994, p. 56). Furthermore, because instructors may inadvertently treat male and female students differently, it must be recognized by program planners that women's experiences and continuity with the past must be incorporated into the design process to allow for identity formation and conceptions of developmental maturity (Chodorow, 1974; Douvan and Adelson, 1966; McClelland, 1975; Tanton, 1994). For instance, participants in Welfare to Work training programs are predominately female. Therefore, training for this population must be structured so that women are able to maximize the differences, such as childcare concerns, they bring to the learning environment.

Defining the Stakeholders

Because program planners do not act alone, it must be noted that "planning practice [is] a social process in which many different people with varying needs, wants, and interests meet at the planning table to negotiate whose needs and interests the program will address" (Cervero & Wilson, 1996, p. 21). There are a minimum of three questions that the program planner must ask when determining whose interests will be represented in the planning process. They are: (a) which individuals will best represent the range of possible interests and offer what degree of

influence? (b) which representatives are the best possible choices given the specific circumstances of the particular situation? and (c) whether the representatives chosen to participate in the planning process are legitimate ones? (Cervero & Wilson, 1996) Both stakeholders within the organization and outside the organization have interests that are important in planning programs. "Government funders, in particular, have interests that reflect current priorities of program efficiency and standardization. Funders are the stakeholders with the greatest power" (Scott & Schmitt-Boshnick, 1996, p. 73). Because Welfare to Work training programs are government funded it cannot be ignored that legislators, and those with political interests, dominate the structure of these programs. The goal of program planners of Welfare to Work educational and training programs then, is to negotiate stakeholder interests so that they are able to provide successful and meaningful programs for this population.

Cervero and Wilson (1996) take the ethical stance "that all people who are affected by the program should be involved in the real choices of constructing the program, not just called upon as information sources or used to justify already-made decisions" (p. 22). Hence, the program planner cannot view herself as a detached professional providing only technical expertise, but must instead view herself as a change agent who can make a substantial impact on the planning process. The program planner is both part of the collaborative and a stakeholder in the planning process and therefore is responsible for negotiating for the best interests of the learner. When planning programs for women it is the responsibility of the program planner to allow the participants to have ownership of the programs by giving them a voice in the planning process. "There is a sense of empowerment and ownership when the women do the talking for themselves" (Scott & Schmitt-Boshnick, 1996, p. 75). Program planners must work within the normal constraints of the planning process while attempting to further the interests of those

directly and indirectly affected by the program. They must be willing to take a stance for what they believe in.

Defining the Power Structure

Sometimes, however, the program planner has relatively less power than those within the organizational context of whom she or he is working (Cervero & Wilson, 1996). "In a changing political climate, political resources and relationships change. Information is contested, withheld, manipulated, and distorted" (Scott & Schmitt-Boshnick, 1996, p. 77). The degree to which the program planner is able to negotiate power, politics, and interests in the context of program planning has a substantial impact on the ability of women to have their views integrated as a part of the curriculum.

> The seeds of curriculum transformation were planted in the late 1960s, when scholars and teachers in higher education began to respond to the growing recognition that coverage of women—their experiences, perspectives, and diversity—was almost completely absent from the traditional curriculum (Hedges, 1997, pp. 1 – 2).

This movement for a changed curriculum to include the views of women continued into the 1970s as the development of women's studies as a new area of scholarly inquiry was further developed. By the late 1980s the work of scholars in this area began to achieve more visibility. However, "[a]s women of color pointed out, much of the early scholarship on women either explicitly or implicitly addressed issues of concern primarily to white, middle-class women in the United States and Western Europe" (Hedges, 1997, p. 3). They further noted that it was essential to examine such issues as race and class biases to fully address the diversity of women. It was thought that by doing so a more complex focus on the diversity of women's race, class, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, social class, and other individualist characteristics could be

understood and used to develop programs to address the individual needs of women in the learning environment.

Incorporating Gendered Curriculum

Based on gendered curriculum studies it seems clear that program planners must acknowledge and incorporate gender inclusive curriculum into the programs they plan. It is equally important, however, that planning programs themselves integrate gender perspectives, such as how we learn as girls to act in certain situations, how we are valued because of our gender, and what place and power we have in various groups (Flannery & Hayes, 2000) into the educational and professional practices of planners. In this way program planners learn firsthand the importance of a curriculum designed to meet the needs of differing perspectives and experiences of individual students. A 1998 Canadian survey of women graduates of Environment Studies at York University (YU), majoring in program planning, revealed that the vast majority of planning programs (other than at YU) inadequately covered or entirely excluded gender issues from the curriculum (Rahder & O'Neill, 1998). However, when these same respondents were asked should gender issues be a consideration in the planning process over two-thirds thought that gender should be considered, at least sometimes. This implies that there are contradictory messages in what schools are sending to the graduates of their program planning disciplines and what is needed to plan effective programs that support social change.

Recommendations of the survey emphasize the need to change the content and process of education within planning courses. In terms of coursework, the most common suggestions made by respondents were to take practical, hands-on courses in planning, as well as courses that provide background either in relations of power or in one's area of specialization. In other words, women advocate taking courses that provide practical skills related to the politics of

planning and to creating social change. They also favor the inclusion of courses related to specialized planning knowledge and technical skills (Rahder & O'Neill, 1998). It is furthermore recognized that new ways of thinking, such as the idea that that women have limited power and decision-making skills, must be developed and implemented that illustrate manifestations of gender discrimination in both planning education and planning practice. Rather than using previously rationalist approaches, present practices will have to be more practical and relevant for addressing meaningful social change.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter has presented a selected review of how Welfare Reform, training and education, and women attempt to realize contradictory yet possibly parallel goals. That these relationships are confusing and often disjointed and frustrating for those involved is evident. As legislative mandates change and programs are slow to meet the needs of the stakeholders, society as a whole will continue to suffer. Both individuals and groups have much to lose but more to gain through collaboration and the sharing of best practices. It is my desire that this research will help to clarify and isolate the issues involved and hopefully provide some insight into how to address women's multiple roles in society through the program planning process.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine how women program planners design programs for predominately women learners in Welfare to Work programs. Establishing how the gender of the program planner affects the planning process contributes to further understanding and value of educational opportunities, especially when planning for the female learner. Specifically, studying how women program planners create adult education and training programs aids in the future development of programs that consider women's concerns and provide a research base for addressing inequities in the learning environments of welfare training programs. The following questions guided this research: 1) How does a woman program planner's gender-based understanding impact power relations within the organizational process of program planning? and 2) How do women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with emphasis on the power and politics of the process?

This chapter addresses how the study for this research project was conducted. Specifically, this chapter outlines why qualitative methods are appropriate for this particular study and what type of qualitative research methods will be utilized. Additionally, this chapter includes sections that: clarify the design of the study, provide profiles of the participants, explain how the data collection was undertaken, describe the methods that were utilized in the data analysis, address how validity and reliability of the data was achieved, and elucidates the researcher's biases and assumptions.

Design of the Study

Qualitative research is an all-inclusive term that refers to certain research strategies that share particular characteristics. For example, qualitative research is rich in its description of

people, places, and conversations; asks questions formulated to investigate topics in all their

complexity and in context; is concerned with understanding behavior from the subject's own

frame of reference; and, typically involves collection in the participant's own setting (Bogdan &

Biklen, 1998). Qualitative methods were employed for this study because they focus on

understanding behaviors and experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998) and are appropriate when

asking questions that explore educational environments where there has previously been little

research conducted (Merriam, 1998). Since this study examined the phenomena for

understanding the process women program planners utilize when determining the learning

environment for predominantly female students, descriptive research was ideally suited for this

qualitative study. Descriptive research, one of the most commonly used methodologies in the

study of adult education and training, seeks to systematically describe the facts and

characteristics of a given phenomenon, population, or area of interest (Merriam & Simpson,

2000). For this study, descriptive research was conducted through the use of interviews that

assisted me in understanding the meaning women give to the program planning process.

Qualitative research methods are suited for investigations in applied fields such as adult

education and training if the goal of the researcher is to improve practice (Merriam & Simpson,

2000). Qualitative research encompasses various research strategies, all of which are based on

the key philosophical assumption that reality is constructed through the interactions of

individuals with others in their lives. Because the researcher is the primary instrument of data

collection and interpretation in qualitative research, the understanding of these relationships was

my focus. The goal of the qualitative researcher is to understand the phenomenon from an inside

perspective rather than from any preconceived notions or visions the researcher brings to the

project. For the purpose of this project, data were collected from the participants in their work

settings that allowed me to gain understanding of the dynamics of the work environment in which the participants operated.

Qualitative methods consist of three general categories of data collection—interviews, observation, and documents—two of which were considered here. Qualitative methods permit the researcher to study selected issues in depth and detail because the data collection is not constrained by predetermined categories of analysis and therefore contributes to the depth and detail of the data (Patton, 1987). Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning individuals give to issues and how they make sense of their differences. Therefore, when considering the design for this project it was clear that using qualitative methods was the most useful way of understanding the meanings women give to the program planning process and for examining planner's beliefs and attitudes of program planning.

Specifically, using qualitative data collection methods allowed me to understand the interpretation women program planners give to their practice. Probing for these meanings from the individuals themselves allowed them to reflect upon their attitudes and beliefs and to interpret their own understanding of the perspectives and convictions that guide their practice. In this manner, I assisted the participants in defining an understanding of their actions and helped them to determine how they give different meanings to their use of negotiation. The data from the qualitative methods used in this study have been organized to allow for interpretation of meaning through content analysis evaluation, assuming that the reality of the program planning process can be understood and represent similar meaning to individuals in comparable contexts.

Sample Selection

A purposeful sampling strategy was used for this study so I could obtain the most meaningful understanding of how women program planners interpret the fundamental nature of

their practice. Purposeful sampling is the identification of sources that can provide the most

relevant and useful information and is the primary technique used to identify research

participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990). "A sample is a strategically

and systematically identified group of people or events that meets the criterion of

representativeness for a particular study" (Merriam & Simpson, 2000, p. 57). In determining the

sample to use, the participants were first identified as individuals that accurately represented the

population to be studied. They were also identified as cases I would learn the most from.

In order to employ purposeful sampling, I first determined the purpose and focus of the

study and then decided what and who to investigate and explore. Other factors also considered

were the types of data to be collected, the controls to be used, analytical approach, time issues,

validity and confidence of the findings, confidentiality, ethical issues, and resources. Further, I

considered how special concerns such as gender, race, culture, ethnicity, and other individual

characteristics of both researcher and respondent might affect or alter the study. Then, based on

the set of criteria for selecting participants, I determined how many participants would be needed

to help gain the understanding required for this study.

For this study, the purposeful sample consisted of eleven women program planners who

had an understanding of their own decision-making style in the process of program planning.

They understand such ideas as how they make decisions, what motivates them to make specific

decisions, the factors they include in weighing alternatives, and how they consider the impact of

their decisions on others. These individuals were selected based on their years of experience in

the profession of program planning and their verbalizing their understanding of their decision

making processes during the selection process. Choosing such a specific target group allowed me

to understand phenomenon about certain select individuals without the need to generalize all such individuals (Patton 1987).

When determining which specific individual planners to include in this study, I first eliminated planners from the Greater Atlanta area of Georgia. This is because the Greater Atlanta area is not represenative of the state as a whole due to its high population density and unique populace. For example, the number of persons living in poverty in the Atlanta area is over 24-percent while the rest of the state has a 13-percent poverty rate. (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/13/1304000.html. My next step in selecting participants for my purposeful sample was to determine geographical variation. I wanted to include women program planners who plan programs for individuals in both rural and urban areas so I chose two urban counties in the state and networked with DFCS workers to determine service providers utilized in those areas. County sizes ranged in populations from over 232,000 to less than 22,000 (http:quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/13/13051). By networking and using personal contacts I determined that the urban counties used an average of 15 to 20 service providers at any one time. Next, I networked and set-up interviews with providers in the small rural counties that allowed for easy accessibility around and between the two urban counties. The smaller, rural counties averaged utilizing around six service providers at any one time. In all, the State of Georiga uses hundreds of service providers for Welfare Reform training programs so random selection allowed me the ablitliy to interview planners in an indiscrimate manner. Not all providers contacted agreed to be interviewed due to such factors as time constraints and scheduling conflicts. However, by choosing individuals who live and work in varying locations of the state of Georgia other than the Greater Atlanta area, by randomly selecting providers in urban and

rural counties, and selecting participants by referral I feel I was able to achieve geographical variation as well as an impartial and represenative sample of participants.

Snowball Sampling

Snowball sampling, asking participants to identify other participants (Bodgan & Biklen, 1998; Delamont, 2002; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1987), was one method used for determining the purposeful sample. I began by contacting individuals who worked with the Georgia Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS) to obtain referrals to training vendors they made referrals to and considered to provide successful, beneficial programs.   I also contacted vendors I was personally acquainted with in the field, to determine their willingness to participate in this study and to obtain referrals to other vendors. I was thorough in recording how the sample was drawn and have detailed how my selection and recruitment of participants has affected the data I collected. Characteristics such as "[t]he age, class, gender, race, status, sexual orientation, housing conditions, and educational level of informants in a snowball sample is worth detailed attention and careful thought" (Delamont, 2002). Participants self-selected and were available at the time of the study.

Participants were fully informed of the purpose of the study and given a detailed account of what the study would entail so that they were able to make a decision to participate based on accurate and full disclose of the objective of the study. Participants signed an informed consent form (Appendixes A and B) that clearly states they could have withdrawen their participation at any time without penalty or bias. I took care to protect the particpant's privacy by labeling all materials with a pseudonym. All documents and notes were labled with identifiers only. Data from this study will be retained in a secure location for three years in my home office.

Primary Participants

In selecting the purposeful sample, I used several criteria to guide the sample selection based on the purpose of the research project—determining how women program planners negotiate power, politics, and interests in designing programs for predominately female learners in Welfare to Work programs. The primary participants, the progam planners, were not affiliated with any particular instutuiton but rather were independent contractors from various employers. Since the inception of welfare reform legislation, most training programs for welfare receipients has been conducted by both private for profit vendors as well as by government agencies through the use of a competitive bidding process. The State of Georgia uses a competive bidding process based on numerous criteria that allows for unbiased awarding of contracts based on uniformity of requirements. Many contracts are awarded at the State level assuming a constancy of needs state wide. The vendors to be used as research participants were identified through contacts with Georgia State Department of Family and Children Services as well as through vendors already known to me, the researcher.

Primary participants were choosen based on several selection criteria of their participation in planning programs for predominately female learners. I labored until I achieved data saturation. I tentatively scheduled nine primary interviews and then completed two more as I was introduced to additional participants by individuls I had already interviewed. I conducted interviews until I felt data saturation had been reached. Specifically, the eleven participants: (a) were women that had a minimum of two years experience as vendors for the State of Georgia producing training programs that provide job skills training to welfare recipients, and; (b) were developers and/or implementers of the programs. These particular criteria for participants were determined for several reasons. First, I felt that a mininum of two years of experience in planning

for welfare reform training programs was necessary for the program planner to understand her own decision making style in the process of program planning. Secondly, I felt that the participants should not simply be administrators who delegate the tasks of program planning, although administrative duties might be a part of their job. I felt that it was critical for the participant to be a part of the planning and development process for otherwise they have not actually been responsible for the decisions that define and shape the program. I made every attempt to achieve diversity in my sample in such areas as race, income level, and social/political affiliation. While it is acknowledged that such charateristics as race, income, or social/political affiliation define individuals, the focus of this project was to determine how women negotiate for the interests of stakeholders—not women with particular defining roles in society. Interviews were conducted until data saturation was achieved through a diverse sample selection.

While being middle class was not a criteria for participation in this study, it must be noted that the participants were women who might be perceived as being part of the middle class. We have seen that "the history of social movements for the emancipation of women and African-Americans, the interests, needs, experiences, and sensibilities of the middle class or capitalist members of the group have clashed with those of the working class members" (Zweig, 2000). And, because most women and minorities are in the working class, these women program planners share a basic interest with working class women such as those in welfare training programs. They all seek to end gender discrimination although the discrmination may have been experienced in different ways. Each primary participant is referred to in this study interchangeably as a primary participant or program planner.

Primary Participants

This section provides a general profile of the women program planner study participants.

The profiles of the program planners include demographic information, and participant

descriptions of themselves, my observations of their behavior, and commentary made by DFCS

administrators and case managers. The profiles also provide some information about the

programs they administer. The participants are presented in random order and are referred to by

a pseudonym: Sharon, Lisa, Mary, Patricia, Pam, Britt, Kim, Bobbie, Becky, Rebecca, and

Grace. The eleven women program planners agreed to participate in this study and were

interviewed between September and October 2003. Each program planner was asked to

complete a sociodemographic questionnaire and the information was used as an aid in compiling

the following information. The program planners as a group have an average of five years

experience in her current position, an average of ten years experience in working with adult

education programs, an average of thirteen years experience in working with low-income

individuals, and an average of twelve years experience working in the area of program planning.

All have earned an undergraduate degree and half have completed a master's degree. Six of the

program planners describe themselves as African-American and five describe themselves as

Caucasian. Over half of the program planners have been on welfare or else describe themselves

as having been poor. The average age of the program planners is age 41 to 51 and the average

salary range of the women is $31,000 - $51,000 per year.

Table 2 provides selected demographic data of the primary Providers.

Table 2: Program Planner Profiles

Planner	Age	Years working in/with				Race	Previously Poor or on Welfare
		Adult Education	**Current Job**	**Low income Individuals**	**Program Planning**		
Grace	41-50	18	3.5	11	11	African-American	Yes
Becky	50+	12	2	12	12	White	No
Sharon	41-50	3	3	15	7	African-American	Yes
Lisa	50+	3	3	13	3	White	Yes
Mary	41-50	8	8	13	13	African-American	Yes
Patricia	31-40	10	10	6	7	White	No
Pam	50+	35	4	35	35	African-American	No
Britt	41-50	2	2	10	24	African-American	No
Kim	50+	13	7	13	13	African-American	Yes
Bobbie	50+	15	8	8	15	African-American	No
Rebecca	41-50	3	1.5	18	3	White	Yes

Sharon. Sharon, an African-American job developer with the Georgia New Connections Program in an urban area, is a well-dressed, extremely intelligent professional. Sharon wore a well-crafted tailored suit and appeared to feel comfortable in both her clothing and surroundings. She spoke in a modulated tone and used precise language in her descriptions and explanations. Sharon states she has had to work for her positive "self worth." One would never guess this from her present appearance and attitude. Sharon grew up a "military brat" and was often the only "little black girl" in certain classes and generally felt either "ignored or ridiculed" until she went to college. While in college Sharon found to her surprise others thought she was "important" and she then began to research her history as an African-American. Once she realized the struggle her ancestors had to survive she began to feel she did have some worth and that feeling changed her life. She stated that it made her want to "go out and do more for her community and help her community". Sharon feels she has a "common bond" with the participants she works with.

Lisa. Lisa, who describes herself as Caucasian, is also a job developer with the Georgia New Connections Program. However, unlike Sharon, she is housed in a rural county where she

has lived all her life. Lisa feels a strong connection to the people, most of whom she knows.

Lisa has an open door policy for everyone from the mayor to the clients she works with and has a

"genuine passion" for what she is doing. Her attitude is very relaxed, yet she is extremely

articulate and dresses very professionally. She had many years of stories to relate that were both

successes and failures for "her" participants. At all times she was positive and had nothing

critical to say about an individual, the policies, or organizational type issues such as a lack of

program funding. Lisa stated that "just when you are stretched so thin you think you will have to

close the doors something happens to save the day". Lisa gave up part of her salary recently to

help keep the program going.

Mary. Mary, an African-American, is also a job developer with the Georgia New

Connections Program. She has worked in her present job for over ten years and stated she

believes participants have to commit to their goals if they want to make a true change. Zeralda's

philosophy for the participants is that she was not asking or expecting them to do something that

she doesn't need to do or has not done for herself. Mary was once on welfare and worked her

way through college as a single parent. Because of her past, Mary feels she has to "put her foot

down" and tell the participants it is up to them to make their desires come true. Mary self-

describes herself as a practical and realistic professional who speaks in a straight forward, no

nonsense manner. She believes her participants are worth taking a chance on but that you can

"go only so far" and that the participants have to "take advantage" of their opportunities

themselves.

Patricia. Patricia, a charismatic and expressive Caucasian, is part owner and instructor of

a school that assists participants to meet the requirements for Certified Nursing Assistance

(CNA) positions. She is very animated in both physical manner and expressions and her face

lights up when speaking of her family, the participants she worked with, and her life in general. Patricia has owned the business with her mother for ten years and finds her mother to be her biggest inspiration. Patricia observed her mother's work as a nurse during her childhood and discovered in herself a desire to show others the compassion and enthusiasm she learned from her mother. Patricia feels you have to nurture and support participants to succeed even if they "relapse" back into destructive ways. However, she stated you have to know when to "take them under your wing but also when to cut them no slack." She feels you have to have a "real love" for what you do in order to do it well and that "really caring" about others is the key to success when working with welfare recipients.

Pam. Pam is the only female vice-president in her corporation and oversees a division that trains, or rehabilitates, low functioning individuals to learn basic job skills. She is also the only African-American female to ever achieve managerial status in her organization. During the hours I spent with Pam, she was constantly in motion and talked relentlessly using exact language which gave no doubt that she does not waste time but rather "makes things happen" in a speedy manner. Pam feels everyone should have a plan, even for daily nuances such as headaches. Many of the participants Pam's company serves have either a mental or physical handicap but she feels no one has an excuse for not working. Pam works countless hours per week, attends numerous community forums, and is not directed to work with participants directly although she describes herself as a "hands on manager with my finger in every pie." During my on-site visit to her facility she was able to not only tell me each of the fifty-plus participant's names but able to also give me a brief history of each individual's circumstances. Pam stated that her workers sometimes tell her she runs a "boot camp" but feels that "tough love" is the real answer to her program's success. Pam is a very out-spoken woman who uses sarcasm, wit, and

straight talk to encourage participants to take advantage of what she describes as "their last chance" to make something good happen. Many of the participants Pam works with are drug addicts, alcoholics, and/or have been physically abused.

Britt. Britt, a Caucasian with a strong military bearing, manages an employment program sponsored by the Georgia Department of Labor. Britt was dressed in a somewhat masculine outfit of unembellished shirt, pants, belt, and sensible shoes that was clearly a holdover from the prudent habits she acquired while in the military. Her mannerisms are no-nonsense and quintessential military in style as she is very outspoken about her personal beliefs but respects there is an unwavering chain of command for decision making. Britt was active duty military for over fourteen years and brings many of the habits and philosophies from her military days to her job. She feels structure and organization are the greatest assets she can teach any participant. Britt stated she had two great talents in life and they are talking and spending money. She feels these talents serve her well in working with the community because she feels networking and getting to know "who is in the ballgame" is the main part of getting things done. Britt has a great deal of freedom to make independent decisions and uses this liberty to "lay it out on the table" for participants to make their own choices to succeed. While Britt admitted she felt compassion for her participants her main focus was on "community collaboration, professional credibility, and professional respect." Britt feels that if you "can't back up the talk" you can't ultimately complete the necessary task of getting women trained and employed in living wage jobs.

Kim. Kim, a job developer with the Georgia New Connections Program, is an elegantly dressed professional who feels the participants have more to do with the success of her program than she does. Kim has the ability to understand both sides of an issue and demonstrated this to

me by relating stories of her own personal hardships while on welfare. Kim, who describes

herself as an African-American, was forced to accept public assistance when her husband walked

out leaving her with five children to care for. With the help of food stamps and welfare, she

managed to work part-time while attending college to earn a degree in social work. Kim feels

that her background allows her to speak frankly to the participants in her program and "get down

on their level." She does not feel she has any control over the success or failure of the

participants. She feels it is "either in them to succeed or not." And, while Kim is very "client

oriented," she stated that "things are not black and white" and is able to realistically view the

limitations and abilities of both the participants and the program that serves them.

Bobbie. Bobbie is also a job developer with the Georgia New Connections Program and

a close friend of Kim although the two women appear to have very different personalities. She

describes herself as an African-American and consistently brought up issues of race and class

when referring to her work with participants in the New Connections Program. She is the only

program planner who had her office set-up so that she held a distinct place of power behind her

desk and a long distance from visitors who come to her office. While Bobbie has lived in the

same community most of her life, which is a rural community experiencing fast growth and

undergoing many changes, she attended a prestigious out of state university and feels her

experiences away from home allow her to see the "big picture" of what needs to be done to help

individuals make positive life changes. Unlike the other program planners, Bobbie was the only

participant who did not speak of her past as having an influence on how she conducted herself on

the job. Also, unlike the other planners, she stated she did not believe in working with

community organizations to obtain such items as good, used clothing because she herself did not

like to take "handouts." Bobbie feels that she is able to better serve her participants by going

through the channels of government and paying for things out of her own pocket because she feels the ultimate responsibility of helping the participants is hers. While Bobbie's principles seemed to be very different in numerous ways from the other program planners interviewed, she shares many qualities with the other planners which are compassion and dedication to the participants.

Becky. Becky is the manager for an urban county initiative to provide training to individuals in culinary arts. Becky, who describes herself as Caucasian, is one of the oldest planners interviewed and is working on her second career. She is a former manager of a fortune five hundred company and stated that after she raised her children she decided to go back to school for a masters in social work and "begin her life's calling." In her own words, Becky is the only program planner "not doing the job for a pay check" and believes that doing what she "loves" is more important than the money she makes. Because Becky does not work out of necessity she feels she has no reason "to put up with narrow-minded bureaucratic decisions" and generally does what she feels is best for the participants in her program regardless of what the "rules may say". Becky feels she does the best job she can for those she serves and sometimes does "break the rules" because it is better to "do the right thing for the right reason and beg forgiveness if the right thing is not in the rule book".

Rebecca. Rebecca manages a program that seeks to assist participants complete both short-term training as well as technical college degrees in order to become employed. Rebecca has lived in the rural community she works in for many years and uses her knowledge of her small, close knit community to network and "ask for favors". She has witnessed many changes in the program in her numerous years working with low income individuals and feels that it is her job, as well as the job of those in the community, to serve as role models for participants.

Rebecca stated that the biggest obstacle in her job is challenging the participants to seek a different lifestyle and participate in that lifestyle. However, Rebecca feels that you cannot impose your own values onto others and that you have to have "patience and perseverance" to encourage participants if they fail. Rebecca admitted she once lived in a "welfare neighborhood" but that her family never actually received welfare. Rebecca also feels her "whiteness" can sometimes become a deterrent to working with participants. However, she thinks her background helps her to see that society has enabled participants to live in a "comfort zone" and that it is her job to show these women another way to subsist.

Grace. Grace, who describes herself as African-American, manages a non-profit program that is funded primarily through a faith based ministry but also has support from the United Way as well as numerous other entities. Grace feels her ability to secure funding from diverse sources is mainly due to her ability to "negotiate." Grace describes herself as "a hands on person" that can dress professionally for the administrator's job she holds but can also "put on sneakers" so she can consistently fill-in for frontline workers. Grace was dressed in a very conservative suit and heels but took the time to show me her jeans, sneakers, and pony tail holder that she packs each day as part of her work attire. She is proud of the fact that she "grew-up on the wrong side of the tracks" and is now able to help those she once called her neighbors. She professes a "savvy" knowledge base of her community's politics and states she has "to be at the planning table and be seen everywhere" if she wants to get things done. Based on the fact that she has the most extensive assortment of programs and the widest diversity of funding sources it appears her philosophy that "decisions are based on relationships" is a correct one.

Administrators

The administrators, those who have a working relationship with the program planners, are

individuals who both collaborated and contradicted the ways the women program planners use

power and politics to negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders. Abby, Emily, Betty, Robbie,

and Francis (pseudonyms) are all DFCS workers and/or supervisors and have a professional

working relationship with the program planners. Therefore, they possess first hand knowledge

of the practices the program planners use to plan the training programs. In some cases the

administrators also have knowledge of the planner's specific work conditions, financial

constraints, and other such factors that influence how they get the job done. Because some of the

administrators work with more than one program planner, these five additional primary

interviews were conducted. Some of the administrators were identified by the program planners

who have observed them on the job and have direct knowledge of how they work to plan

programs. Others self identified themselves and then made referrals to the program planners.

The interviews with the program planners and the administrators were conducted simultaneously.

Once a primary participant or administrator was identified, I determined the order of the next

interview based on their proximity to where I was physically located within the state of Georgia

at the time. I completed meetings in North, Middle, and South Georgia during the interview

process so as to achieve geographical variation.

The administrators were not requested to complete a sociodemographic questionnaire.

However, of the five representatives, three of the individuals are case managers and two are

supervisors who all work in the employment services unit for the Georgia Department of Family

and Children Services. Three of the participants describe themselves as African-American and

two describe themselves as being Caucasian. Each administrator is a stakeholder in the outcomes

of the programs and are referred to in this study interchangeably as a DFCS representative or administrator.

Table 3 provides selected demographic data of the administrators.

Table 3: Administrator Profiles

Administrator	Race	Job Title	Support Area
Abby	Caucasian	Employment Services Program Manager	Urban
Emily	Caucasian	Employment Services Case Manager	Urban/Rural
Betty	African-American	Employment Services Case Manager	Urban/Rural
Robbie	African-American	Employment Services Case Manager	Rural
Francis	African-American	Employment Services Case Manager	Rural

Data Collection

The data collection for this research was conducted using the qualitative method of interviews. Because the emphasis on qualitative methods is on depth and detail of understanding, the issues of how much to study, how many to study, and to what degree to study I was required to establish a clear focus and specific priorities from the beginning. For this reason I chose between quantity and quality in the number of participants chosen and quantity of time spent in the one data collection method. The critical decision here, as in all logistical aspects of the research process, was that the purpose of the research be the driving factor in the decision making process. "The challenge [was] to find out what information [was] most needed and most useful in a given situation, and then to employ those methods best suited to producing the needed information" (Patton, 1990, p. 196).

I was careful to remain aware of individual differences that could have affected the data collection and cause me to interpret the data in a different way than it was intended. Gender,

race, culture, ethnicity, and other individual characteristics of both researcher and respondent can cause differences, therefore it was vital that I learn not only the language of the respondent, but that I stay attuned to non-verbal communication that had special significance. Further, I maintained, to the human extent possible, neutrality in my opinions toward such things as the physical characteristics and dress of the respondents as well as to the specific content of the responses given. To do this I first framed my bias and subjectivity of all issues because,

> [t]he fieldwork exchange fosters a tendency to downplay differences, as both investigatory and source seek to establish a footing with one another and find a common ground from which to proceed to the work of collecting and recording… materials. Additionally, as we are forever constructing our own identities through social interaction, we similarly construct our notion of others (Borland, 1991, p. 72).

Interviews

The most common method of gathering descriptive data is through the use of an interview. Both qualitative and quantitative research use interviewing as a technique for eliciting information, although qualitative methods allow the researcher to study subjects in detail without the constraints of a predetermined hypothesis. For the purpose of this study a semi-structured interview process was used consisting of open-ended questions. Semi-structured interviews are those in which the researcher encourages the participant to talk in the area of interest then probes more deeply for clarification and specific meaning (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Merriam & Simpson, 2000; Patton, 1987; Rossman & Rallis, 1998). Open-ended questions are those that are preconfigured, asked to each participant in the same order, but allow the participants to respond freely (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Patton, 1987; Rossman & Rallis, 1998).

When interviewing is used in qualitative data gathering, the "task for the qualitative researcher is to provide a framework within which people can respond in a way that represents accurately and thoroughly their points of view about the world, or that part of the world about which they are talking" (Patton, 1990, p. 24). An interview is defined as a purposeful conversation that is directed by the researcher for the purpose of eliciting information, or expressions of opinion or belief, from another person or persons (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). In this context the interview allows for interaction between researcher and participant which permits further clarification and exploration of the ideas presented.

When conducting in-person interviews it is imperative that the researcher utilize a questioning format that will not influence the individual's responses by either verbally or nonverbally encouraging and/or rewarding desired answers (Mitchell & Jolley, 2001). The researcher must not lead the individual to respond in predetermined ways and so must assume the role of non-directive listener by asking short, descriptive questions that are followed up by probing questions related to information obtained in a prior, non-leading format. For this reason, questions asking "how" and requests for descriptions were used in the interviews. The research interview is a professional conversation that uses a careful questioning and listening approach with the purpose of obtaining thoroughly tested knowledge (Kvale, 1996). By utilizing an interview guide (Appendixes C and D) to define and shape the situation I directed and controlled the situation. By using this strategy the information garnered in the interviews is an accurate representation of the actual process used in planning programs for the population of women learners engaged in training for Welfare to Work programs.

Interviews were conducted to gather descriptive data to facilitate my understanding of the participant's perspective and interpretation they give to the program planning process and for

examining the planner's beliefs and attitudes of program planning. Because the validity of

results generally rests more with the interviewing skill of the researcher than with the interview

format, it was my responsibility as the interviewer to elicit pertinent information in the

investigation (Merriam & Simpson, 2000). An interview guide was used so that consistent

information could be gathered from each participant. The questions for the interview guide were

determined based on several factors. First, I field tested the guide by interviewing three planners

approximately one year before data for this study were gathered. After those interviews were

conducted, the questions were altered somewhat to allow for more descriptive answers from the

participants. Secondly, I used my prior experience as a program planner and research in the area

of qualitative data gathering to determine an appropriate format for the questions. Thirdly, I

used questions based on the Cervero and Wilson (1994) theory of program planning in order to

frame questions that allowed me to determine how planners use power and politics to negotiate

for stakeholder's interests. And, while the conversation did adhere to the interview guide, the

dialogue was not so structured so as to constrain the exploration of topics outside of the stated

areas of focus. To enhance the understanding of the data gathered in the primary interviews,

interviews with administrators were also employed. The primary interviews were used to gather

descriptive data in the subject's own words so that I could develop insights on how the subjects

interpret some piece of their own world (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992) and interviews with

administrators were used to substantiate the validity of these findings.

　　　The specific process I used to gather my data was to first secure permission from the

State of Georgia Department of Human Resources, Division of Department of Family and

Children's Services, to conduct the interviews with DFCS personnel working in the employment

services area. This correspondence is available in Appendix E. I then contacted, by both

telephone and electronic mail, individuals I identified as possible participants and gave them a brief verbal explanation of my research project to determine their willingness to participate. All of the interviews were conducted at the individual's place of employment and all interviews with the program planners were conducted at one of their training sites. During the initial contact I informed each individual how they were referred to the project. I sent an electronic copy of the DFCS permission letter to all the DFCS representatives I communicated with. This greatly facilitated my access to these individuals. When any suitable individual indicated a willingness to participate I scheduled a time for the face-to-face interview. I contacted them again prior to the scheduled interview time, by telephone or electronic mail, to confirm the time of the interview.

Interviews were scheduled at the participant's convenience and took place during September and October 2003. I did not conduct the interviews in any specific order but rather scheduled them to correspond to concentrated geographical settings. The settings were both rural and urban. The interviews lasted from one hour to over two hours in length. The shorter interviews were with the DFCS representatives. Participants granted me permission to tape record the interviews and this facilitated transcription. A tour of facilities was included in several of the visits with the program planners and there was dialogue during this time although the conversations were not recorded. The audio recordings from the interviews were transcribed from audio to written text as were field notes both handwritten and recorded after the interviews. The interviews and field notes were transcribed using Microsoft Word and were formatted to be double-spaced with a 2.5 inch left margin and one-inch margins on all other sides. Each line of text was formatted with sequential line numbers to facilitate analysis of the data. The transcribed pages totaled 468 pages in length. All materials were labeled with pseudonyms.

The data presented in this chapter include insights collected through interviews with the participants and through limited observations made on-site during the interviews. Additional observations were made through casual conversations both before and after the interviews based on several of the program planners having worked together previously, heard of each other through reputation, and/or having current working relationships with each other. The interviews with the program planners focused on several themes. The first area addressed the program planner's philosophy of organizational and personal goals and basic job duties. The second area addressed each individual's thoughts of her role in the program planning process. The third category of questions related to the planner's ideas concerning the inclusion of women's needs into the program content. The interviews with the administrators, the DFCS representatives, followed the same questioning format with some variation.

Each interview was transcribed verbatim and then formatted to allow for easy readability and coding. The transcript pages of the DFCS representative interviews and the program planner transcripts were separated to allow for independent coding depending on the unique perspective of the participants. As each transcript was read and coded, I searched for similarities within and between the participant's thoughts and experiences. Initially, the data was coded by the three major themes contained in the questioning format: the participant's philosophy of organizational and personal goals and basic job duties, each individual's thoughts of her role in the program planning process, and each individual's ideas concerning the inclusion of women's needs into the program content. After the broad categories were organized into manageable sections, smaller, more specific categories were established within the broad categories. When categories intermingled or overlapped, reviewer's comments were inserted at appropriate places to reference themes back to other categories. The goal of cross-referencing the data was to show

how the program planning process blends together within itself. Pseudonyms were used to ensure the confidentially of all participants.

<center>Sociodemographic Information</center>

The gathering of sociodemographic information contributes to understanding of the data (Appendix F). Background or demographic questions concern the identifying characteristics of the individual being interviewed and allow the interviewer to locate the respondent in relation to the other participants (Patton, 1987). It was important then for me to have included these types of questions in written form to the program planners so that inferences could be drawn as to the appropriateness of the sample population identified and used in this study. A partial summary of this information was presented in Table 2. The sociodemographic data questionnaire was administered before the interview began.

<center>*Field Notes*</center>

As a final means of clarifying information gained in the interviews, in a private location such as my automobile or a restaurant, I made both written and taped field notes immediately after my visits then transcribe them so I had a record of my impressions of what I saw and observed. Everything from composition books to cocktail napkins was used to record written field notes. Other field notes were made at various times as ideas occurred to me throughout the process of gathering data and then transcribed periodically. There were approximately 17 transcribed pages of field notes. Field notes are a taped and/or written reflection of what the researcher sees, experiences, and thinks during the course of collecting and reflecting on the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Patton, 1987). There is no common method of taking field notes although Bogdan and Biklen (1998) suggest there are two types of field notes. The first is descriptive field notes where the researcher provides a "word-picture of the setting, people,

actions and conversations as observed" (p. 121). The second type is reflective field notes in which the researcher describes and speculates about the process and one's own relationship to the research. I feel that the use of both types assisted me in logically organizing my ideas and thoughts so I could draw valid conclusions from the data. Additionally, keeping detailed records in the form of recorded, then transcribed, memos to myself kept my data realiable and valid and provides an audit trail for peer review.

Data Analysis

Analysis involves organizing and sorting the data so that patterns, themes, and relationships can be recognized and interpreted. "If research is carefully planned and conducted, an analysis of data will produce descriptions and inferences about the phenomenon being studied" (Merriam, 2000, p. 11). Inference and interpretation then, "involves attaching meaning and significance to the analysis, explaining descriptive patterns, and looking for relationships and linkages among descriptive dimensions" (Patton, 1987, p. 144). Data collection and data analysis become intertwined—so do data analysis and data interpretation. Therefore, it was imperative during this process that I did not allow data gathered to guide my approach to data yet to be collected although it did serve as a suggestion of ideas that needed further exploration. In conducting research and analyzing the findings it was critical that I refrained from focusing on ways to confirm my initial ideas. I had to pay particular attention to looking for alternative explanations and contrary patterns that would invalidate initial insights (Patton, 1987).

The first step in data analysis was to sort the data into broad categories and then to organize the data so that themes could be developed. As themes and concepts emerged the data had to be further categorized into smaller, more manageable pieces. From this process of taking enormous amounts of data collected through the use of qualitative methods and categorically

managing it, insights and possible conclusions could be drawn. Content analysis, methodically

identifying specific characteristics of messages (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998), was used in this study

to identify concepts, examples, and patterns to identify how women program planners negotiate

for interests through the use of power and politics.

Constant Comparative Analysis

The constant comparative method of data analysis was used to aid in inductive analysis,

which is one of the defining characteristics of qualitative research (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

The constant comparative method is designed to aid analysts in generating a theory that is

integrated, consistent, plausible, close to the data, and in a form that is clear enough to be readily,

if only partially, operationalized for testing in quantitative research (Glaser, 1969). While the

constant comparative method of analysis emerged from grounded theory literature, it is

commonly used in all types of qualitative research (Merriam, 1998). Specifically, when using

the constant comparative method of analysis, data are collected that relate to a precise focus of

inquiry and hypotheses are not generated a priori and so the relevant variables for data collection

are not predetermined (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). The constant comparative method is

primarily used because of its rigorous focus on the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam &

Simpson, 1998; Patton 1990).

When using the constant comparative method no attempt is made at testing or proving

theory but rather theory is suggested from consideration of theoretical properties of identified

categories. This means that not all available data must be considered but rather that concepts are

linked with other concepts in a theory or explanation until the concept is thought to be saturated.

Specifically, concepts are linked with other concepts that result in explanations of the

phenomena. This search for supposition begins by first identifying small units of meaning that in

turn serve as the basis for defining larger units of meaning. "The process of qualitative data analysis is one of culling for meaning from the words and actions of the participants in the study, framed by the researcher's focus of inquiry" (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Additionally, the constant comparative method of data analysis is well suited to the simultaneous collection and analysis of data because the researcher is able to compare and contrast new data with that previously collected (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

When using the constant comparative method of data analysis the first step in the process, in its broadest definition, is to identify units of meaning from the data collected. For the purposes of this study the data are the transcriptions of the interviews. Several paper copies of the transcriptions were made and the original electronic data was secured in a safe location. After each tape was transcribed I coded the data into themes. Coding is selectively attaching meaningful tags to words or phrases and distinguishing them as contributors to the study's findings (Krathwohl, 1998; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). In the second step I determined the essence of the unit's meaning and handwrote the notation in a word or short phrase in the left-hand margin of the transcript. Once the data were divided into units of meaning, I then categorized the data by organizing and sorting the data so that patterns and relationships could be recognized and interpreted. I did this using Microsoft Word to "cut" the data from the original transcript and then "paste" it into a new document under an appropriate heading. A reference system was used to cross-reference the data back to the original data source. During the process of coding data into categories I constantly looked for instances of phenomena that did not fit into the pattern or fall into a category. This data was then considered to determine the limits of explanation and to show the generality of the conclusions.

The data were also considered to determine the relationship of one idea to other ideas in order to integrate categories. Once all data was coded, I read through the data several times over a period of weeks and used Word to highlight reoccurring words and phrases. I also used reviewer's comments to make more cross-reference notations and I also inserted comments to record further connections between and within the data. As themes began to solidify, I again reexamined the data to ensure it accurately reflected the meanings the participants had intended. Some of the original categories such as "Power and Politics" and "Contracts" were divided into smaller pieces and then moved to reflect a better fit into the organizational structure of the established themes. Some categories such as "Different Guidelines for Different Programs" were moved to a separate document named "cut stuff" as there was not sufficient data to maintain the category and/or it had no significant implications in the study. As a final step, the data was sorted, with cross-references, into four main categories that corresponded to the original research questions. The data was then grouped under each of the four main categories into descendingly smaller subgroups. Table 5 in Chapter 4 provides a concise representation of how the data was organized.

One way I relieved conflict of thought during this process was by recording memos that reflected logical ideas so that valid conclusions could be drawn and to ground the theory in substance, not speculation. Memos were recorded in the same manner during analysis as were used in the process of data collection. By categorically managing the data, I was able to commit to selecting and focusing on boundaries of inference that fell within the scope of the original research questions. Once the data was reduced to logical and relevant categories, I was able to write the analysis. Using the memos to provide content based on the categories of examination, I

have been able to provide illustrations using specific examples and explanations to provide

credibility for the conclusions drawn.

<div align="center">Validity and Reliability</div>

When conducting research it must be considered if the data collection methods measures

or represents the characteristics it is intended to assess. Specifically, the researcher must

determine if what is observed and/or interpreted matches what really occurred and transpired.

"The degree to which a study is valid is important in that it indicates to the research consumer

how accurately cause was established and future events can be predicted" (Merriam & Simpson,

2000, p. 58). And, while establishing focus and priority can be difficult and frustrating when

designing the research project it is important that the data gathered be proven reliable through

some means of balance.

<div align="center">*Validity*</div>

In qualitative studies the validity of the data, as it relates to the accuracy and

comprehensiveness of the data collected and analyzed, is a primary concern of researchers.

Qualitative research is concerned with two types of validity—internal and external. Internal

validity may be threatened by factors that affect the degree to which the research procedure

measures what it purports to measure (Merriam & Simpson, 2000). There are several internal

methods a researcher can utilize to ensure the validity of the data collected and the subsequent

analysis of that data. For this study, I used data triangulation, peer examination, member checks,

and examination of researcher biases and assumptions.

Internal Validity

Data triangulation is the use of multiple data sources to obtain verification of the facts

gathered. One type of triangulation is the use of more than one data collection method in the

research process. Another is the use of triangulation across data sources. Triangulation provides

a balance in the research by allowing for comparison of data from different sources and reminds

the researcher to seek answers to the same question in each source. Because, while different data

sources capture differing information, "consistency in overall patterns of data from different

sources and reasonable explanations for differences in data from various sources contribute

significantly to the overall credibility of the findings presented in the evaluation report" (Patton,

1987, p. 162). Triangulation across the data sources for this study include primary interviews

with women program planners, primary interviews with DFCS administrators, and observations.

Peer examination—asking a colleague to scan some of the raw data and assess whether

the findings are plausible based on the data (Merriam, 2002)—was used to ensure internal

validity of this study. This included assessment and evaluation of the research methods used as

well as review and consideration of the accuracy and consistency of the conclusions drawn from

the data. Peer assessment was conducted by colleagues and supervising professors. Specifically,

I met with my major professor and my methodologist after the interviews and engaged in

extensive data categorization as well as received feedback concerning how to organize the data

into meaningful findings. Armed with collaborative insights, I reevaluated the data and

organized my findings in a consistent and cohesive manner that allowed for further data

exploration.

Member checks—requesting that participants comment on your interpretation of the

data—is a third method of internal validity that was used in this study. After the transcripts were

transcribed, I sent a copy of the transcript, either electronically or via the US mail, to each

participant and requested verification that the interview captured their unique perspectives of the

program planning process. No comments were received from any participant after a six month period so therefore no changes were made to the findings.

As a final means of ensuring internal validity, I examined my biases and assumptions that I brought to the study. By doing that I feel that the participants and consumers of the information derived from this study will be able to better understand the unique perspectives I brought to the issue of program planning as well as to the enterprise of welfare reform

External Validity

External validity is concerned with the generalizability of the findings (Merriam, 2002). In other words, because qualitative research deals with the thick, rich descriptions of a few participants it is imperative that the findings of the study can be transferred to other situations. For this study, extensive detail of the study's context is provided so that comparisons can be made. Additionally, every effort was made to ensure maximum variation of diversity of the participants.

<div align="center">Reliability</div>

Reliability refers to the extent to which research findings can be replicated and whether the results are consistent with the data collected (Merriam, 2002). Because reliability in research is critical I used the afore mentioned methods of triangulation, peer examination, member checks, and examination of researcher biases and assumptions to demonstrate validity of the research project. Additionally, by providing an audit trail through a detailed written rational and chronological record of the data collection process I have assisted peers as well as readers in determining the objectivity of the research process and analysis. Audit trails of data collection are vital so that others can reconstruct how an analysis was developed, to check how well coding

terms were grounded in the data, and to determine the logical validity of conclusions (Krathwohl, 1998).

Researcher Bias and Assumptions

When using qualitative research methods, a researcher's common concern is subjectivity. Ideally the researcher should enter into the project with no preconceived notions of the findings, no theory or point to prove, and with no extrinsic reward for particular findings. All individuals, however, bring personal values and beliefs to all things. It is imperative, then, when conducting qualitative research that the researcher understand and acknowledge her subjective ways of thinking so that the researcher remains a non-directive listener and not a skillful manipulator of information. The researcher's perspectives can distort the information gathered. Therefore, the emotional bias, interests, opinions, past experiences, and personal awareness of the researcher must be forefront during both the data-collecting phase and the data analysis phase of the project. "The practical solution may be to replace the traditional search for truth with a search for useful and balanced information, and to replace the mandate to be objective with a mandate to be fair and conscientious in taking account of multiple perspectives, multiple interests, and multiple possibilities" (Patton, 1987, p. 167).

Having piloted one of the first Welfare to Work programs in the State of Georgia in 1989, as well as worked in various capacities with welfare reform for over nine years, I brought a considerable amount of personal experience laced with subjectivity to this topic. My first job with DFCS was as a case manager mainly developing employment plans that focused on long-term education. Participants were served in a priority order beginning with those who chose to volunteer, most of whom were already enrolled in school seeking two to four-year degrees. These participants were self-motivated and were using welfare as a temporary solution to a bad

situation. Very little encouragement was needed to move these individuals off of the welfare

roles because long-term, self-sufficient employment was their main motivation for obtaining an

education.

As volunteers began to graduate and enter the workforce, mainly in well paying white-

collar jobs, the participants we began to serve were often not as willing to attend training or else

came to us with numerous physical and/or emotional barriers. Although many individuals we

served adhered to work plans they assisted in developing, others either refused to participate or

were motivated to participate only to avoid sanctions of their benefits. It was frustrating for both

the participants and the case mangers in that receiving financial assistance was a way of life for

some that had been handed down from generation to generation and there was no quick fix to

years of this idea that this was the way one lived and survived. There were also participants who

wanted off of welfare but due to very real barriers, such as a lack of childcare or transportation

simply could not leave the welfare roles and remained on financial assistance, which gave them

and their children a better quality of life than employment would have. Additionally, about five

years after these initial pilot programs began, welfare reform legislation changed its focus from

education to job search just at the time when most volunteers had been served. This meant that

participants who choose not to participate in short-term training programs or seek immediate

employment faced losing their benefits. As a case manager I found myself in an environment

where clients too often were hostile and saw me, the case manager, as the source of most of their

problems. This caused me to many times ignore the human factor involved in my job and treat

my clients as nothing more than problems to be dealt with. Since that time I have been able to

see my views were the result of many years of frustration with the "system" which culminated in

old-fashion "burn-out". I recognize this as a possible bias I brought to this research project.

Fortunately, I was able to acknowledge that my feelings were not contributing positively to the welfare of the clients and so I applied for and received a promotion to a management position. The most enjoyable and rewarding responsibility of the position was contracting for short-term training programs for the hard-to-serve welfare population still on the rolls. I worked a predominantly rural, five-county area that boasted no public transportation other than that of local, independently owned taxi services. My first large contract was to provide vans to transport clients to the various training programs that were in place. From there I began contracting for classes, from floral design and customer service to basic job coping services and literacy and aptitude testing. It was clear from the beginning that some contractors provided better quality, more practical, and results-oriented programs than did others. Based on my observations, the best programs acknowledged and incorporated women's issues into the curriculum and made the participant the focus of the training. Additionally, there was some unexplained "magic ingredient" that these contractors gave to the project that motivated these women to achieve their best. My subjectivity of program planning is positioned here. I did not know why some program planners were more successful at what they did than others. I did believe, however, that it was in how and whose interests they looked after.

The third and final bias I brought to this project is that I am a forty-two year old, educated, southern white woman. My middle-class parents raised me to believe I could do and be anything I wanted. I have never wanted for food, clothing, or shelter. I have never known what it was to be alone or without love and support. I cannot, and have never been able to, comprehend exactly what it is to be poor—I have never been poor. And, while I realize the welfare system must be legislated in some manner, even after years of working in the social

services field I find it difficult and confusing to understand how laws are passed that perpetuate a system of poverty.

I recognize that my past experience and who I am causes me to view program planners, programs, and the planning process in unique and different ways. My goal then was to be fair and conscientious and allow each participant to tell her story her way. Through listening the stories became a joint ownership between the individual telling the story and myself. I strove to create a trusting and risk free environment for this research so the ownership of the data is one of truth and collaboration. I sought assistance from the members of my dissertation committee in helping me to be objective during the research process. Additionally, I requested that the program planners themselves review their interview transcripts to help me minimize the possible biases, prejudices, and assumptions I brought to this project.

Overview of the Programs Studied

An overview of the eleven programs the primary participants administer and the manner in which the primary participants and administrators are required to work is provided in this section. It is hoped that by allowing a quick glimpse of the programs the reader is better able to understand the nature of the decisions faced by the participants. Eleven different programs administered by the primary participants were observed during my on-site visits to conduct interviews. Of the eleven programs, only one is administered by a private-for-profit provider. All have ties to their local colleges or Departments of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE). The longest program is eighteen weeks in duration and the shortest is two weeks long. Table 4 provides a brief profile of the programs.

Table 4: Program Profiles

Agency Type	Funding Sources	Training Examined
Department of Labor (DOL)	State	Job readiness and assistance with post secondary educational needs
Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE)	State	Job readiness, job skills assessment, and employment assistance
Non-Profit Religious Organization	Grants, private donations, United Way and community funds	Childcare
Vocational Rehabilitation	State, Federal, United Way and community funds	Job readiness
Food Bank	State, Federal, United Way and community funds, and private donations	Culinary arts
Community Action Agency	State	Job readiness
Private for Profit	Tuition obtained through both private students and contracts with various State agencies	Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA)

All of the programs have a definitive conclusion as well as an established content. Mary describes her program as having "the same basic format," but stated "each is different because the participants are different." None of the programs follow the same format but each emphasizes employment training, employment, and employment retention as the objective of each participant. Each program planner was careful to state that while there was a basic format for each program the program content was altered in some manner during each training session to meet the individual needs of the participants. Several planners described how a great deal of time was spent discussing how the issues unavoidably intertwined in an individual's personal and private life are brought to the educational setting.

Each administrator is familiar with the individual programs offered and is knowledgeable of the content of each program. In most cases all welfare clients are first sent to DTAE programs. The DTAE programs, through New Connections to Work, are secured through a

State-wide contract providing the Test of Adult and Basic Education (TABE) to all clients. The process is characterized as a marriage of the participant's ability to learn, their interests, and aptitude. Each administrator stated that by each client taking the TABE when they are initially referred to employment services planners and DFCS workers can better establish an employment plan to meet the needs of the clients

Collaboration and Funding

Both primary participants and administrators identified collaboration with other agencies as a contributing factor to providing effective programs. This is not only because of the mandate by the Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) to coordinate efforts with other agencies providing comparable programs but also due to such issues as budget cuts and the need to prevent duplication of services. Rebecca stated, "Funders no longer want to fund programs that are operated by a single entity that may provide services that are available in the broader community." However, all of the primary participants felt there was a duplication of services provided within the service delivery areas. Sharon described her thoughts succinctly by describing collaboration as a "numbers game where everyone is desperate for a plausible plan that can work so everyone can see they are getting something out of it". It was this researcher's opinion that both the primary participants and the administrators appreciate collaboration is vital to the prolongation of the programs they provide.

Issues relating to collaboration bring forth concerns to all those working with welfare recipients in employment services. The first is the placement rate of the individuals into jobs and the determination of what agency gets credit for the placement. In the past, only the agency that made the actual referral for the job was able to count the employment placement as a positive case closure, even if the individual was working with multiple agencies. And, while there

remains a grey area in how employment placements are counted there seems to be a shift in the mindset of all funders that multiple agencies, working with the same individual, can all count the placement if any agency services are rendered to the client. This shift from turf guarding to client sharing can only benefit the clients served and keep the primary participants employed as job placement directly impact program funding. In my opinion, this banking of favors in the form of collaboration is an accurate depiction of the primary participants use of power to negotiate for the needs of stakeholders by taking the participants needs into account as a central consideration.

The second issue of concern to all participants, and a primary barrier to providing effective programs, is budget cuts. Each administrator interviewed stated that collaboration has become necessary as agencies compete with one another for limited funds. Specific examples of budget cuts were described by all the participants. Lisa stated her "budget for 2003 was cut by two-thirds." Kim's comment about current funding was, "…our budget was cut down to a total of $45,000. That is $20,000 for salaries and $25,000 for operating expenses. That won't even pay my salary." That budget cuts affect all aspects of how the programs are administered can be seen in numerous ways. Pam related she had "sixty-six staff members a year and a half ago at this time." She now has 22.

Program planners are addressing the lack of financial resources in very real ways. Sharon stated she has written many grants and always looked for resources to partner with so that she could maximize the resources and not duplicate services. Mary indicated working with allied agencies and pooling funds had allowed her to continue providing programs and "receiving my pay check." And, while turf guarding is seen as a continuing obstacle to providing quality programs the harsh reality is that collaboration is necessary in order to stay in

business. Every program planner acknowledged that collaborations cannot work when partners do not meet at the planning table to decide as a group how to best serve DFCS referrals. The use of power and politics fueled by the need to collaborate will be discussed in chapter four.

Program planners bring unique, yet similar, perspectives to the program planning process and all have very real issues that must be addressed and resolved in order to provide successful programs for DFCS referrals. The Cervero and Wilson model of program planning (1989) recognizes planning is not just an ordered series of steps that can be followed but rather consists of continually changing challenges based on issues such as funding, changing legislation, working relationships, and other factors that must be dealt with on a continual basis. These types of factors are a part of the process and must be considered, acknowledged, anticipated, and managed. These previous sections have discussed organizational and legislative obstacles to planning. The next section discusses the data collection process and how the participants attempt to make sense of the worlds they work in.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

The purpose of this study was to determine how women program planners negotiate power, politics, and interests in designing programs for predominately women learners in Welfare to Work programs. This chapter detailed the design of the study, the criteria and selection of the research participants, how the data was collected, and the methods and techniques that were used to analyze the data. It also rationalized how the validity and reliability of the data were achieved and discussed my biases and assumptions brought to this project.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine how women program planners design programs for predominately women learners in Welfare to Work programs. Establishing how the gender of the program planner affects the planning process and studying how women program planners create adult education and training programs aids in the future development of programs that consider women's concerns in the learning environments of welfare training programs. The following research questions were addressed by this study:

1. How does a woman program planner's gender-based understanding impact power relations within the organizational process of program planning?

2. How do women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with emphasis on the power and politics of the process?

This chapter is divided into two primary sections and attempts to answer the two questions that guided this research project. The first section, addressing the first research question, examines the impact the program planner's gender has on power relations within the organizational process of program planning and focuses on both personal and social variables that result in emotional reactions. The second section, which addresses the second research question, details how women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with emphasis on the power and politics of the process.

Table 5 provides a concise representation of how the data were organized. The data consist of two main findings that corresponded to the two original research questions. These groupings are categorized into descendingly smaller themes and categories under each of the two main findings. These findings are addressed in the following sections.

Table 5: Representation of the Data

Findings Based on the Research Questions	Themes	Categories
Question 1: *How does a woman program planner's gender-based understanding impact power relations within the organizational process of program planning?* The program planning process for women is mitigated by personal interactions and relationships between the program, organization, and planner	Possessing personal gender-based understanding domains that have societal ramifications	Empathizing with the participants
		Fostering self-esteem
		Giving back
		Having a passion for the job
	Possessing social and organizational domains that have societal ramifications	Awareness of race in the planning process
		Awareness of poverty in the planning process
		Gender unconsciousness
		Planning for women
		Helping the clients become employed
Question 2: *How do women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with emphasis on the power and politics of the process?* Women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders using power and politics	Working behind the scene and using relationships to get things done	Collaborating, negotiating and building relationships within the system
		Collaborating, negotiating, and building relationships with and for the clients
		Negotiating turf issues
		Contracting
		Going the extra mile
	Sitting at the planning table	Being present at the planning table
		Being accountable at the planning table
		Being accountable for the client's interests

The Research Questions Addressed

The findings from the two research questions that guided this research are addressed in this chapter. The participant's attitudes and feelings are explored through quotes and observations from the interviews. The literature from program planning, welfare practices, and women provide the background to illustrate the findings.

The Program Planning Process for Women is Mitigated by Personal Interactions and

Relationships between the Program, Organization, and Planner

The program planners interviewed for this study had an average of thirteen years experience as a group working with low income individuals. Most of these individuals worked in case management positions, or similar positions with direct client contact, prior to the current positions they now hold as program planners, administrators, and/or instructors. Because of their longevity in the profession, the participants interviewed were well versed in how to negotiate within the system to bring about organizational and community change.

When asked to describe the perfect program planner of Welfare Reform educational training programs these women—both the program planners and the DFCS representatives—said they all had traits in-common. The women interviewed stated they, or other women in the profession, were, "caring," "empathetic," "possessed self-esteem," "loved what they did," and "felt guided by a spiritual way of thinking." In addition, some participants had particular defining characteristics that greatly affected the way things got done. Of the twelve program planners interviewed, seven were African-American. These women gave examples of how their race affected their views and outlook of the system they operated in. Six of the program planners described themselves as having been poor and/or on welfare. These type characteristics define who these women are and how they plan programs.

There were several themes that reoccurred during the course of the interviews and after organization of the data. As I continued to work with the data, it became clear that the program planners choose their professions based on several factors. Specifically, the program planners are part of an ongoing social construction that dictates that they continually use their prior knowledge and interact within current contexts to carry out their work. Some of the reasons that

the women interviewed are so successful in their jobs are: because they are caring and empathic, because they enjoy seeing a client find self-worth, because they love what they do, and because it allows them to fulfill a spiritual need within themselves. These women program planners possessed personal factors that intersected with socially constructed beliefs related to such issues as gender, self-esteem and race. These ideas are discussed in the next sections.

Possessing Personal Gender Based Understanding Domains that have Societal Ramifications

The interviews clarified how these women internalized and acted on socially constructed beliefs. Character or personality traits were observed that were manifest within the program planners and resulted in common behavior patterns. Empathy for the participants, the fostering of self-esteem, and the need to give something of themselves back to the community were all identified. Empathy with the participants will be discussed first and seems to influence all aspects of the planner's processes and is paramount in defining the women as individuals.

Empathizing with the participants. All of the planners interviewed stated in some manner that they had feelings of empathy that were unique to women understanding women. The planner's empathy for the participants is derived from the women having lived much the same lives at one point as the women they worked with either as a single parent themselves, from being poor and seeing their parent(s) struggle with economic issues while they were growing up, and/or from being a woman working in a male dominated profession. The participants understood one of more of the following: being a single parent and having the responsibility of being the sole source of the family's income, the feeling of being unable to feed and clothe their children in a manner they desired, seeing their own parent's inability to provide for their basic needs due to a lack of financial resources, and/or being a woman working in a male dominated profession and having to work harder to gain less than their male counterparts. When discussing

how she felt about her clients, Grace, an African-American who manages a non-profit faith based organization, told me, "There has got to be a certain degree of empathy for that individual. It's got to be some kind of understanding on the part of what these people are living or what they are going through." All of the planners used terms such as "dedication," "flexibility," "compassion," "love," and "understanding" to describe the feelings they brought to the profession. Sharon, an African-American job developer with the Georgia New Connections Program, stated, "You have to have a certain degree of dedication, you cannot be elite and work this program, you can't. You have to be flexible. You have to be organized. You have to want to do." Additionally, because all but two of the planners interviewed described themselves as having been poor and/or raised in a single parent situation, having worked in a male dominated work environment that discouraged women working in the profession, and/or having been on welfare themselves, these women planners defined themselves in large part through their past experiences and felt that part of their job was to assist their clients in becoming active, self-sufficient members of the community they live in. Bobbie, an African-American job developer with the Georgia New Connections Program and a strong advocate for race and gender equality, told me, "Once that person gets on that road [to self sufficiency] we encourage them to reach back and encourage someone else and start the process." All of the planners interviewed stated that changing individuals changed communities.

The planners also felt that changing individuals and assisting them to becoming self-sufficient also achieved organizational change. Sharon described her empathic approach to program planning by saying,

If we just look at what is supposed to be for them and actually make sure that what we are doing is oriented toward them, you are going to automatically see X person is doing

real well and that is a success story for that person. Then we have also played the

numbers game and that satisfies the program. So, it works.

The planners all stated the same thought as Rebecca who works in a rural county and assists

participants in completing both short-term and technical college degrees. Rebecca said,

"Looking after the interests of the participants automatically benefits everybody else." Abby, a

DFCS administrator, stated it this way, "The goal in the community is to make everyone as equal

as possible, giving them jobs so they can work, they pay more taxes, and it will help someone

else and give back to the community." All of the participants interviewed, both program

planners and DFCS representatives, stated that helping clients to better themselves was helping

the organization and the community in positive ways.

A criterion for participation in this study was that the women were involved in the

planning process and possessed an empathic approach to helping clients to better themselves

appears to be a critical requirement the planners impose upon themselves. Working with

individuals and getting to know them was important to all the participants. Grace told me,

We meet with [the participants] one-on-one and their [DFCS] case manager is very good

about talking to them when they are here and learning what they're about and what

they're looking at. Some people are really out of their comfort zone. They've been at

home, they've never been out there and put themselves out there and it's scary. So I

think we have some of those and until you really get to know them, and I think [we] do

an excellent job with getting them to open up, you don't learn anything about them.

Patricia, who is part owner and instructor of a school that assists participants to meet the

requirements for Certified Nursing Assistants, told me this about her nursing students,

One thing I have them do the very first day is write a paper on what makes life worth

living. You ask ten different people, you get ten different answers. And I think that if

they can't express how they feel then how are they going to understand how someone

else feels? And, you get to know them and what makes them tick.

Understanding where an individual has been and where they could and want to go is important to

the planners and how they define being successful in their profession. If the planners did not

have caring and empathy as part of their emotional and mental frame work, these planners feel

they only have jobs, not life altering experiences each day they labor.

The program planners told stories of clients who had experienced occurrences of abuse,

homelessness, and poverty. Knowing these very personal experiences of their students was what

allowed the planners to provide successful programs. Mary, a long-time veteran program

planner and former welfare recipient herself, said,

I think that the common bond is that we are all human. We all have feelings and we all

have our different issues and that the more we understand one another the better our

relationships are…. Because what I understand is that everybody has a different learning

style and that when you change up the different learning styles everybody gets something

out of that. And sometimes what somebody might need that other person might need, or

not need, but if they understand why they need that then they understand people better

and that's what's happening in my teaching, in my instructional class.

Robbie, a DFCS representative who has observed a portion of Mary's training program, told me,

There are some barriers that need to be removed and most of the time it's not always just

substance abuse, or mental health issues it's just little things again that we, maybe as

workers or case managers, may take for granted that we think our clients have these

skills, and in most cases they don't. And sometimes they just need to be addressed with them. Because again, in that jobs skills training class some pretty personal things are covered in there.

These types of experiences between the program planners and the DFCS clients are what allow the individuals to get to know one another. Having a "caring and empathic attitude" for the participants is what these program planners say allows them to enjoy their jobs and to make a change in the lives of the individuals they work with.

As part of their empathic style of planning, these planners also feel it is critical to foster self-esteem in the participants. These planners know from years of experience in working with welfare clients that raising the self-esteem of individuals is crucial for the participants to learn and succeed in today's market place. The next theme discussed focuses on the correlation between empathy and self-esteem as an essential factor in helping the participants to succeed in both the training programs they are involved in, as well as in their future employment endeavors.

Fostering self-esteem. For centuries, we have held the belief that there is a direct correlation between success and self-esteem. Because the planners perceive high self-esteem as an essential factor of success, they feel it is important to foster self-esteem in the participants. Helping the students to develop or rediscover their own self worth is a very important component of the training programs the planners provide and defines their morality. The women these planners work with are in a poverty situation and they enter the programs with low self-esteem that threatens to derail their future success. Because of this, the planners make sure that their programs incorporate an empathic, nurturing attitude toward raising the self-esteem of the women the planners serve.

When asked to describe how her program was beneficial to the client's well-being Sharon described it this way,

> Well I think basically what we try to do, and then it doesn't always work out this way of course, but we are on a personal level with the participants. What we want from them is to boost their skills, their self-esteem, their educational level so that they can hopefully go out and get a job and become self-sufficient.

Lisa, a Caucasian job developer with the Georgia New Connections Program, described it like this, "I think it's very important…if their self-esteem is raised. I think they are going to do much better when they go into skills training, or school, or whatever it is that they choose to do." These types of statements suggest that program planners find a correlation between how the participants feel about themselves and how well they do in training programs. Research supports the feelings of these women program planners because much of a woman's learning has to do her identity and self-esteem. Raising self-esteem then allows these women in poverty to view themselves in a way that transcends their self-doubt and permits them to view a better future for both themselves and their children.

The planners discussed that one key ingredient to a successful program was that the students be able to "be themselves" so that they could participate in the programs and "feel a part of it." The planners also indicated that how well the students did in the training programs and how well they felt emotionally to enter the job market was a direct result of the support received from the other participants in the programs. The following statement by Rebecca, a program planner who does skills assessments, shows the way the process works.

> I think it's very important…if their self-esteem is raised. I think they are going to do much better when they go into skills training, or school, or whatever it is that we choose

to do. But, the way that we go about it initially is to do an assessment when we do

aptitude testing, and the entrance inventory, and then we do the TABE, which you know

gives us an idea of what grade level they're on. Then we'll go back and once that's

graded we meet with the participant and their case manager with the test results and we

try to match that person up with an activity or a program that suits their needs based on

what the results were, or, suits their interests in their aptitude and that's hard.

Allowing the participants to enter into training and/or jobs that not only suits their ambitions but

also unites their mental and physical capabilities is an important program component in raising

an individual's self-esteem. Because if the participants are not guided and assisted into an

employment training program that matches their abilities, they will fail and this in turn lowers

their self-esteem to the point where they themselves cannot succeed and therefore cannot convey

empathy to others.

These women planners understand that doing such things as allowing the participants to

have a voice in the planning process and allowing for individually achieves success in the

learning environment that is necessary for a successful progressive step into the work place and

out of poverty.   In discussing how their self-esteem affects their prospects in the job market

Pam, the only female vice-president in her corporation that oversees a division that trains and

rehabilitates low functioning individuals, told me,

Well, for many of them they have been homeless or living on the welfare system,

doubled-up with families, lacking self-sufficiency for many, many, many years. It helps

improve their self-esteem when they learn a skill and they feel confident in their ability to

market themselves to employers. We see a lot of change in them to have a job paying

living wages and benefits. For many of them this is for the first time in their lives. Most

of them had no prospects to have that kind of a job. So, it's an amazing change and the

change interestingly that occurs in the students [is that] there is as much of a physical

change in the students as there is a change in their attitudes, a change in their

employability.

Without raising the self-esteem of the participants, the participants would not be able to get and

keep a job and therefore changing the perceptions the participants have about themselves is

paramount to them becoming self-sufficient.

One specific example that illustrates this belief of the planners that self-esteem goes

hand-in-hand with self-sufficiency was shared by Becky. Becky, who runs a successful culinary

arts program in an urban county, feels very strongly about the inclusion of drug testing as a

component in her program and personally advocated with her collaborative partners to include

drug testing as a mandatory component of attending the program. Becky knows from past

experience that drug abuse is a detriment to achieving and maintaining employment and also

believes the research that shows a correlation between low self-esteem and substance abuse

Some of the same socially constructed health issues challenging the medical profession that deter

women from self-sufficiency also challenge the planners. Becky described her process of

fostering the participant's self-esteem to discourage them from substance abuse as follows,

We drug test randomly throughout the program. Every student coming into this program

knows that that's a condition. That was another component I put into the program, and I

did that not because I want to kick people out of the program. But, the reason that I put

that in is I know in order to drug test, to give a negative drug test at admissions, that

depending on what you're using, you may need to be clean for 30 days. And then we

keep people in the program for 18 weeks or equivalent for four months. And if we keep

them clean for an additional four months that's five months of sobriety behind them.

They have an excellent shot of staying clean. In addition to that we also know all the

research indicates that getting a job that pays a living wage is the best cure for substance

abuse that there is. So, people come out of the program, they've been clean for four to

five months, they have a new sense of self-esteem, and self-worth, a new confidence in

their ability to market themselves to employers and just based on that they're less likely

to relapse.

 Becky went on to describe how sometimes you have to do things that helps the clients that you

do not want to do but that you feel are "necessary things to do" if you want to give the

participants the best shot you can at helping them to be successful. During the course of the

interviews several of the planners used the term "tough love" to illustrate their need to help

others and Becky's story is a typical example of the planner's empathy with issues such as

substance abuse. Becky is acquainted with substance abuse from her former days of working

with *Fortune 500* companies and so has witnessed drug abuse at all echelons of income levels.

Because of her past and present empathy regarding substance abuse, she understands that drug

abuse occurs at all economic levels with the same negative consequences to the abuser. She

summed this idea up by saying,

When they succeed their sense of accomplishment is the most awesome thing to watch

and I quite honestly am pleased that we've put [drug testing] in because I think we really

do give people every opportunity to get their lives in order.

All of the program planners had some type of measures in place in their programs that allowed

the students to rise to personal levels of self worth that in turn allowed them to feel confident in

seeking employment after their training was complete. And, to the extent that the program

participants accomplished their goals, the planners themselves found genuine satisfaction in their jobs and abilities. The next section will discuss the many ways the participants found that satisfaction by giving back to others.

   Giving back. "Loving what I do" was the main reason the planners say they chose their profession. By giving back to the community, to the participants, and to themselves, the planners derive feelings of self-worth within themselves. Lisa told me, "a lot of people get into these jobs just for the pay or just for the title; you have to really want to do it." When asked if you could have an ego and still be an effective planner of Welfare to Work programs I received answers such as Kim's. Kim, who is a job developer for the Georgia New Connections Program and feels her clients have more to do with their success than she does, stated, "You can but people are going to see through you. I know people like that. People are going to see through you and eventually it's not going to work." Sharon reiterated this thought when she told me,

   I know somebody who is very, very effective in what she has done with her program.

   However you can tell her emphasis is on, look and see what I have done, and the

   participants know that and people outside are like I cannot stand her. So eventually,

   people are going to not be as cooperative as they are if you are always up-beat and you

   really seem to care about this program.

Giving back to the program, to the community, and to the organization was a high priority for the program planners and part of their own personal growth. Because a major focus of their programs is in fostering self-esteem, seeing participants succeed is a reward for the planners and critical to the planner's ability to show empathy to others.

   This trend in women giving both their time and money to causes they believe in is not new. There is recent research that shows women are giving both more financial assistance, as

well as time, to societal causes than ever before and Zeralda's comment that asking, "What is the benefit for them? This is the only way you can be effective," echoes this research. Other similar comments like this one from Patricia including, "You have to give back too. You can't just take, take, take," and Rebecca's response that, "You can't expect people to just do it because it is the right thing to do" all indicate that giving back by assisting the participants to achieve self-sufficiency the planners are giving worth to themselves, the community, and to the participants. A happy, content employee is an asset to society and an inspiration to all.

Because Welfare to Work programs are both federally and state funded (Abramovitz, 1997) there are accountability issues such as how many clients an individual program serves, how many job placements are made, and other such statistical issues that show clients are being served in ways that allows them to become self-sufficient without the need of government assistance. These statistical data are extremely important to program funding so that programs can continue to operate and be viable. PRWORA emphasizes short-term job readiness training that leads to immediate employment. However, as important as these numbers are Pam, like the others, feels you have to, "Deal with the real issues. Don't go for numbers, don't go for stats, don't go for the flow. Go to the need of it; find out what the issues are and see what you need to do." These statements suggest that although meeting quotas and government standards are important, the priority for these women is establishing and maintaining the human component in the work. Being able to provide others with what many times has been given to these planners is what makes these women "love what they do".

Having a passion for the job. Every program planner, and every DFCS representative, indicated in some manner that the planners who worked with welfare clients "loved what they did". The planners also cited a love of their occupation as what made them successful in their

chosen professions. It may be this passion the planners bring to the job that allows them to overlook some of the political issues, budgetary restraints, and negotiation necessary to get the job done. Betty, a DFCS representative, told me this about Sharon, a planner she works with, "She displays a genuine interest in that person for it to work, and it works." Francis, another DFCS representative, said, "She has got a pager and a beeper and her hours are wild, everything is on what have I done for this person." The planners themselves also gave numerous examples of their love for their job. Becky, who states she works because of her passion for the job and not a pay check, told me this story.

> I feel privileged and blessed to be able to do this work. This is really the work that I came to social work to do. I came to social work late in life. I've only had my Master's degree [since] 1997. If I look back around the early 1990's, I really sat down and looked at my life and what I wanted out of my life. I had had a very successful career with a couple of *Fortune 500* companies but my children were grown and I knew I could do something different. And I sat down in the early 1990's, and I wrote a personal mission statement. And as I look back at the personal mission statement that I wrote in the 1990's, prior to my returning to college, I find it interesting that the work that I do today is directly framed in the mission statement that I wrote in the early 1990's.

The planners indicated that the rewards are not in the paychecks they receive but in the rewards of seeing a client become, "self-sufficient, establishing and maintaining a self-worth, and in becoming employed." Sharon told me a story of how she helped a client get a job with a local restaurant based on her ability to negotiate, and negotiating to Sharon is "fun." This is Sharon's example of how she finds satisfaction with her job.

So I went to [this] restaurant and I went there because I knew the manager, and I knew

the manager had had some problems with a child that had had some problems in the past

like this girl. So I went in there and I talked to him and I asked him, 'Would you just

please look at this person? This person wants to bake and I know you need a baker,

could you just look at her?' And, he was like, 'Sure, send her over.' They hired her,

she's been working there ever since. She's gotten raises. She sent me a thank you card

and that's the kind of thing that I am most proud of. If somebody writes to you that you

changed families, you're helping families, and this has changed her life and she wants to

go on, then that's the kind of thing that stands out. And I get a lot of this so you know

you're doing the right thing. You know you're doing the right work with the right beings

and that is okay.

When Sharon was asked if she had any advice for future program planners of Welfare to Work

programs she told me successful program planners should possess, "enthusiasm, compassion,

love of whatever she's planning—not just what I'm going to do. You have to want it and want it

to happen. You have to fix it, you can usually see it happen, success, you know." This passion

and love of the job for its emotional rewards was a reoccurring theme throughout all the

interviews.

Words such as "passion, emotional satisfaction," and "fulfillment" were words spoken by

the planners when describing the enjoyment they derive from the work they do. Being religious

and being a Christian was also cited by several participants as what "called" them into their

professions. A few participants attempted to describe some "spiritual feeling" that made them

want to make a better world for others. Some participants alluded to having been "given a

chance and wanting to give back to others" what they had been given. Grace told me,

I think first of all you have to believe in what you do. You have to be sincere in what you're doing. I feel like this job is not just a job, it's more like a ministry. And I have a real desire that when my time comes I want to say, 'Well God did I do okay?' I am not doing it for anybody else's accolades or anything like that.

Becky described her motivation to come into the profession by saying,

In my own arrogance I guess I thought I'd come to this work and use it as my own personal mission and that I would witness to those people who had so much less that I did. What I've learned over the last six years is that I was put here to let them witness to me, because the spirit that I see is in people everyday. I see it in their survival instincts and in their own compassion. This keeps me motivated and keeps me going everyday.

When asked how she got things done Kim told me, "I pray a lot at night." Other comments of what their work meant to them included "privileged," "blessed," and "lucky." And, if you love what you do, then it would seem that these adjectives fit these individuals.

Possessing Social and Organizational Domains that have Societal Ramifications

The previous sections discussed how personal gender based understanding domains result in societal ramifications. Having empathy with the participant's individual situations, fostering self-esteem in the participants, being able to give back to society, and having a genuine passion for what they do defines the everyday existence of the planners. However, in addition to the aforementioned factors, the participants also possess social and organizational domains that have societal ramifications. These issues are discussed in the next sections.

While all individuals bring multiple layers of personality and unique past experiences to their professions, there are several individual defining characteristics that require mentioning in relation to how these women define themselves in their profession. Empathy in varying forms

with the participants seemed to be a constant theme revealed by the planners as well as the desire

to assist the participants to achieve a better life for them and their families. This empathy is

derived from personal interactions and relationships between the program, organization, and

society. These social and organizational ramifications are constant as they relate the specific

processes these women bring to their planning.

Of the eleven program planners interviewed, seven were African-American. This caused

these women to view the programs they planned through a different lens than those of their

Caucasian counterparts. Additionally, six of the program planners interviewed defined

themselves as having been poor or on welfare. These characteristics defined how the planners

felt about themselves and how they wanted to make others feel. Becky tells a story of how being

a woman in her organization caused her to recognize that in order to get things done she had to

"think like a man." Being a woman influenced how these women worked within the system to

advocate and bring about change. Their stories follow.

Awareness of race in the planning process. Of the eleven planners interviewed for this

study, four were Caucasian and seven were African-American. None of the Caucasian planners

alluded to their "whiteness" during the interviews. This may be because white people are

oblivious to the reality of privilege given automatically and invisibly to white people every day

(Ayvazian & Tatum, 1996) as well as the fact that "whites are carefully taught not to recognize

white privilege" (McIntosh, p. 76, 1988). However, in a study conducted by Brown, Cervero,

and Johnson-Bailey (2000), research shows there is a clear connection between the societal

position of African-American women and their use of teaching strategies and classroom

interactions. Therefore, while I did not ask any specific questions of how an individual's race

might affect them as program planners, it is not surprising that three of the planners freely

volunteered that being African-American influenced how they did their jobs and/or why they choose working with low-income individuals as their profession. These African- American planners were very conscious of how their race impacted the planning process. In discussing how changing the clients changed the community Sharon, who is between the age of 41 and 50, told me this personal story.

> In my life I always felt that I wasn't good enough. And one of the reasons that I felt that way was because growing up when I did back in the olden days I grew up a military brat and we traveled a lot. And a lot of times I was the only little black girl in certain classes and for the most part, either I was ridiculed, or I was ignored. So, I grew up thinking I was invisible, and for the longest I grew up thinking I had no worth. When I was in high school, I was a very bright student, but didn't know I was smart because nobody ever told me I was. I had a 3.888 average in high school and my guidance counselor told me I needed to be a cosmetologist. So, I said well thanks, but no thanks, I think I'll try college. And when I did go to college I was surprised to know that other people thought I was important. And then starting to study about history and where I came from and how I got here, you know, from my ancestors and stuff made me feel I did have some worth. If I could, if my people could survive everything that they did, then I had to be something else. So, looking at yourself and seeing what your worth is, is what changes you and that in itself changes you, makes you want to go out and do more for your community and help your community.

While this one example describes Sharon's personal journey in acquiring the skills she needs to negotiate through the mine field of power relations within society, it also illustrates how she feels about herself in relation to how she works with the clients.

The other African-American program planners told me that being black also helped them to be "straight up" with the participants, both African-American and Caucasian clients. Due to the culture we live in where ethnic traditions and customs appear to overlap with traditional conventions, how one dresses and presents one's self is not always so clearly defined. One specific example of this overlap of ethic practice was when Grace, an African-American, was telling me how she tried to assist the clients in dressing professionally for job interviews. During our interview Grace was dressed in a very conservative business suit and had braids in her hair. This, however, is what she had to say.

> A lot of people talk about, oh dress for success, all the little buzz words, we don't do that. We tell them specifically what they need to do. 'Girl you need to take that earring out of your nose, it's not going to work with Corporate America. I love the dread look but it is not going to work here. You know what, when I go to an interview I take my braids out because I don't know the audience, you have to consider the audience you are working with. I tell you what, dress, then go to your friend, if your friend says you look alright go home and change. If your peers say you look okay, go home and change because you're not dressed right.'

Sharon supported this thought when she stated, "I tell them what they need to dress in and they don't hate me and that is because they can relate to me. I explain to them it is political, not personal." It would seem then that being African-American allows these program planners to be "real" when there is a need to impart ideas to African-American students, or students who have adopted non-traditional cultural customs, which requires straightforward advice in various areas such as professional dress for job interviews.

Awareness of poverty in the planning process. Six of the program planners interviewed described themselves as poor and/or having been on welfare at some point in their life. They all stated in some manner that "having been where they are" has helped them to understand and deal with the unique issues the clients bring to the training programs. Kim, an African-American over the age of 50, described her journey by telling me,

> Before I got into social work I was working at the university in data entry. All we did all day was data entry. I always wanted to go to school. So I just made up my mind, I was a single parent. My idea was take one class every quarter so I had enrolled, I got accepted, and I applied for financial aid and I was approved for that and I remember seeing somewhere on that form you had to be enrolled for at least 12 hours and that just kind of went out my head. Anyway I went and enrolled and registered for my one class. Then I went over to the table to get my financial aid check so they said you can't get this because you have to be enrolled at least full-time, you know 12 hours. I was like okay how am I going to do this? I can't quit work because I've got these two children and I definitely can't quit school. So I just said I'm going to go ahead and enroll in these other classes and I'm going to go home and pray about this and whatever the Lord he lead me to do that's what I'm going to do. So I got up the next morning and turned in my resignation and I just started school full-time and that's how I ended up being on welfare. I went and applied for assistance while I was in school.

Kim told me this story to illustrate that she feels she can better relate to the clients after having been in a situation similar to theirs. Kim had the following to say about the DFCS case manager she worked with as both a client and later on as a co-worker, "When I saw [him] I remembered his compassion and I always remembered I would treat people the way he treated me if I was

ever in this situation." Other participants described their past experiences as a DFCS client

themselves and how that influences the way they work with clients. Words they used to describe

their past experiences include, "she recognized my strengths," "he saw me," and "treated with a

lot of respect." These program planners told me they try and remember their own experiences

every time they feel they are not "getting through" to participants.

When asked if having been on welfare helped the planners to understand the unique

perspectives of their clients Sharon told me,

> Well it helps them also because I share that [I have been on welfare]. I tell them about
>
> when I was getting food stamps and we used to have to go into [the local] park with the
>
> bread truck and stand out there and how dehumanizing that was. I was determined that I
>
> was going in with a plan, I had a plan when I went in to get welfare, I didn't go to sit on
>
> the ladder, I went to climb it. I use that to share with them that if you don't go in with a
>
> plan somebody else is going to plan for you. So you need to go in with your plan and
>
> plan your life.

This very individual defining characteristic of these program planners having experienced

privation themselves seems to provide an empathic bond that allows the program planners to see

the world through multiple lens and therefore allows them the needed understanding to recognize

the unique issues that living on welfare entails. When planning programs for the clients, these

planners realize they must include various viewpoints of the planning process: the side of the tax

payer who funds the programs and wants to see a receiver of tax monies become a payer of

taxes; the side of the administrative, political funders who must see successful outcomes from

the programs to continue funding them; and the side of the clients themselves who are part of the

process and have the most to gain or lose.

Gender unconsciousness. Few of the program planners thought that being a woman was a hindrance to getting the job done. In other words, the planners are not conscious of how being a woman impacts their personal planning and decision processes. I feel that because the planners do not have to spend time considering how to approach and negotiate concerns based on their gender, as well as their social order in their organizations, they are better able to use their time for other more meaningful aspects of the program planning process itself such as course development. However, there was one specific story told by Becky where being a woman meant having to "think like a man." Becky's previous work was in a male dominated workforce as a member of several *Fortune 500* companies. Therefore she, more than the other program planners, understood the significance of, "how hard it is as a woman to build collaboration while being assertive without being aggressive." She told me, "I think I'm fairly successful at getting issues resolved and getting things done, but I've learned when it's appropriate for me to back off and pass the ball to our [male] president." When asked if it would make any difference if the president was a woman Becky replied,

> I know it would make a difference because we just recently changed presidents and in this particular scenario with our two other partners, having the president and the chief operating officer of the programs both as women, it was next to impossible to get things done. Our new male president has just recently moved to [this] area. However, in our board search the profile of the person to be recruited as president was certainly male. Because this particular program is so important to our organization there was knowledge among our board members that in order to negotiate the partnership in this program that it would need to be a male. That was very probably directed some by me because I believe

that to be true as difficult as it is to say. I believe that the decision to hire a male was the correct decision.

This one example illustrates the need of some women to be attuned to the politically structured complexities of their own organizations as well as those of the organizations they must negotiate and collaborate with. Learning to negotiate in specific situations where gender can help and/or hinder the program planning process, according to Becky, comes from "experience and learning who has the power, who wants the power, and who can attain the power." Other than this one story concerning a community that is highly political in nature there was only one other instance shared by Lisa where being a woman was felt to be a defining characteristic of her profession.

The other story that was volunteered where gender was clearly important to getting things done involves Lisa, a Caucasian planner over the age of 50. Lisa works in a rural area where she has lived all her life and where she has worked for the same employer in varying capacities for over thirteen years. She has always worked with low income individuals and while she was once poor herself, she is now married with grown children and she self-describes herself as being currently perceived, "as successful and not facing financial hardships." About four years ago, when funding for welfare reform programs was being diverted from the DFCS offices to the technical schools, Lisa was able to hire a part-time assistant. She hired a male and she told me, "It was fascinating how he was able to get things out of these women I never dreamed of getting them to think or do." Lisa illustrated this by recalling an incident concerning the State's push to divert women into non-traditional employment roles such as carpenters, welders, and the such. Lisa stated,

When I was attempting to get these women to work at the local railroad distribution site they were unable to comprehend what they might physically be able to do. But, when

[he] began to work with the clients and they heard a man tell them they could do it, well, they decided they could do whatever they wanted to do and now we have three of our former clients working at [the rail road] making more money than both of us put together. I guess they just had to have someone who was not a women to help them realize their potential.

By these planners understanding that their gender can affect client perceptions, as well as the perceptions of those they must negotiate with in their jobs, they are better able to use their political astuteness to view problems as obstacles that can be successfully eliminated with forethought. These women realize in different ways that in order to successfully make things happen they first have to acknowledge that gender can be an issue in the program planning process and then think outside of the box to concoct solutions to barriers. Using this information is what makes these planners a success in what they have chosen to do with their lives. A part of this choice is helping the women they work with become self-sufficient and is this idea is discussed in the next section.

Planning for women. The goal of program planners of Welfare to Work educational and training programs is to negotiate stakeholder interests so that they are able to provide successful and meaningful programs for this population. Enabling welfare recipients to achieve and maintain meaningful and self-supporting employment is the objective of each program planner interviewed for this study. By taking into account the social structure of women in the workplace, as well as in the learning environment, these program planners can look at the needs of these participants who are primarily women. The program planners interviewed for this study, such as Mary, were able to give numerous examples of how, "the more people that you have that are self-sufficient, then they are adding back to the community in some way." The planners

allowed the women they sought to help to help themselves. They did this by helping the

participants see the rewards they would derive for both them and their children by making

positive life-long changes in the way they viewed themselves within society and by gaining self-

belief in their own abilities.

When the learners, such as welfare recipients who are predominately female, are part of a

disadvantaged population the focus of program planning practice becomes critical. All of the

planners were asked if they plan programs differently because their students are women. The

first responses I received to the question, "Do you do anything differently because your students

are predominately female?" included, "Not a thing, not that much, no not that much," and "No,

in fact at one point we were working out of the same workbook [as the Fatherhood Initiative

Program] because a lot of the issues are the same." As I probed for deeper clarification the

planners then explained that they worked with men who many times had the same concerns as

women such as being the primary caregiver of their children or the head of the household. While

the idea that issues specific to men's and women's learning were not addressed based on their

gender, Sharon expressed the rationale behind the idea when she told me,

I think we address these issues differently because [these women] are heads of

households and they are the ones who have to take responsibility. If I had a man who

was parenting his children without anyone and he was a single head of household we

would deal with it the same way because there is nobody else to fall back on. They have

to create their support system.

From this response, and similar ones, it is clear that these planners do address the specific issues

women bring to the classroom, even if that "woman is a man" forced into a traditional female

role such is associated with female heads of households. Mary told me this when asked if she planned her program content differently because the audience was primarily women,

> Oh yeah, because the needs are different. I don't know how this happens, but [women] have been called upon to handle and deal with a whole lot more than I guess we ever anticipated or hoped that we had to. But, somehow we have stepped up to the plate.

The planners also related stories of issues they deal with in the classes that are only relevant to women. Pam conveyed this story.

> You know I have women who come in and say, 'Well you know I didn't come to work because I had cramps.' And I say to them, 'Let me see, are these normal cramps or do you have some issues that you need to be seeing a gynecologist?' And they say, 'Normal cramps,' and then I say, 'Well let me see. I think you should take a Tylenol and get to work because that's not an excuse not to work. If you know that you have to work and if you don't report here we have to report to DFCS that you didn't come. That's not an excuse.' So I know some of my staff say that I run a boot camp, and yeah, it is a boot camp, but people know what the expectations are, they know, basically, I draw a line in the sand. 'You want to go to work? These are the guidelines that you need to follow. If you want to get and keep a job, if you choose not to do that these are the things that we have to report to your case manager.'

From examples such as the one above it is clear that there are issues that only women have and that having to deal with these issues requires a special kind of ability. It is also clear that these women are up to the task and not only have sympathy but empathy for the participants. Pam told me, "The needs are just different. Sometimes I look at some of these women that are going

through these programs and I think how in the world did you make it that far? How did you do

that?"

The program planners make it clear that working with women and the unique issues they

bring to the classroom is not easy. When I asked Lisa, "Do you think planning for women is

unique from planning from men?" her response was, "Oh, yes! Working with women is harder

than working with men!" Kim told me,

> Women usually have a lot more issues. Their issue is they are usually the caregivers. So,
>
> if things are wrong with the kid you have a different set of circumstances. With a man,
>
> you give him a job, you get him ready to go to that job, he can go to that job, and he's
>
> pretty much cool. You're not going to have the same issues as if Little Johnny is sick
>
> with that man as you are with [women].

Besides such issues as single parenting, childcare, and domestic abuse that seem unique to

women, several planners discussed the emotions that women bring to the classroom. Britt, a

Caucasian with a strong military bearing who works for the Department of Labor, said,

> Another thing, reference to women, we're emotional, we're very emotional. There are
>
> emotional men, too. But, women, there are a lot of issues that they carry that men don't
>
> appear to carry, and that's what I'm saying, working with women is just different.

Most of the planners talked about being able to discuss any topic in the class and that generally it

was the clients who began the discussions. Mary described her program as,

> …a safe environment type setting. They feel by the time they start talking about these
>
> issues they've been with each other for a while so they feel safe among each other. But
>
> when that happens that's when the real breakthroughs come, when they can get some of

this stuff out and they can see that they're not the only ones going through this kind of

stuff and guess what? You can go on from there.

That there are real and unique issues that only women, or men in traditional female roles, bring

to the learning environment is legitimate. That these program planners realize and understand

this is clear because they too have experienced the same difficulties these women are

encountering. These planners work and derive satisfaction from this understanding. Therefore,

they realize that the critical issue is assisting the participants to achieve and maintain

employment so that the participants can take their feelings of achievement and pass the lessons

on to others.

     Helping the clients become employed. The goal of all Welfare to Work training programs

is to assist the clients in becoming employed. Betty, a DFCS representative, described her

mission this way,

> Our goal is to get our clients off of TANF and get them in a position or profession or job
>
> so that they do not need TANF again. Our goal is to develop families that receive
>
> assistance so they don't need assistance later on.

Abby, another DFCS representative, expanded on this thought by telling me,

> [The clients] will be better prepared to help their children that are in school and increase
>
> their learning ability. It also adjusts their self-esteem and gives them some sense that
>
> they want to give back to the community [and] encourages them to seek employment,
>
> better employment.

Emily, another DFCS representative, described the working relationship between the DFCS

representative, the clients, and the program planner by explaining that, "by [the planner] having

compassion it works in our favor and more so for our clients."

In the midst of DFCS pushing employment are program planners who seek the same goals for the clients. Mary told me,

> The basic emphasis is getting people self-sufficient and the way you do that is first of all to change their perspectives on life. Basically, what we do is we work with an individual first. What we try to do is to get them to think differently than they did in the past. We get them to look at their past situations and see how it hasn't worked out to this point and how they need to change it. So, we work on the individual by enhancing her life skills and then we go into skills training.

Changing an individual's perspective on life is not an easy task and is a challenge faced by all planners of Welfare to Work programs. Rebecca described the challenge this way,

> Certainly the challenges the clients bring to you are barriers to planning a successful program. The needs they come with are so complex and multi-layered, and so I think to plan a program you have to fully look at all the needs that they come with and be prepared to address them.

That these program planners must be innovative in how they administer services to the clients is apparent. Equally apparent is the fact that in order to perceive and meet the needs the clients have, the program planners have had to first identify the needs they have had to satisfy in their own lives to achieve success.

One example of being innovative in administering services to clients was described by a planner who understands the federal time limitations on DFCS recipients to receive welfare and to be in particular training programs. Specifically, Becky explained how her program is designed so that the clients receive particular employment skills training while being able to

access basic literacy education, which is not one of the federally "approved" activities for most DFCS employment services participants. She said,

> In our program that is specifically for TANF recipients it's an open entrance/open exit program. First of all not everyone completes their GED at the same speed so we have to be able to keep them in the program for as long as it takes them to complete the GED. If we didn't they would graduate the culinary program and then they would have little or no motivation to complete their GED. So, we try to keep them in the program for as long as it takes to get their GED.

By circumventing the system through negotiation, this planner succeeds in both helping clients to achieve meaningful employment while raising their basic literacy levels that in turn benefits everyone. Becky realizes that her attainment of education is what has allowed her to seek a second career without the need of monetary rewards and therefore uses this information to assist her clients in having the needed education they require to be successful. Grace tells of how she increased the usefulness of training available to the clients so that the jobs they were able to secure provided a wage that would support their families. She said,

> What we found in the last program we were working with is that while we were trying to transition them from welfare to work they got in jobs that were mostly minimum wage jobs. Is that really a living wage; are they going to survive off that? So, we starting looking at how can we take them to the next level. What can we do to take them beyond this point?

From this training program that once taught clients to work in traditionally female occupations as daycare providers in daycare centers at minimum wage, this planner put in place a course that allows them to become family childcare providers. "Once the participants have completed their

academic training then they will be in an internship study and then we will place them in family

childcare and they have their own business." Grace also wrote grants to give these newly

certified in-home childcare providers, "a $1,500 stipend toward toys and such and to provide

them partial reimbursement for the meals they serve to the children in their care." She went on

to tell me that, "[I] was so impressed with seeing people set up childcare in their homes, in public

housing, it was phenomenal." That assisting clients to be self-sufficient without the need of a

welfare check is the goal of all these women planners who are involved in administering these

programs. Additionally, one can see that neither money nor fame drives these women to help

others and be successful in their professions. A genuine caring for individuals, their

organizations, and their communities is what drives these women to work in partnership as well

as a desire to see the women they work with provide more substantial opportunities for their

children than they themselves were given or were able to give to their own children.

Summary

This section addressed how the program planners bring a genuine passion to their job that

allows them to plan programs that puts the participant's needs at the forefront of the planning

process. In addition, because many of the planner's have experienced similar life experiences

and/or have similar defining characteristics as the individuals they work with, they bring a

unique empathic perspective to the program planning process. The planners related having

caring and empathy for, and with, the participants. They expressed how loving the role they play

within their profession, as well as following a spiritual calling, helps them to define themselves

as individuals both outside and within their occupation.

This section also examined individual defining characteristics that the women bring to

their profession. All of the planners are women and seven are African-American. Six of the

planners have been poor and/or on welfare themselves. These unique characteristics define who and what these women are and illustrate that they bring those unique characteristics into the planning process.

Lastly, program planners help the participants become self-sufficient so that they do not need government assistance as a means of survival, therefore making the programs successful ones for all stakeholders. Because the participants and planners have so many common bonds, the planners realize helping others helps themselves.

Women Program Planners Negotiate for the Interests of the Stakeholders Using Power and Politics

This section discusses the findings based on the second research question. It addresses how women work both within the system as well as behind the scenes to build relationships that allow them the ability to negotiate for collaborative relationships. The planners relate how it takes "going the extra mile" sometimes to get things done, especially when negotiating through the minefield of turf issues. Because all the planners believe they must be present at the planning table, they feel accountability takes being physically and emotionally present at the planning table in order to look after stakeholder interests. The stakeholders of Welfare to Work programs include, but are not limited to: communities, organizations, taxpayers, Welfare to Work program planners, and the clients who attend the programs plus their families. This next section addresses these themes.

The first way planners bargain for the interests of the stakeholders is through collaboration and negotiation. Working both within and outside of the system, the planners demonstrate the necessity for the participants themselves to have input into the programs in which they participate. The planners also contend that welfare training programs are successful

only when extra care is taken to meet the needs of the participants on an individual basis and that

many times this may mean circumventing the system and putting in extra hours of effort.

Assisting welfare mothers to achieve meaningful and self-sufficient employment is the goal of

all of these women program planners. They feel that how that goal is achieved takes looking at

individuals and not just program outcomes based on legislative mandates.

Working Behind the Scenes and Using Relationships to get Things Done.

Attempting to change the system one small way at a time was important to the planners

when they identified barriers to the client's learning that might be outside of the realm of the

mandated program areas. General program expectations, in their simplest form, are assisting

clients in learning a skill that will achieve the result of life-long, self-sustaining employment.

Mandated program components do not include the inclusion of life-skills, self-esteem awareness,

and other such emotional health issues these women know from their own personal experiences

clients need to be successful in everyday living. Furthermore, state funding is not allocated for

these program components. Interestingly, however, every program planner interviewed

incorporates life skill topics into each of their training programs. Mary told me this about her

planning style, "I try to feel that everything that I'm saying or doing is going to benefit [the

clients] because if that happens then the other interests are going to be taken care of anyway

because everybody will have a success story." Mary successfully negotiates within the system to

include her own agenda. Pam, a long-term veteran planner and only woman vice president in her

company, shows her negotiation savvy as she describes how she operates after twenty years of

working with low-income individuals in her very male dominated organization,

> I don't tell anybody anything that I don't produce. If I tell them that I'm going to do
>
> something then I do it. Most of our customers have been in six-zillion programs that

have not worked for them. That's both our rehab clients and our welfare clients, and

they've been disillusioned by all of these do-gooders. Sometimes my staff says to me,

'You can't be that blunt with people.' And I say, 'But if I'm not clear about what I want,

what my expectations are, then how do they know what they are supposed to do?' As a

woman, I have to tell you that that is how I got here. I was given very clear directions

and I knew what to expect; I got what I set out to do.

It may be small, miniscule ways of working within the system to negotiate the needs and

interests of the participants but these planners feel that looking after "the interests of the clients"

means having to circumvent convention at times. It would appear that looking after the interests

of the stakeholders, in whatever manner they have learned from their own experiences, is the

priority. Betty, a DFCS representative, described how one planner operates this way,

They don't go around trying to toot their own horn or anything like that. They do stuff

because again it's not for our approval or our anything. They just do it because it needs

to be done and they have a passion like we do to get our clients employed.

"Bending the rules" to best serve the clients would appear to be a part of the daily routine of

these planners because according to Pam, "looking after the clients is what I get paid to do and

when they say I can't do this or I can't do that and I know it needs to be done, well, I try and find

some way to do it. Sometimes it just seems ridiculous." Working behind the scenes and

establishing predictable relationships allows these women to negotiate for the interests of the

stakeholders using a type of practical and functional power.

As discussed in chapter three, budget cuts have mandated collaboration between partners

in order for programs to stay operational. Lisa described her idea of collaboration as, "getting

people to do what you need them to do and figuring out how to make things go even when you

don't have the money to make it go." The program planners discussed ways of getting more funds such as through grants but most of them, like Kim, admitted they "don't really know enough about that to know how to go about it." An overall consensus was that working with multiple partners who have the same goals not only "eliminates duplication of services [but also] leverages dollars to be able to take the resources that we all have—that little that they might be—and work with them," which was put into the above succinct statement by Sharon.

Becky, who manages a culinary arts program costing around $750,000 per year to operate, discussed how the three partners involved in her program managed to find the funding for such a large project. She said,

> None of the three organizations could afford by themselves to operate this program. So as our funding decreased, we had to go outside of our own agency to maximize resources. Vendors today are looking for these kinds of close collaborations.

Collaboration then might seem to be the key to having better, larger, more effective programs that can serve more clients. And, because collaboration must be negotiated through the use of politics due to the nature of how funding is allocated though federal, state, and local community programs, the planners have to use their political savvy to negotiate for funds. They establish and maintain relationships in order to get things done.

However, when I mentioned it seemed that by collaborating with others planners pressures are lessened because everybody is looking out for the good of the participants and the community I was told by Mary, "Oh my! Collaboration is difficult and there are turf issues." Planners who have programs funded through collaborative efforts all agreed with Sharon who stated that, "meeting on a regular basis and keeping abreast of what is happening in the programs" is one way to minimize the turf issues. Grace stated that, "interestingly, it is much

easier to work through those turf issues at the operational level then it is at the upper-management level." "Working through turf issues" then requires the use of negotiation skills that involve using power and influence to get one's share of the funding allocation. It does take the use of power to negotiate for one's share, which can be "exhausting," even though it has huge benefits for the communities, organizations, and individuals. These women planners use their power to work behind the scene and within the system to build relationships that allows them the collaborative power to negotiate.

Collaborating and negotiating within the system to build relationships. According to Cervero and Wilson (1994, 2006), what planners do can be viewed as a social activity in which people negotiate with each other in determining a programs configuration, function, content, audience, and design. Therefore, they must build relationships. The program planners I interviewed were aware of the negotiations they had to accomplish collaboratively to produce successful programs. Lisa told me, "I have to use negotiation skills because it's a give and take in talking with people and trying to get things done." Sharon followed this line of thought when she said, "Trying to get people to understand what is in it for them [helps me to get what I want] because people usually are motivated to do something if they can see something of value for themselves." These statements and others like them were consistent answers to questions of how the planners used negotiation to get things done. These types of relational negotiations are up-front, straightforward collaborations. The planners realize they interact with collaborative peers in such a way as to gain the concessions they want and need while assisting their cohorts to see the goals they have achieved for their own good.

When I asked the planners during the interview process, "How do you, as a program planner, try to effect change through your programs, both personal change and in the

community?" I received questions for clarification to the question because the planners stated they had, "never really thought about how they got things done, they just did." As I conducted the interviews, I discovered that asking the question as it was written on the interview guide seemed to confuse the participants. Therefore, I asked the question as stated on the interview guide and then, when asked for clarification of the question by all the planners, re-framed the question by asking, "Do you feel you use power and politics to get things done?" In other words, once I re-framed the question and used the words power and politics the participants found their own synonyms to substitute for the two words. Then, the participants began, in some instances, to use the word power in their replies. I discovered these trends as I analyzed the transcripts and feel that rephrasing of the question assisted me in probing for further meaning.

Bobbie, who began by stating she had never been poor but then made references during the interview to impoverished times in her own life stated, "No, I don't like to think I do use power and influence because I don't have power or influence." Bobbie has the authority to request that DFCS terminate a client's welfare benefits for non-participation in her program, which is a huge amount of power over an individual's existence. Bobbie also stated at another point in the interview that, "I make the decisions once I get a contract." This statement also shows this planner has the power to negotiate independent decisions within the system concerning how her program operates. Patricia said, "I'm equating motivation with power" and went on to tell me, "I just think I use respect and I mean that may not be politically correct, but you know you establish credibility with people in the community." Patricia also has the power to control how her program is operated, especially as she is a private-for-profit vendor, as well as request of discontinuation of a client's benefits. These responses were typical of the replies I received to the theme of internal organizational negotiation.

Becky followed the same trend of using other terminology to describe the use of power when she said,

> You have to have knowledge about your community, and one way of becoming
> knowledgeable about your community is getting out and talking to people about what
> their needs are. You can't just look at what their needs are but you also have to look at
> their accomplishments—what are some successes in the community—to be able to
> communicate that and be able to work with people of all levels, from diverse
> backgrounds.

Knowledge is power and taking the initiative to gather and infer the significance of that awareness is a use of power to employ in negotiation with others. Pam also related how she gathered information for use in collaboration when she told me, "You can't sit up in that office in a tower. No, you got to be out there among the people, be able to plan."   All of the planners use power daily "to get people to do what you need them to do." How the planners verbalized this skill of using knowledge to collaborate and negotiate and felt about it was unique and different for each planner. It is clear, however, that negotiation utilizes power to achieve successful collaboration.

Negotiation seemed to be the term that most of these women preferred to use to describe what they did when dealing with clients, DFCS personnel, community leaders, and other planners or individuals with whom they collaborated. I asked Grace, "Would you say that you do have power and influence but that you don't define it that way?" She replied, "I don't [define it that way], because I've never thought of it that way. I always thought of it as establishing trust and credibility. Once you establish that, then people respect you and then that's when you get results." Kim stated, "It is interesting to see how those dynamics go on between [people] in

power situations. Because, you can't be so aggressive that you are a …….well, you can't let them run over you. Then you are thought of as a pushover."

In discussing with Sharon how she might motivate others she stated, "I try to give them options." However, once I changed the wording of my question to, "Do you think it takes having power to motivate?" Sharon told me,

[Power] really isn't [just a set of steps] and you know, I didn't learn that until I went to [my previous job]. And I said, 'oh my goodness the politics that are involved in trying to address the quality of life issues,' was just so unreal to me I could not believe it. And politics are in every factor of what you do.

Becky, who works in a political urban community, told me, "Decisions are based on relationships."   Other comments included, "it is very important to build relationships," "you can't work in isolation," and "you don't really have any decision making power if you are not involved in the process." The crux of the matter is just this—it takes building, maintaining, and the strengthening of relationships in order to negotiate for results that include stakeholder interests in the programs.   Often it takes having the power to reach specific individuals to make this happen. Nevertheless, no matter what words are used to describe the use of negotiation skills, these women use compromise, conciliation, and cooperation daily to get things done based on the stories they shared. They build relationships.

Collaborating, negotiating, and building relationships with and for the clients. Without welfare clients there would be no welfare training programs. That welfare clients bring unique barriers to employment that makes training and job placement difficult is understood by all the planners who work with this population; the planners understand it because they have overcome the same barriers themselves. The program planners also understand that they cannot make their

training programs available working in isolation. All of the programs considered were part of

collaborative efforts that were necessary to provide components the program participants needed

to obtain the skills necessary to achieve employment. Building relationships, rather than

working in isolation, allows the planners to include some of the life skills type training

components into their programs that are not funded through State contracts. Bobbie, a planner

who states she has no "power", told me,

> If I'm asking an adult in the community to come in to be a facilitator, I'm talking about
>
> how that person has information that could help some of the participants become self-
>
> sufficient and that gives that person the sense of having done something worthwhile. It
>
> might be considered politically correct or it might be that that person feels that this is
>
> something that he or she is doing for humanity and has a need to do. So I'm saying here
>
> is an opportunity for you to come in and make a contribution to people who need the
>
> benefit of your expertise in whatever it is.

Bobbie illustrates through this explanation that she possess power. She had the power to

influence others in the community to become socially involved in ways that provide positive

outcomes for others. Besides Bobbie, all of the planners talked about negotiating with others to

achieve an end result of a balanced amount of information that allows the participants to obtain

employment. Even though the words power and politics may not have been used by the

planners, the planners did negotiate for the inclusion of specific individuals and information into

their programs that allowed for maximum exposure to topics they felt from personal experience

were necessary for successful program outcomes. It took the planner's taking the initiative to

foster and guide relationships through the use of negotiation and collaboration to accomplish

this.

Based on specific criteria established by federal regulations such as a participant's age, the age of their children, and other such factors, select welfare recipients are mandated to participant in particular work activities a specified number of hours per week. Some of the recipients are pleased to be a part of the training programs and view their participation as an opportunity. Others, however, view their participation as an endeavor to be endured. Because some welfare clients are unhappy to be a part of the training the program planners must use special skills to not only motivate the participants to stay in the programs but must also clarify for them the consequences of not participating in the training programs. When asked how they motivated the participants to become and stay motivated learners in the programs I received answers such as, "You just have to let the process take hold. You just kind of let it happen and then let them see students who've already graduated come back." Pam told me she tells her students, "Every time you think about your DFCS worker your goal is to get her out of your life. Channel it positive, get a job and you won't need her anymore." Because over half of the planners have been poor and/or on welfare, they understand first hand the importance of motivation to being successful. They build their relationships with the participant based on shared experiences.

Planners discussed that viewing the world through the client's perspective helped them to understand that the client's unwillingness to be a part of the training programs was not just about defiance or rebelliousness. Rather, the planners understand that the clients feel emotions such as "being out of their comfort zone," "intimidated," "overwhelmed," and "scared." Because of this, the planners understand that they have to "advocate" for a safe learning environment so the program participants can, "get their minds right, get focused, get motivated, and start the day."

The planners also understand that without "helping the clients set goals" there will be no life long learning. Mary told me,

> We just talk about all those things that are going to be a barrier. A lot of times people come in blaming and saying they won't let me do this—talking about the welfare office—they won't let me do this or they are telling me this and I'm so sick of them telling this. So I say, 'let's look at how we can get them out of your life. What are some of the things that you most hate about your life? What is it going to take for you to improve those things? You tell me.' That's when I start talking about goal setting. Because people control their outcome, not me. They have to set the goal; they have to buy into the goal.

Mary set her own personal goals and changed from DFCS paying her in welfare checks to "having DFCS pay [her] salary through employment contracts." Allowing the clients to see and understand that the programs are about them, the participants, and that the outcomes are individual goals the clients have to achieve for themselves are just a few ways the planners use power and politics to motivate the participants to take control of their own learning and therefore their own future. They understand relationship building takes empathy and understanding.

Many of the program participants experience unique barriers to employment that they bring to the training programs they attend. Some of these barriers identified by the program planners include "substance abuse," "physical and mental abuse," "a lack of basic skills," and "criminal histories" to name just a few. That these barriers are real obstacles to obtaining self-sufficient employment is an understatement. The program planners are using collaboration and negotiation skills to try and eliminate these barriers for the clients they serve. Sharon told me,

What I've come to realize is that everybody has barriers to employment. Be it a criminal background, be it a lack of skills, be it just the fear of getting out there, everybody has some kind of barrier. And sometimes you need somebody to help you with some of those barriers in order to for you to get to the next step. What I do as a job developer is I work to alleviate some of those barriers. Prime example, if I had somebody with a criminal background, and I know that background is going to keep them out of certain jobs I'm going to try to steer them towards employment that won't take that into account. In addition, I discovered that after a certain period of time when you're back on your feet and you've lived a pretty law-abiding life, you can have your record exonerated; you can have it pardoned. So, there have been several people I've helped with their paper work. It's a free process and I have helped them with their paper work in order to get their records expunged and that's helped with the employment process as well.

This one illustration shows how the program planners "go the extra mile" to help their clients and even though it is not part of their job description they see these duties as, "part and parcel of the package." According to Pam, "you have to get in the nitty-gritty if you want to make it work." It is clear that these program planners have to "make it happen" everyday just to keep their programs running and keep their jobs. They only ask of their clients what they ask of themselves and use negotiation at all levels to make this occur. They work both within and outside the system to negotiate collaborative relationships.

Negotiating turf issues. Eliminating turf issues and making collaborations work to many planners' means, as Patricia stated, "People are willing to give up the power." Pam told me, "There is enough work around here for everyone and I believe there are always going to be turf issues in the community. There are power struggles and so you just try to be the most admirable

partner." For Pam, being the most "admirable" partner, or as she put it, have "integrity," means "at the end of the day I can hold my head high because I know I have done the best job I can do while respecting myself by not stepping on any toes but still getting the job done." Rebecca stated that, "collaborations break down because folks come to the table protecting their turf and their organization without realizing we can all share the credit." Some of these women program planners, like Pam, told stories of partners who wanted the "glory" for themselves and felt that being in a partnership only meant "sharing money." All of the planners nonetheless had good feelings about collaborating with community and allied partners. This is mainly due to the guidelines from state and federal legislation becoming increasingly more stringent. This in turn has made it more difficult to provide services to clients because, as Bobbie stated, there simply is, "no other alternative if you want to operate." Grace told me, "The rules at DFCS are changing and we have to try and stay viable. It's skills, skills, skills; its work, work, work! And so, we're trying to make adjustments to that now." That these new guidelines are making more demands on how the programs operate and serve clients is clear. The planners themselves are more accountable for program outcomes that ever before and as Kim, who has been in her present position for seven years, stated, "Begging forgiveness just does not work anymore." Being accountable, however, is nothing new to these women. As told in their words, "being accountable is something we define for ourselves." They use the knowledge they gain to build relationships through collaborations in order to strengthen positive program outcomes for the stakeholders.

Contracting. Through my interviews and observations, it was clear that individual communities and service delivery areas had working relationships for contracting client services that did not seem to follow any prescribed pattern. There were some counties that were

contracting services on a local level with individual providers such as New Connections to Work, DOL, and their local technical schools. Abby, an administrator who has worked for DFCS for over twenty-five years stated that, "We are not allowed to contract out for services on a local level. We can only spend DFCS money on services that are funded through State level contracts." These contradictions were mainly between the larger urban counties that have numerous educational providers and the smaller rural counties where there are few local providers such as the technical school or DOL. For example, Georgia has a statewide contract with DOL to provide job readiness and placement services to clients. In one of the smaller counties Robbie, the DFCS representative, told me, "The DOL office that we deal with is a little over an hour from here, but a representative comes from that office and meets with clients at a local agency here." When I asked how well that worked Robbie told me, "Our job placements with them are very low and the DOL representative is not really all that familiar with jobs that are available here." In these type instances neither the planner nor the DFCS representatives are able to circumvent, negotiate, or collaborate for the stakeholder's interests. This means that some planners have to work with what they have in an uncertain environment because no amount of political astuteness can be used to change the politics of these types of situations. They are unable to negotiate any positive results from these type collaborative relationships. This frustration is not true for all because Abby, a DFCS representative in one of the urban counties, said this about the services they received from the DOL office located in the same town. "She is dedicated just for TANF participants. There is a joint interest in that she is dedicated to taking care of us. It is in her interest to provide a service because she only deals with DFCS clients." It was apparent from these and similar comments that when there was local contracting for services based on the needs of the clients in the immediate community the job placements were higher

because the contracted services were developed based on local labor needs, not the supposed

needs of the entire State. These very specific examples illustrate that sometimes all the

knowledge at one's disposal cannot be used to negotiate or collaborate, no matter how astute

these planners are.

Contracting for services on the State level also seemed to be an area where there was

little, if any, input from the individuals using the services. For example, Francis, a DFCS

representative, told me a story of her involvement with sitting at the planning table to decide the

needs for a statewide contract for her area. She said,

> I drove two hours for this meeting to renegotiate a contract with one of our statewide
>
> providers and a representative from [their organization] did not show up. This was a
>
> statewide meeting. What we were doing was looking at the existing contract to see what
>
> services we are provided in the area and what we needed in the new contract. This was
>
> months ago and we still have not done anything. I want to do something and our district
>
> manager agrees that it is needed but he told us that right now it is just so political. We
>
> are just sitting here waiting but it has been addressed.

This example of driving a great distance to a meeting where nothing gets done and nothing is

decided is typical of my own former experience at DFCS. PRWORA mandates collaboration

meetings with specifically designated partners at periodic intervals during the year and these

meetings must take place regardless of if a consensus has been reached among the partners for

services. At many of the meetings I attended I found that funding had not even been allocated

and/or specific services had not been decided upon prior to the mandated meetings. My personal

political analysis of these events are collaborated by both DFCS representatives and the program

planners through their stories which are filled with continued examples of how contracting done

on the State level include decisions made "in the best interests of all" that are not necessarily what is best for any one individual community. One might need to consider how the interests of the stakeholders can be considered when negotiation is not an option. If planners cannot build a relationship with others, she cannot negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders.

Going the extra mile. Most of the program planners had some story to tell of how they did "lots with little." Budget cuts were a concern of all the programs and this had an impact on such issues as staff allocation, travel budgets to hold workshops in surrounding communities, and supplies. One real difficulty for the program planners in the smaller, rural areas was getting out in the field to complete workshops without the need to bus clients out of their own communities. Lisa, a planner in a very rural community, told me,

> We have to go out of the county to serve them. It takes two people to get out there and get all this done. I could show you a calendar. I mean it's just about everyday. And then see you have to visit all these places. I don't think there's any way that one person could do everything that we do. Now we can cut some services and one person could do it but there's just something everyday and a lot of times it's out of county.

Another issue was not being able to fill vacancies when staff resigned or being able to hire temporary help. Grace told me this story of how she had to fill-in for a program manager so that the program did not have to be closed down.

> When I first started working here one of the program managers resigned and he was the program manager of the after school program. So, I came to work every day, every morning, all dressed up in my heels and dresses and everything. And then by about 2:00 in the afternoon I'd have to dress down and put my jeans on, put my sneakers on, and my hair up into a pony tail or whatever, and go over to the center and be the program

manager for the [after school program] until I could get somebody in there. But, it's just that you have to do what you have to do. I wasn't going to close the program down because it was a service that those children look forward to and it was needed.

When I asked Grace why she was willing to go the extra mile to make the program work she told me,

I would have to say that my mission and the mission of the organization mirrors in terms of helping people and making sure that people's lives are improved or increased by the services that we provide. I've lived in this community and have always wanted to have some way to give back. A lot has been given to me and so I certainly want to be able to give back to this community in whatever capacity that I can.

This general idea of being able to provide needed programs while stretching every dollar was a repetitive theme of all the program planners. Being able to provide the participants with the programs of most benefit to them required that they keep the main stakeholder's, the participants, needs and concerns at the forefront of the planning process. Because so many of the program planners work collaboratively, they build their relations with others knowing they are collaborating with others who strive for the same goals while facing many of the same barriers and obstacles to planning.

Other ways the planners went the extra mile in order to give the participants a voice was simply by doing tasks they were not required to do but saw a need to do. There were numerous examples of how little things made a huge difference to the students being able to succeed. A typical example of this can be seen in the following illustration of how Mary keeps in contact with the students even after they have completed the program,

We are in constant contact with them. That's one thing that we find that we have to do.
We can't just leave them to themselves because they need a lot of support even if it is just
someone there to encourage them and say you can do this.

One specific example of an employee going out of her way to help the clients was told by
Patricia, the program manager of a nursing program. Because this program is held to stringent
State guidelines due to licensing standards there is little room for failure. Patricia told me,

I believe that [Diane], one of our instructors, really loves what she does and she loves
each and every one of her students, and she helps in as many ways as she can and that's
why we're so [successful]. For example, there's one student who is having trouble with
blood pressure, so what are we going to do? I said, 'Send her equipment home with her,
just whatever. Send her here, send her by here, we'll help.'

Britt told me this story of how she has built collaborative relationships within her community,

We've developed incentive programs because we've gone out and gotten used computers
and the ones that need to be rebuilt, we got them rebuilt so that some of these young
ladies could have computers. We've also developed a clothes closet and [a place they
can go get] furniture. We've even helped some of them move into their own places.

Another example of going outside of their job description to build relationships and help the
clients was told by Lisa, a planner who incorporates topics into the class that are not part of what
DFCS contracts with them to do. She told me,

I think [the citizenship class], for example, was something that was needed and I just
think that even though it was not a vocational thing or a skills thing it really enlightened
some of them and put that information out there. It was interesting and it did affect their
lives and they picked-up on that. And, I am sorry we [are not supposed] do things like

that because I think no one should be able to go in and apply for TANF or anything

without being orientated to knowing what it is really all about.

These women program planners felt there are matters outside of training needs specifically

designed to give the clients skills that the clients need to know in order to obtain employment

that help to "round the person" or to "enlighten" individuals. "Going outside of the box" and

helping the clients to see other ways of living was important to them. Building relationships that

allowed them to collaboratively negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders was essential to

achieving this.

Sitting at the Planning Table

Cervero and Wilson (1996) state "that all people who are affected by the program should

be involved in the real choices of constructing the program, not just called upon as information

sources or used to justify already-made decisions" (p. 22). Program planners do not act alone;

they do not act in isolation. Therefore, it is critical that "different people with varying needs,

wants, and interests meet at the planning table to negotiate whose needs and interests the

program will address" (Cervero & Wilson, 1996, p. 21). It would seem then, that those who are

most affected by the programs be involved in the planning process. This is not always the case.

Both the DFCS representatives and the program planners were asked who should have

been involved or not been involved in the planning process. No individual interviewed felt there

was anyone involved who should not have been at the planning table. Several planners did make

statements like Grace who said, "I can't think of anybody who should not have been involved.

It's just that maybe there are some who should have had more time to be; for example, the DFCS

case manager should have had more time." There were numerous examples of situations where

more input by various individuals and organizations would have been valued by the planners. Bobbie told me,

> I think that DFCS and [the governing agency] have to be a part of it. They are the ones who know the budgets, know the rules and regulations, know how the money has to be allocated and how it has to be spent.

It appears then that being at the planning table is perceived by the planners as necessary to building relationships.

Other examples to the question, "Who should be at the planning table?" concerned the involvement of the clients. When asked if the clients should be involved in planning the programs I received answers such as,

> I think the people that I serve have to be a part of it and I sit down with them at least once a week and ask, 'Ok guys, what are you not getting that you need?' And, I think they have to be a part of it because if we are here to help them be successful and self-sufficient then without knowing what they need you can't very well do that.

Overall, the program planners welcomed input into the planning process from entities such as the community, collaborative partners, civic organizations, politicians, and employers.

When the program planners were asked, "Who has input into the planning process?" most of the participants interviewed stated they had never really thought about who was involved in the process besides themselves. A typical response to the question, "Who planned the program?" was, "I did." As I probed for further clarification to the question some planners said they had sent out surveys to the community to determine the training needs for the area. For instance, Lisa said,

We do our own community needs survey so we can determine where we should be going

as a department and as an agency. How we determine that is that we write to all of our

partners when we do our needs survey and ask them, 'What do you think people need in

your location?' And they send it back to us. And then we come up with what we, as one

agency, can provide.

Rebecca, a planner in a rural community, told me that she sent out a needs survey to all the

businesses in the county that belonged to the Chamber of Commerce. She did this to determine

what the training needs were for specific jobs. Because the Chamber of Commerce is the largest

professional organization in her community, Rebecca realized that this was a simple way to build

collaborative relationships. She was correct in her assessment as the outcome of the survey

concluded that food service jobs are, "one of the most available jobs and it does not require…a

certain level of education." This information resulted in a training program being designed that

taught participants the basics of working in the food service industry and many of the students

went on to obtain employment close to home in food service jobs. Had Rebecca not sought to

bring community leaders to the planning table and build this community relationship, this very

successful training program would not have been undertaken.

When asked who came to planning meetings and who contributed to the broad, as well as

the miniscule, aspects of the planning process the answers were varied. Some planners

mentioned agency representatives such as those from "DFCS," "the State office," "Family

Connections," and the "technical schools." When asked if there was representation from such

fractions as the "Chamber of Commerce, business and industry, elected officials, community

members, and religious organizations," I received varying answers. Robbie, a DFCS case

manager, told me, "I don't know on the state level when they started [this program] because this

was an initiative with Michael Thurmond [the then Georgia Department of Labor Commissioner]

so I can't say on that level if there was any participant or tax-payer involvement." In some

instances there was a huge disparity in the amount of input the planners expected from

community members and the amount received. Based on the participant's responses, I feel it is

clear that the program planners in the smaller communities worked collaboratively with only a

minuscule number of individuals in planning programs and that the larger counties were much

more accountable for funding sources and therefore had numerous individuals involved in the

planning process. This disparity is because there are just not enough individuals physically

available in the smaller communities to participate in community planning while in the urban

counties there is a larger population and therefore more individuals available to involve

themselves in public affairs. This inconsistency of collaboration in turn may affect whose

interests are negotiated.

Once the topic of stakeholder involvement was raised, planners in the smaller

communities made statements such as Lisa's who said,

> I do think that people from the chamber should be there. I think it would be nice if some
>
> of the commissioners, county commissioners, were present. And I think it would be
>
> important to have other agencies that we already partner with, that we already work with,
>
> like Family Connections and like DFCS. I think it would be important for people from
>
> [the local] technical school to be there, like the adult literacy teacher. And well, actually
>
> from all of those programs. I think there should be a representative from the schools.

Rebecca, another planner from a small community, said this about a typical planning process,

> No input, not in planning, not from the community. I work with the Department of
>
> Labor. I work with the University of Georgia's Cooperative Extension representatives so

we have facilitators from both of those to come in and we sort of coordinate because they understand what the mission is, what we are doing, and then I will recommend that they do some things or they will recommend and we come to some conclusion, that kind of thing. So in that sense you can say that they are helping to plan.

Other planners, mainly those in the urban counties, felt that involvement by those in the community was imperative to planning successful programs and gave numerous examples of planning meetings with extensive involvement. Sharon told me,

> Yes, yes, yes, it is important to build relationships. You know, when we make decisions about what we are going to do in the community we always involve the city government, county government, and there is always going to be DFCS, the Department of Labor, the Chamber of Commerce, and see you have to have a really good mix also. It has to be private sector, public sector, the religious sector. Everybody needs to be there or somebody can easily offend someone if not. I think those are the relationships that I have to build and I think the other thing is that you do need to be sincere. Those relationships [from my previous position] carried over to this position or over to this job and I think that is being in partnership because all of the programs that we provide here, we are doing it in partnership with some other entity. It's not [just this organization] alone.

Grace, another urban program planner, explained the importance of having as many community members at the planning table as possible this way,

> One of the things we do in any assessment process is go out and talk to persons who will be affected by the programs and activities that we are providing. So, we're hoping that we are affecting change by the services that we provide. And we are hoping that even more so because we have involved the community in the planning process.

Whether there is a difference in the type of programs and program outcomes based on the amount of individuals at the planning table is debatable. The smaller, rural counties were at times able to provide programs such as Rebecca's food service program that was a unique need for that community alone. However, in Robbie's rural county they were unable to utilize the Department of Labor very much due to a lack of community knowledge by the DOL representative. As in all things, the planners simply make the most of the resources they have and attempt to use those resources in the best way they can.

The DFCS representatives stated that the program planners negotiated first for the interests of the clients but did so by allowing for community input into the programs. All the DFCS representatives gave examples of planning meetings between themselves and the program planners and all indicated that communication was ongoing on a daily or weekly basis. When the DFCS case managers and the program planners had a great deal of communication there seemed to be more individuals involved in the planning process. The DFCS supervisors also appeared to have more knowledge of resources based on upward and downward internal communication. Robbie, a DFCS representative, had this to say about a program run by veteran planners,

> They come from an environment that was working with our participants so they know what other services we need so I think they really fight for our participants with the services offered within their organization. We sit down and talk to them at least once a week and generally by phone every day.

When asked who else "fought" or negotiated for the client's interests in the programs all of the DFCS representatives interviewed seemed to find the question puzzling and difficult to answer. They expressed they had, "never really thought about it," and that they, "just relied on the

[program planner] to provide quality training programs without question." These statements would suggest that some communities are less political than others and therefore the negotiation process takes different forms. However, regardless of the size of the service delivery area all the program planners made attempts to build relationships and used their political skills to do so. They also were very aware of what they could and could not change within the system they operated in.

Being present at the planning table. The program planners interviewed sit at the table because they understand that if they do not provide input into the planning process they will not have "ownership" of the programs they administer. Britt told me, "You have to be politically astute." She expounded on this by saying, "You have to be a change agent and look to [others at the planning table] in terms of how they are impacting the community." This political statement emphasizes that the planners understand the critical need for negotiation and relationship building, especially at the planning table. The planners gave numerous examples that showed you have to be a part of the planning process if you want to, "advocate for your organization, the community, and your clients." Sitting at the table for these planners gave them a, "voice in what was going on" and several planners stated in some manner that, "if you are not there then decisions will be made without you and those may or may not be the decisions you want to have made." These statements show being present at the planning table is a critical component in negotiating for the interests of the stakeholders.

The DFCS representatives also felt that sitting at the planning table was extremely important to producing quality programs, "that result in rewarding, self-supporting employment for the clients." Most stated that gathering individuals together was difficult. Abby summed up the view of the DFCS representatives when she told me,

It is hard, it's very hard. It's hard. Now we do meet once a month try to work with other

collaboratives—we meet with all of our local partners. And, we give out the

information. It started for the purpose of working with and sharing information, how

we're going to help the people to kick the TANF habit. It's now changed into a

hierocracy. It's now changed into where every agency that comes talks about what is

going on in their agency—not necessarily directed at what it can do, what's their input,

or how they're doing with welfare, with TANF.

The planners and the DFCS representatives all stated that while it was difficult to get individuals

from different organizations together to provide input into the process it was "crucial" to do so

and "foolish if you don't" build and cultivate relationships.

Even though the urban county planners and the rural planners had differing amounts of

input by others into the planning process they all agreed that building relationships was the key

to having influence to negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders. Becky, an urban planner,

told me,

In this community a lot of decisions are based on relationships. It's very important that

you are at the meetings and that you are at the table because if you are not then you really

don't have any decision making power, you are not involved in the process. And, before

you know it you are almost alien to what is going on in the community and decisions are

being made for you.

This concept that if you were not physically present at planning meetings to voice your opinion

and to provide input into the planning process was well understood by all the planners

interviewed. Sharon stated it very simply when she said, "One of the things that I learned that is

very important is building relationships. That's very, very important." There were differences in

the amounts of input from other individuals and there were differences in the kinds of input

received in each program studied but all of the participants understood that, "you just have to be

there in terms of impacting the community." Whether the relationships were inside one's own

organization or outside in the community all of the participants interviewed stated in some

manner that, "You can't make decisions in isolation."

Being accountable at the planning table. Because there are numerous levels of

accountability, the program planners have to be aware of who the stakeholders are and strategize

to incorporate all voices into their decision making processes. Some examples of "voices"

include "the State office," "DFCS," "my immediate supervisor," "the clients," "people in the

community," "the funders," and "allied agencies." Even though there was an overall ability to

make independent decisions regarding much of the content contained in the programs there was

accountability built into the end results of the programs. Such factors as meeting the minimum

participation rate set by the federal government and overseen by DFCS, the number of job

placements, and the retention of the clients into the jobs they secured were all of concern to the

program planners. In addition, there was accountability based on how many participants are

served by the programs and a self imposed accountability based on how well the clients

performed in the programs.

A basic concept understood by all the planners was that you have to be accountable to

your organization to continue to draw a paycheck. All of the programs studied are funded by

State dollars in some manner. Because PRWORA encourages collaboration between State

agencies such factors as employment placement rates and diminishing welfare caseloads are used

to determine a program's effectiveness. Therefore, administrators of the agencies that provide

Welfare to Work training programs have a vested interest in seeing these programs succeed

knowing that funding is many times based on program performance. Sharon told me,

> I send accountability reports to [my supervisor] on a regular basis to let him know what
>
> I'm doing. And I do that so that if I'm not doing what they want me to do then I can
>
> change it at that point. And the great thing about this is that it keeps me on track as an
>
> accomplishment of my goals.

Each planner stated they were accountable to a higher layer of management within their

respective organizations. Some strategies the program planners shared for in-house

accountability include, "I have leeway in making the changes but I run it by [him]," and "I do my

calendar on email so everybody gets it." In these cases, stakeholder accountability is in the form

of organizational responsibility.

There were also examples of State and regulatory accountability. Patricia, who provides

CNA training, told me, "We're governed by Georgia Health Partnership….They come in and

look at our files….usually every six months to a year. We keep files for five years." The DTAE

planners are governed on a State level by several layers of administration. Lisa explained it by

saying,

> For job development my supervisor is in Atlanta. He is with DTAE. The coordinator of
>
> New Connections to Work comes under [a vice president here], and under [her boss] is
>
> the Vice President of Economic Development and she is also under the executive Vice
>
> President. I also work with [several people just at the] Technical College. There are
>
> guidelines that are set by DTAE at the state coordinator's office and that is a New
>
> Connections to Work office that you work under. So you pretty much have your
>
> guidelines.

Sharon described her layers of accountability by explaining,

> Our administrative offices are in Atlanta and that is where my boss is. We do have our
> board of directors, a state-wide board of directors, because we have services throughout
> the state of Georgia. So we try to make sure that our board is representative of the
> geographical area that we serve. And we receive our funding from federal, state, and
> local governments to whom we have to be accountable.

Interestingly enough, with all these layers of accountability within and outside of the immediate organizations the program planners all stated they had flexibility in their decision making process. A few examples of this included "So you pretty much have your guidelines and you can flex and you know there's a lot of flexibility," and "that gives you a lot of latitude in making decisions."

Being accountable for the client's interests. According to the program planners, accountability to the program participants was as much a part of the planner's responsibility as was organizational responsibility. In addition to allowing the participants a voice at the planning table, being accountable to the participants meant being "honest," "upfront," "real," and "not cutting them any slack." When discussing substance abuse all the planners stated they had, "zero tolerance." Becky, who initiated drug testing as a mandatory component of her program, stated, "This is basically a program of last resort." Becky allowed the participant's voice to be heard at the planning table for something she knew from past experience was critical to the participant's success. In this sense, Becky negotiated indirectly for the stakeholder's interest although the directly impacted stakeholders themselves might disagree.

Pam, who provides job training for recovering drug addicts, abused women, and mentally handicapped individuals, told me,

It's all about tough love. When we start to drug test, if someone comes to us and says

I'm going to test positive, I smoked a joint last night, or I took a drink, or I took a hit of

crack—if they come to us and tell us they're going to test dirty then we refer them to

drug treatment with the option to come back into the program at the conclusion of the

drug treatment. They have to start all over again. They can't come back where they left

off.

By the program guidelines allowing the participants a second chance, this possible need was

addressed for the participants during the planning process. When I asked Pam how she dealt

with these program participants she said,

I say to them, 'you have a choice of staying here because [this agency] has no clout and

if you don't want to be here that's fine because we have other people out there who do

want to be here. But if you decide that you are going to come it is not going to be easy

because you are going to get the feed back maybe that nobody else told you about. That

you need to look a certain way, you need to act a certain way, and unfortunately, those

are your choices. You may not like the choices, but this is all I got.' And some people

respond to that and some people don't. However those who don't, tend to come back a

year later, six months later, two years later.

All of the program planners interviewed felt it was imperative to be "honest" with the clients

they served because, "if they do not know what the expectations are then they won't know what

they need to do to stay here." The planners used the only power they have at their disposal to

negotiate for the clients and that is their use of empathy and the fostering of participant

relationships. The planners also stated they had to have a positive attitude that each participant

could complete the program. Patricia described her philosophy by saying

I do believe you have to care and I think you have to have faith that we have put all the

right elements into the program to make it possible for people to succeed including tough

love. And then I think we have to believe that they can succeed.

Accountability to the participants then would seem to be an important aspect of a successful

program and without an encouraging and optimistic attitude by the planners themselves there

will be no positive attitude by the participants to succeed in the programs. This relationship

building is the foundation that allows the program planners to negotiate with the participants in

having their voices recognized and heard.

I asked the program planners if they allowed the participants to have specific input into

the training program. Most of the program planners felt that it was imperative to have client

input like Kim who said, "We've learned from our students what services they need, what their

issues are, what issues are generalized to every student or most students." Mary told me,

…even though I have a schedule sometimes the schedule gets thrown out the window just

depending upon what is happening that day because [the students] can change things all

around just from what they bring to the table and we need to address.

Lisa told me this story of how one topic was being taught in a program and how discussions in

the classroom lead to learning in another area.

Somehow or another the conversation led to the stock market, and let me tell you they got

interested in the stock market. In fact, we got a chart in there where we charted some

stocks for a week or two and they got all into that.

Most of the planners stated they allowed for exploration of issues within the context of the

educational content because it was critical to allow participants, "to have a voice in their own

learning." Allowing the participants to have a voice is part of the relationship building process.

I asked the program planners how they specifically allowed the participants to have input into the programs. Grace described a childcare program that was in the middle of its first class. She said,

> And so we are listening to the ones who are in class now, getting feedback from them on what else do you need, what else can we do to help you? That kind of thing. So, we are getting feedback from them, preparing for the next class.

Lisa explained it this way,

> I encourage the students when I am here to let me know their names, and to let me know what their experience is in the program. It is really through the students that we have learned how to build this program.

However, getting the clients to speak up for themselves can be difficult and frustrating the planners said. Rebecca described it this way,

> It is extremely hard because they think that if they advocate they will lose what they already have and they are not willing to give it up. They are not going to lose anything and they don't understand that. They will gain, if they, you know, workers of the world unite.

Allowing for participant input into the planning process and helping them to understand how to negotiate for their own interests is customary procedure for these planners.

Three of the planners, however, adhered to a strict regimen within the classroom but allowed participant input into the program content in other ways. For instance, Patricia operates a training program for CNA licensure that is held to very stringent State licensing guidelines that does not allow for flexibility in the curriculum. When asked if the clients were allowed input

into the program, Bobbie, one of the other two planners, said, "It has pretty much been established, especially with the skills training." Rebecca, the third, told me,

> Actually they mostly plan graduation. They plan the graduation sequence. Some of them even get up and sing. They usually have a little something for themselves special. The very last night of class we give them the final grades, and that's pretty much their night. We'll either go out to eat or we'll have a play here, or I think one group even, we went on [a cruise ship]. Just something special and they plan that.

In these instances the students had little control over the program content although they were allowed input into small, inconsequential aspects of the program planning such as the graduation plans. However, as unremarkable as these small concessions may sound, it is important to note that the voices of the participants do get heard and that the participant's ideas are utilized to the extent possible within the constraints of the planning process.

Summary

This section addressed how the planners work within the organizational context of program planning to negotiate for and with the clients to provide programs that meet the needs of all concerned stakeholders. By negotiating within a system of politics and power, as well as negotiating with the clients themselves, the planners are better able to circumvent the obstacles they face during the planning process. The planners are able to achieve an end result that motivates them to continue advocating for the participants and also allows the participants to become successful through their own hard work. The obstacle, however, is how to look after the interests of the stakeholders when negotiation and collaboration is not an alternative.

This section also addressed how women use power and politics to impact the planning process. Although these women understand you have to be a physical presence at the planning

table, these women also understand they have to work behind the scenes to make their programs work. Guiding relationships at the planning table are organizational, community focused, and for the program participants. The planners must be accountable to the organizations they work for, the communities they live in, and accountable to the participants they serve. They realize that the welfare population brings many barriers to employment and that these barriers are manifested in attitudes as well as tangible obstacles. That these women program planners go outside of their written job descriptions to assist their clients in alleviating these barriers is unquestioned.

Chapter Summary

This chapter began by first documenting how a woman's gender impacts power relations within the organizational process of program planning. The first question addressed the defining characteristics shaped by the planning process of women program planners. In this section the question of why the planners choose their professions was addressed. The planners stated that they felt caring and empathy for the participants, that helping a program participant to achieve self-esteem was important to them, and that they loved what they did.

The first section also discussed the very unique and individually defining characteristics that the women bring to their professions. Seven of the program planners were African-American and six of them had been on welfare or had been poor at some point in their lives. These characteristics affected how these women defined themselves and clarified how and why they advocated for valuable and meaningful employment training programs for the clients they serve. This section also addressed the role of being a woman and how their gender impacted the planning process. Lastly, this section discussed how helping the program participants become

self-sufficient though meaningful employment is why the program planners go outside their job descriptions to make things happen.

The second section of this chapter addressed the second research question and discussed how women negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with the emphasis on power and politics. Two main themes were constructed. First, women program planners use negotiation and collaboration to advocate for organizational and community change. The planners operate within the organizational context of their planning communities in order to advocate for the interests of the stakeholders. The planners negotiate outside and within the system. Additionally, women program planners use collaboration to assist them in navigating through the turf issues and through the minefield of contracting with other entities to fund programs. They accomplish this by building relationships.

The remainder of the second section discussed how women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders. The importance of being physically present at planning meetings was addressed and how being politically astute within one's community was necessary for looking after the client's interests and seeking change within the system. The section also addressed accountability at the planning table and discussed the advocacy of the program participants needs as a priority within these contexts. The clients are the reason for the programs and addressing the real issues they bring to the programs was the main focus of this section.

Chapter five will discuss the conclusions and implications of the data addressed in this chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine how women program planners design programs for predominately women learners in Welfare to Work programs. The following questions guided this research: 1) How does a woman program planner's gender-based understanding impact power relations within the organizational process of program planning? and, 2) How do women program planners negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders with emphasis on the power and politics of the process? The specific purpose of this study was to understand the process women use when planning programs for women. How women program planners negotiate for inclusion of women's learning into the educational or training context using power, interests, and politics was also considered.

In order to answer the above questions, eleven women program planners who had an understanding of their own decision-making style in the process of program planning were interviewed. For this study, the purposeful sampling criteria required that the program planners: (a) be women that had a minimum of two years experience as vendors for the State of Georgia producing training programs that provide job skills training to welfare recipients, and (b) be developers and/or implementers of the programs. By choosing such a specific target group I gained insight into a phenomenon about certain select individuals without the need to generalize all such individuals (Patton, 1987). In selecting my purposeful sample I also included women program planners who serve individuals in both rural and urban areas. By choosing individuals who live and work in varying locations of the state of Georgia that have differing and unique populations I feel I was able to achieve geographical variation.

The program planners interviewed had an average of five years experience in her current position, an average of ten years experience in working with adult education programs, an average of thirteen years experience in working with low-income individuals, and an average of twelve years experience working in the area of program planning. All earned an undergraduate degree and six completed a master's degree. Seven of the program planners were African-American and four were Caucasian. Six of the program planners had been on welfare or described themselves as having been poor. At the time of the study, the average salary range of the women was $31,000 - $51,000 per year.

Five DFCS (Department of Family and Children's Services) representatives, individuals who worked with the program planners and had direct knowledge of how they planned programs, were also interviewed. Of the five representatives, three of the individuals were case managers and two were supervisors and all worked in the employments services unit. Three of the DFCS representatives were African-American and two were Caucasian.

The data collection methods used in this qualitative study included both interviews and field notes. A semi-structured interview process was used which consisted of open-ended questions. Interviews were held in the participant's office and/or instructional setting where the training was held. Each DFCS interview was conducted in the individual's office located in their county of employment. All interviews lasted from one hour to over two hours in length. The shorter interviews were with the DFCS representatives and the longer interviews were conducted with the program planners. The program planner interviews were longer as they included tours of the training facilities.

The field note system used included both reflective and descriptive field notes (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Rossman & Rallis, 1998). The reflective field notes taken included my

interpretation of what was said and not said during the interviews, associations between what was learned in the program planners' interviews with what I was told by the DFCS representatives that worked with them, and my observations of the dynamics of the participant's training and office environment. The field notes also integrated my ideas for themes and associations between the data gathered. The descriptive field notes taken included observations such as the attire of the participants, the physical setting of the interview environment, and observed interactions with co-workers and students at the site of the interviews.

Research Conclusions

Based on an analysis of the findings, two conclusions were drawn which show women educational program planners shape the structure and content of the programs they plan and administer. The gender of the program planner is one factor that affects the planning process. Because people bring individual ideas of desirable educational program content to the process based on prior experiences, these factors directly affect how women program planners negotiate for the inclusion of women's learning into the educational or training context of the programs they plan. Two conclusions were drawn from this study. They are: 1) Women define themselves based on past experience which gives them a basis for contextualizing the work and striving to change lives through shared understanding; and 2) Women program planners use relational negotiations to get things done. These conclusions are addressed in the following sections.

Women Define Themselves Based on Past Experience which Gives Them a Basis for

Contextualizing the Work and Striving to Change Lives through Shared Understanding

The planners share individually defining characteristics that personify them within the planning process. They possess personal gender-based domains that intersect with socially

constructed beliefs. These domains include the way the planners experience empathy for the

participants, feel it is necessary to foster self-esteem in the participants, have an internal need to

give back to society, and exhibit a passion for the job that is instrumental in accomplishing

established goals. The women also possess unique social and organizational domains that bring

a distinctive decision making style to the planning process based on who and what they are as

individuals. Race, economic situations, gender, and life circumstances all affect the planning

process. Because the planners interviewed were women, feelings for the clients that are unique

to women understanding women affected the way the planners got things done. Women's

identity and self-esteem were interrelated with the class, cultures, and ethnic groups to which

women belong and therefore women develop differently and express their gendered identities

differently (Flannery, 2000). Further, the planners are part of an ongoing social construction that

dictates how they continually use their prior knowledge and past experiences to perform the

work they do.

The planners have in-common experiences and beliefs with the women they serve. The

planners understand being a single parent, being poor, and/or living in a male dominated society.

They understand being a woman in today's culture. Due to these understandings, the planners

know from shared experience many of the same concerns facing the women they work with and

therefore are able to accurately recognize the internal orientation of their students. The planners

empathize with the participants.

According to Gold and Rogers (1995), empathy is accurately perceiving the internal

frame of reference of another person. Empathy is an unselfish trait and "empirical researchers

have found that gender differences in empathy commonly indicate that women have higher

levels than do men" (Toussaint & Webb, 2005, p. 675). And even though recently there have

been a significant number of studies by researchers such as Baumeister (1993) who claims self-esteem is not linked to one's behavior, Slater (2004) states,

> Self-esteem, as a construct, as a quasi religion, is woven into a tradition that both defines and confines us as Americans. If we were to deconstruct self-esteem, to question its value, we would be, in a sense, questioning who we are, nationally and individually. We would be threatening our self-esteem (p. 16).

Because the women believe positive self-esteem is a determination of life-long success, having empathy for the participants results in the planners having compassion and understanding with the life situations of those they work with and they use this awareness as a form of power to plan programs to best serve women learners.

Cervero and Wilson (1994) draw on the literature of Apple (1992) and Isaac (1987) to define power which they state very simply as, "the capacity to act, distributed to individual planners by virtue of the enduring social relationships in which they participate" (p. 119). The planners use empathy as a means of power to raise the self-esteem of the participants and do this in the hopes that by showing they both intellectually and emotionally comprehend the barriers the participants face, they can raise an awareness of self-worth within the participants. Because so many of the planners interviewed for this study have been in many of the same circumstances as those they serve they give more than "lip service" to their actions and communications with the participants. When the program planners are women they learn how to interact with others and learn what place and power they have in various groups of societies (Hayes & Flannery, 2000). This study produces a strong conclusion that empathizing with the participant's life situations is the planner's motive for serving a role that addresses esteem needs of women.

Planners perceive negotiating for subject matter as essential program content, even if not traditionally prescribed, allows them to make program planning decisions they feel will positively impact the outcomes for the participants upon completion of instruction. This set of behaviors the planners bring to the job resonates in a social support for the participants that acknowledges she is valued and cared for by others (Barnes & Duck, 1994.) By using tactics that address critical issues of social justice, the planners feel "the comfort and emotional support people receive from others thus helps them to feel better, relieves hurt and stress, and improves life quality" (Burleson, 1994, p. 6). By the planners defining themselves in society based on their own pasts they attempt to raise the participant's self-esteem.   They are able to situationally place themselves in much the same emotional and social contexts as the participants and encourage them to make life-altering changes to better their lives and the lives of their families. By doing such things as including necessary, non-vocational type subjects in the program's content without consideration of negative, government-regulated ramifications, the planner's actions confirm the research that shows "the culture of the classrooms that women experience as adult learners can also strongly influence their self-doubt or lack of confidence in their learning abilities" (Hayes & Flannery, 2000, p. 73). Research validates that the planners measure their success by how well they positively impact the lives of those they work with even when the measures they take are not sanctioned ones.

The planners in this study use self-esteem measures to enhance the learning environment by including basic life skills type subjects in the curriculum of the programs they administer, even though topics such as self-esteem awareness is not a prescribed part of the State's training models. Flannery (2000) states that women are agents in fostering their own self-esteem and cites studies showing that even working-class women have quit education and training programs

that were regimented and rigid. The planners understand they must be flexible in their inclusion of program content, even though they are not motivated by research that bears out the beliefs they hold. The planners profess no formal educational knowledge that self-esteem and success have a direct correlation but they all feel that individuals must have internalized self-worth in order to succeed. Recent research is showing that successful business women understand the importance of economic self-sufficiency and share an interest in helping others achieve financial independence, says Rosemary Mitchell, executive director of the Women's Foundation of Genesee Valley (Hall, 2005). These women planners know this to be true and their actions confirm research concerning women's learning. For example, the planners all made reference to the fact that raising the self-esteem of the participants allows the clients to transcend their self-doubt and view their lives in a positive way that promotes emotional growth and life success. The planners feel that societal defined success begins with internalized positive self-perception and demonstrate through their planning process that "women are agents in fostering their own self-esteem as well as developing their own identities" (Flannery, 2000, p. 68).

Baird's 1994 study of single women on welfare shows that distinctions are made between school learning and common sense and this distinction relates to their identities as learners (Flannery, 2000). Because of this identity formation by welfare recipients, the planners know that how women view themselves as learners impacts their learning experiences and therefore their future individual and societal defined success. Our "subjective understandings of the world are different yet interconnected" (Sheared, p. 31, 1994) and therefore the planners realize they must foster self-esteem within the participants that allows the clients to understand their unique knowledge of the world is valuable and useful. The literature concerning women's learning was congruent with the research findings of this study.

Due to the empathic nature of the program planners interviewed, the women I spoke with in conducting this study said they feel a strong need to give back to their communities and society. "Both women's sense of self and women's sense of morality are integrally connected to issues of responsibility toward and care for other people" (Flannery, p. 61, 2000). The planners all feel that by instilling a sense of community awareness in the participants they work with that the participants will find self-fulfillment and therefore grow toward self-sufficiency. Research (Hale & Holly, 2005; Conover, 1994), for example, has been shattering stereotypes about female philanthropists by showing that women give to charities to make a difference so they tend to give to influence social decisions. The planner's words echo research such as that conducted by Schwartz, Patterson, and Steen (1995) that states although money represents security, it is secondary to the need for emotional connectedness. Women have a need to give to promote social causes, feel this giving promotes self-esteem in others, and feels that the raising of self-esteem is essential to life-long success. This reoccurring finding of this study confirms research in this arena.

The planners interviewed bring multiple layers of personality and unique personal facets to the planning process that impact their decision-making and their decision making style. They are part of a specific social order in society based on their gender; they embrace a definite culture in society, and hold an economic position set by traditional standards. Their goal as adult educators is to find ways to recognize and acknowledge the voices of each student and to do this, they understand the information they proffer is grounded in a political, social, historical, sexual, racial, and economical context that is distinct to all of us (Sheared, 1994).

Seven of the eleven program planners interviewed were African-American and this caused these women to view their worlds through a different lens. In a (2001) study conducted

by Merriam, Lee, Kee, Ntseane, & Muhamad, they found power and positionality go hand-in-hand when it is recognized and acknowledged that we live in a race-conscious society. Additionally, African-American women "produce a teaching philosophy based on a history of marginalization" (Brown, Cervero, & Johnson-Bailey, 2000, p. 16). Therefore, it is not surprising that the African-American planners interviewed for this study detailed how their race affected the planning process when working with some women. This might be because most adult educators reflect a white, middle-class culture that perpetuates an interpretation of their interactions with minority groups from their own cultural context (Amstutz, 1994). Because the African-American planners possess a distinctive empathy for some clients based on shared common experiences within society they are better able to address issues of racism. "Phyllis Safman (1988) identifies a link between feelings of control and women's self-esteem as learners, particularly for women of Color and economically disadvantaged women" (Flannery, p. 73, 2000). This shared connection between the African-American participants and the clients they work with reinforces the research that shows a correlation between lack of experience with and sensitivity to other races that manifests itself in adult education programs.

Another way these women program planners define themselves within the program planning process is through a shared lens of poverty with those whom they work with. Six of the planners interviewed have been poor and this allows these women to identify and understand the views the participants bring to their approach to living and coping in society. Identity refers to who a woman is and how she identifies herself while self-esteem is the positive or negative evaluation a woman gives to her identity (Hayes & Flannery, 2000). High self-esteem, then, defined quite simply as liking yourself a lot, holding a positive opinion of your actions and capacities, is essential to well-being (Slater, 2004). Because these women planners have

experienced poverty they understand first hand that compassion and empowerment are vital keys to self-sufficiency and feel these factors are critical components in the learning environment. "Women develop and gain a sense of identity in a context of connections with others rather than through individualization and separation from others" (Flannery, 2000, p. 60). Because the planners understand this, they know that diversity of women's lives and as well as their learning should be recognized as much as the similarities that are brought to the educational environment (Hayes & Flannery, 2000). Social support occurs in a variety of contexts and may be direct or indirect but is a part of how women learn. The planners use shared experiences to alleviate the discomforts and fears they were forced to deal with and assimilate from their own pasts and incorporate this learning into the curriculum.

While these women program planners acknowledge that being African-American and/or poor defines them in the context of program planning, surprisingly being a woman is not considered by many of the planners to be a defining characteristic of either their profession or being. "Like forms of consciousness rooted in race or class, gender consciousness may also carry a cognitive evaluation of the group's sociopolitical disadvantage" (Rinehart, 1992, p. 14). However, since these women practice "gender unconsciousness" their planning decisions illustrate a lack of awareness of sex differences within society although they did share anecdotes that showed gender issues were apparent in the planning process. Bierema (2005) defines gender consciousness as the "measure of the degree to which individuals and organizations recognize how gender differences create privilege for men and oppress women" (p. 214). This calls attention to the research of feminist theorists who feel that women are marginalized in our society (Bartholomew & Schnorr, 1994; Parsons, 1990; Lindsey, 1994) and therefore should seek to end gender differences. However, since these planners do not view gender as an issue in

the decision making process it is not illustrated within this study that specific decisions concerning women's needs are a "recognized" part of the planner's negotiation tactics. This phenomenon of gender unconsciousness that is demonstrated within this study substantiates Bierema's (2005) research of women's networks which bears out the unexpected conclusion that women who express an awareness of gendered power relations and regularly challenge the culture are few.

Even though most of the planners did not see a woman's gender as defined by society a factor to consider as part of the planning process, all of the planners developed a clear conclusion that planning for women is unique and challenging. Because the planners all work with a specific population, gender defining issues such as being a single parent and the head of household require negotiation on behalf of the planners to achieve meaningful educational experiences for the clients. Those who are marginalized by such factors as race, class, ethnicity, age, and sexuality measure their gender identities against those of a dominant group (Kimmel, 2000). The dominant group is defined by the individual and for some women just attending an adult education program enhances self-esteem because it gives them the socially acceptable status of "student" and legitimizes them in the eyes of society and reduces their feelings of inadequacy (Gorback, 1992). Real issues the clients bring to the educational setting require specific views of program planning strategy. The planner's stories collaborate the research that shows the culture of the classroom strongly influences how the program participants feel about themselves and influences their future success.

In summary, the words and actions of the women planners studied for this research project show a clear pattern that they define themselves based on past experience. The planners are able to contextualize the work and this allows them to change the lives of the participants

though the use of empathy in several ways. The planners have shared life experiences with the participants that permit them to unconsciously place the needs of the students at the forefront of the planning process. By placing the participants needs first, the planners are able to provide training programs that deal with the "real" concerns brought to the classroom and allows them to negotiate through the political minefield of issues that are abundant in any planning environment.

Women Program Planners Show a Clear Use of Relational Negotiations to get Things Done

The second major finding of this study is that women program planners work behind the scenes and use relationships to negotiate for stakeholder interests. This conclusion is congruent with the Cervero and Wilson's (1994, 2006) framework of program planning that shows when individuals work in any organizational context they act within relationships of power in order to get things done. "Recognizing that people have 'power' means that they have a certain 'capacity' to act, rooted in a specific socially structured relationship" (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, p. 85). The planners interviewed for this study understand the real need to collaborate and negotiate in order to build relationships within the system. By building relationships with the participants, their peers, and organizational leaders, the planners understand that it is easier to work within the system, to circumvent the system, and to change the system. Within this effort to collaborate and negotiate the planner's observed actions and words again validate Cervero and Wilson's (1994) ideas because the planners understand that "the form and content of any educational program are expressly a function of who negotiates what interests in what context" (p. xiii). The planners related that "bending the rules," negotiating based on relationships, and collaborating to obtain needed program components is vital to successful program outcomes. And, without building relationships the planners realize they cannot promote the needs of the

stakeholders and therefore achieve positive program outcomes for the participants. The planners demonstrate a clear conclusion that they use relational negotiations to get things done.

Within the arena of the organization itself, the planners established conclusively that to negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders they must also negotiate "turf issues" that arise from the chaotic worlds they work in. Cevero and Wilson (1994) state, "planners construct educational programs from the judgments they make in this messy everyday world" (p. 4). Constraints such as budgetary concerns, inclusion of desired program content, and turf guarding by other entities are just a few of the concerns managed by the planners. For example, government regulations can inhibit the freedom of planning content and therefore building relationships within the community, with other organizations, and peers is necessary to collaborative program planning where the needs of the participants get met. In order to change the world the planners work in they go the "extra mile" to do what they feel has to be done to meet the needs of the stakeholders. Negotiating organizational issues through the use of relationships to achieve goals was a reoccurring conclusion.

The planners noted that helping the clients to achieve positive employment is a difficult task. "Between 1994 and 2001, the nation's welfare case load was reduced from 5 million to 2.1 million families" (Platt, 2003). However, because many of the women the planners work with have an unstable history of employment for example, the planners realize that changing the client's perspective on life is a barrier that must be overcome through innovation within the planning process. Many programs that were a part of TANF and allowed recipients to attend educational and training programs have been eliminated (Platt, 2003). Critics of welfare legislation state that there are barriers to TANF recipients obtaining employment that are not addressed and have real negative consequences for all of society. This is substantiated

throughout the interviews conducted for this research project and show a clear use of relational power by the planners to configure the structure and design of the educational programs they administer.

According to Goldberg (2002), Gueron (1995), and Sweeney (2000), there are three realities with this welfare reform legislation that must be addressed. One reality is that many families remaining on welfare have issues that hinder them from achieving gainful employment such as problems with substance abuse, physical or mental problems, domestic abuse, and physical or mental health issues. While not mandated nor sanctioned to do so, the program planners incorporate course content into their programs to address these issues. The planners first identify the needs they as women have had to satisfy in their own lives and then adapt their program planning styles to benefit the population of the learners by incorporating issues specific to women's learning into the program content. This means that the planners develop, implement, and seek approval in both direct and indirect ways to incorporate explicit learning into the programs they administer through the use of negotiated power relations .

The planners all related stories of stretching dollars, circumventing the constraints of the system, and going outside of the realm of their job duties to get things done. Because the planners actively collaborate with peers and community leaders that share the same goals and aspirations for their clients, while facing many of the same barriers, the planners build relationships with organizational counterparts who seek to attain the same objectives. These women work with and for women and thus Gilligan (1982) proposes the main goal of women's development is an effective balance of self-nurturance and care for others. Research conducted by Merriam and Caffarella (1999) state judgments are not made in isolation and working with a

diverse mix of individuals as these planners do defines the context of how they respond within their environments.

One way the planners build relationships is at the planning table. Program planners do not act alone and they must work collaboratively in order to accomplish goals. The planner's awareness that their physical presence at the planning table is critical to shaping valuable and meaningful programs confirms the literature. Cervero and Wilson (2006) state a relational analysis must take place where education does not stand outside the unequal relations of power that more generally structure social life but rather educational programs are structured by these relations and play a role in reproducing or changing them. These women program planners are aware that "to assess how a concrete planning situation is socially and politically constructed and how their relationships of power can be exercised to nurture substantively democratic planning" (Cervero & Wilson, p. 127, 1994) they must be "there." These planners validate the use of Cevero & Wilson's planning table metaphor (2006) by showing they fully understand that "exercising power" means they must be physically, emotionally, and intellectually attuned to what to say and do in planning situations. Being present at the planning table allows the planners to have a voice in the planning process and allows them to build the necessary relationships required to collaborate for program content. A reoccurring conclusion from the research shows that the planners comprehend it is essential to be physically present at the planning table in order to negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders.

Just being present at the planning table, though, was not enough for the planners. They know that you have to also be accountable at the planning table if you are to negotiate for the stakeholder's interests. "If planners are to nurture a substantively democratic planning process in situations marked by conflicting interest and asymmetrical relationships of power, they need to

use strategies that will give all legitimate actors an equivalent voice in constructing the program" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 129). This idea validates the third idea of Cevero and Wilson's (2006) planning table metaphor that states "ethical commitments define who should be represented at the table" (p. 85). The planners discern they have multiple layers of accountability and must strategize to incorporate all voices into the planning process. Being accountable to the organization, the participants, and to society demands awareness of who the stakeholders are and recognition of what is at stake for all. One of the most recognized needs of accountability for the planners is to the participants and this assertion was present throughout the study.

Relational Negotiations with and for the Participants

The planners deemed being accountable to the participants as important as organizational and community accountability. While building relationships within the community is critical to positive program planning efforts, the planners feel building relationships with and for the program participants is equally vital. This conclusion shows the planners understand working in isolation or in an "ivory tower" will not lead to meaningful and useful training programs being established. Looking after the needs of the clients through collaboration and negotiation is looking after the needs of the organization and benefits all of society. "Negotiation occurs when a course of action is chosen through the social interactions among people, regardless of whether they have similar or conflicting interests" (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 157). The planners feel it is imperative to establish expectations, be honest, and demand accountability in order to satisfy the needs of the participants. Building and fostering relationships is the key to providing for successful program outcomes for the stakeholders.

The planners fully understand they must negotiate and collaborate with the participants in order to initiate and guide the participants to achievement-oriented goals. Specific examples of this phenomenon are illustrated in the planner's stories of participant motivation practices as well as in stories of organizational negotiation maneuvers. Due to the constraints the clients impose on themselves, the planners realize that viewing the world through the lens of those they serve is important in establishing appropriate relationships that are mandatory to changing attitudes and beliefs of individual self-worth. "Those involved in planning educational programs exercise their power in accordance with their own specific interests and the interests of others they represent" (Cervero & Wilson, 2006, p. 88). For example, because the planners work with other women they understand conversational rituals learned by girls and maintained by women tend to focus more on the connections dimension (Kendall & Tannen, 2001). Because the planners understand this they attempt to build relationships with the participants they work with by various means. Planners must attempt to improve the quality of the business enterprises in which they work and one way they do this is by addressing racism and sexism in social relationships (Cervero & Wilson, 2004). The planners demonstrate they do this by looking after the welfare of those they serve through educational programs.

In summary, the program planners work both outside and within the system to establish a program planning environment that allows for negotiation of stakeholder interests. Using power to negotiate and collaborate for stakeholder interests, while working within an organizational context of program planning, is part of what the planners do everyday. The women program planners interviewed for this study show a obvious conclusion they understand establishing, fostering, and guiding relationships within the messy world of program planning is vital to successful program outcomes.

Implications

This study revealed the interests of the program participants, peers, and society drive the decisions women planners make when planning educational programs that have consequence. Empathy, nurturance, the fostering of self-esteem, and a genuine caring of individuals are equally vital ingredients women bring to the process. Women have both personal gender-based domains as well as social and organizational domains that allow them to change lives through shared experiences and this contributes to their program planning decisions. Women program planners work in a messy world that must be negotiated through and around in order to provide inclusion of women's needs into the practice. Because these women allow their voices to be heard this study contributes to the literature of women planning for women.

This study also contributes to the literature base of program planning theory. Cevero and Wilson (1994, 2006) bring a needed, fresh approach to program planning theory that shows individuals cannot work in isolation in order to make feasible, workable decisions that positively affect society. Looking at how women make planning decisions charts a strategic direction for future research that can look at how women may make social planning decisions not considered to be essential to their male counterparts. This study opens a door for the possible inclusion of best practices that can be shared with other scholars and used to make best decisions in the disordered world of program planning.

Finally, this study shows that although Welfare Reform legislation has been successful in assisting thousands off the welfare rolls, it might be doing so at a very high price to women, families, and society in general. Negative, long-term impacts can result when the goal is in someone getting a job, getting any job, which may not pay a living wage for a family but does meet federal and state legislation requirements. Critics of PRWORA might be right. Are we

asking too much when we seek to change a family's way of thinking and living with a short-term training program that only addresses the immediate goal of employment but does not "fix" the foundation of the family's social and economic existence?   I feel that the inclusion of issues specific to women such as those identified by female physicians who have tapped their experience as a woman by helping to widen the boundaries of medicine, ushering in consideration of violence, poverty and other social conditions as health issues (Marquis & Writer, 2000) must be addressed. It is my hope that this study will assist program planners of both genders to consider that vocational skills are only learned and successfully utilized when an individual's mind is open to obtainment of their personal, highest reaching potential.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

 This study showed that women negotiate for the interests of the stakeholders through the use power and politics and revealed that women negotiate for the inclusion of women's learning into the educational or training context of the programs they plan. These finding raise issues for future research.

One issue is that there is a gap in the literature. Various studies have been conducted using the Cervero and Wilson (1994, 2006) model of program planning (for example, Archie-Booker, 1996; Carter, 1995; Hendricks, 1996 & 2001; MacLean, 1996 & 1997; Scott & Schmitt-Boshnick, 1996). Until this research project, there have been no studies that have specifically addressed women in the role of program planner as this one does.   "There is a great deal of literature on women as learners and the role of gender in education, but very little of this work has been incorporated, directly or indirectly, into planning theory" (Sork, 2000, p. 174). Cervero and Wilson's (1994, 2006) program planning framework represents a shift in theorizing about program planning and it is my hope that this study addressing women in the role of program

planner adds to the literature base and assists in clarifying how women use power, politics, and negotiation in the planning process. Further studies of women in the role of program planner could help to clarify how women use power and politics in specific ways when making program-planning decisions.

The second gap in the literature concerns the inclusion of women's learning in the educational environment. Because planners of educational programs may inadvertently consider male and female students differently it must be recognized that women's experiences and continuity with the past must be incorporated into the design process to allow for identity formation and conceptions of developmental maturity (Chodorow, 1974; Douvan & Adelson, 1966; McClelland, 1975; Tanton, 1994). Therefore, training for a predominately female population, especially the welfare population, must be designed and structured so that women are able to maximize the differences they bring to the learning environment thus women's learning is placed in a context that includes such elements as their past and present social positions, culture, diversity, and past experiences in educational settings.

Although reports show that the emphasis of short-term job readiness training programs have "reduced the welfare rolls from 4.4 million people in 1996 to about 2.7 million today,…it has too often lead welfare recipients into short-term jobs, with little chance for advancement" (Hardi, 2000, p. 1). This has resulted in women remaining in jobs that continue to keep them firmly entrenched in gendered employment roles. Further, a thoughtful look at the job placements of welfare recipients into the workforce revels a "stark mismatch between many welfare recipients' skills and the skills required to get, and successfully perform in, the 'good' jobs the new economy is creating – jobs that lead to self-sufficiency" (Carnevale & Desrochers, 1999, p. 1). This lack of understanding of how work programs can be designed to be more

effective in assisting welfare recipients in achieving sustained employment and financial independence, as well as assist in examining other factors that contribute to this problem, is also an area for further research.

A final consideration for future research would be to track the program outcomes of the individual programs studied. Although state and federal guidelines mandate that the employment status of program participants be tracked for up to one year this only gives a view of what one county, one DFCS worker, or one program planner may have accomplished statically. If programs, identified as curriculum that provide meaningful training to participants that results in long-term self-sufficient employment, were tracked this information could assist in developing best practices for future programs. The information gleamed from these programs could also provide a basis of research for scholars to use in determining how women use power, negotiate politics, and promote interests in specific ways when making program-planning decisions. Specifically, it is thought that the findings of this study could be disseminated to those in the field for use to inform their practice and provide adult educational programs that not only moves recipients from welfare to work, but that are also effective in assisting these individuals to achieve sustained, life-long employment and financial independence.

<div align="center">*Summary*</div>

This study shows conclusively that a woman's gender influences the planning process in unanticipated ways. Women use prior learning experiences to make everyday judgments concerning what they feel is "right" and "just" to include as educational components in learning environments for specific populations. Women use more than prescribed measures to plan educational programs and, in fact, use emotion and a somewhat unexplainable way of thinking as

tools to plan. By defining themselves based on their own past experiences, these planners reveal they use their personal history as one of their most potent weapons of negotiation.

Final Thoughts

This research project was both an educational and personal journey for me. I have always felt that hard work and endurance are all anyone needs in order to achieve the goals they desire in life. I have, in some hidden corner of mind, been aware that if I were a male I would be much further in my professional quest to attain specific goals. I have also acknowledged that my white, middle-class background has been a positive attribute in my interactions with others of all races and cultures. However, it was not until I completed the research for this project that I realized I was truly unconscious of both my gender and my race as it relates to how I view society and act and react to daily personal and professional nuances. Without the tools I was equipped with from birth, my race and my socio-economic background, I would never have had the courage to think I was capable of obtaining a doctorate degree from a prestigious institution such as the University of Georgia. I would also not have the confidence to "skate" through life with a minimum of regard for those who have less privilege based on their birth circumstances.

I realize that the "system" is not set-up to help everyone and not everyone is fortunate to come from a culture that advocates success for women or those born into poverty. I realize that the welfare system as we know it is not as helpful as our politicians would have us think. It is my hope that this research will touch all individuals and allow them to view other's life situations with a more compassionate lens. Getting a job is not the cure for poverty and no amount of lobbing in Washington will make that a reality. We all must take a stance that indifference is the same as not caring. We all must take responsibility for the success of those who have a genuine desire to make a better life for themselves and their families. Just like the

program planners interviewed for this study, we must all allow some type of positive spiritual

compassion to guide us in making daily decisions that affect those we meet so that our universe

is a better place for all.

REFERENCES

Abramovitz, M. (1997). Temporary assistance for needy families. In *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed., 1997 supplement, pp. 311 - 327). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Abramovitz, M. (1995). Aid to families with dependent children. In *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed., pp. 183 - 192). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Adams, K. & Lofaro, L. (1995). Define middle. *Time*, 145, (7), p. 16.

Archie-Booker, D. E., Cervero, R. M. & Langone, C. A. (1999). The politics of planning culturally relevant AIDS prevention education for African-American women. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 49, 163 – 175.

Ayvazian, A. & Tatum, B. D. (1996). Can we talk? It's time for a new conversation on race in America. *Sojourners*. January/February, pp. 16-19.

Barnes, M. K. & Duck, S. (1994). Everyday communicative contexts for social support. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of Social support: messages, Interactions, relationships, and community,* (pp. 175 – 194). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Bartholomew, C. G. & Schnorr, D. L. (1994). Gender equality: Suggestions for broadening career options of female students. *School Counselor*, 41, (4).

Baumeister, R. F. (1993). *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard.* New York: Plenum Press.

Bierema, Laura L. (2005). Women's networks: A career development intervention or impediment? *Human Resource Development International, 8, (2).*

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Borland, K. (1991). "That's not what I said": Interpretive conflict in oral narrative research. In S. B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*, (pp. 11 – 26). New York, NY: Routledge.

Braus, P. (1991). Will boomers give generously*? The Washington Monthly,* pp. 44+. Retrieved January 6, 2007, from http://sirs.com

Brody, Celeste, M., Fuller, Kasi A., Gosett, Penny P., Moscato, Susan R., Nagel, Nancy G., Pace, Glennellen, & Schmuck, Patricia. *Gender consciousness and Privilege.* New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Brown, A. H., Cervero, R. M., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2000). Making the invisible visible: Race, gender, and teaching in adult education . *Adult Education Quarterly*, 50, 273 – 289.

Brown, L. S. (1993). *The politics of individualism: Liberalism, liberal feminism and anarchism.* Cheektowaga, NY: Black Rose Books.

Burleson, B. R. (1994). Comforting messages: Significance, approaches, and effects. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of Social support: messages, Interactions, relationships, and community,* (pp. 6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Carnevale, A. P. & Desrochers, D. M. (1999). Getting down to business: Matching welfare recipients' skills to jobs that train. *Policy and Practice of Public Human Services*, 57, (1).

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (2006). *Working the planning table: Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing, and workplace education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1996). Negotiating power and interest in planning: A critical perspective. In R. M. Cervero & A. L. Wilson (Eds.), *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*: *What really matters in adult education program planning: Lessons in negotiating power and interests,* (pp. 81 – 91). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1996). Who sits at the planning table: Ethics and planning practice. *Adult Learning*, 8, 20 – 22.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1994). *Planning responsibly for adult education: A guide to negotiating power and interests.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1994). The politics of responsibility: A theory of program planning practice for adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 45, 249 – 268.

Chodorow, N. (1974). Family structure and feminine personality. In M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Eds.), *Woman, culture and society*. Alto, Cal.: Stanford University Press.

Collard, S. & Stalker, J. (1996). Women's trouble: Women, gender, and the learning environment. In R. Hiemstra (Ed.), *Creating environments for effective adult learning,* (pp. 71 - 80).

Davis, M. D. (1997). The black woman in America: Defining our future. *Emerge Magazine,* pp. 38-43.

Dean, J. P., Eichhorn, R. L., & Dean, L. R. (1969). Establishing field relations. In G. J. McCall & J. L. Simmons (Eds.), *Issues in participant observation: A text and reader*, (pp. 68 – 70). New York, NY: Random House.

Delamont, S. (2002). *Fieldwork in educational settings: Methods, pitfalls, and perspectives.* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Douvan, E. & Adelson, J. (1966). *The adolescent experience*. New York: Wiley.

Forester, J. (1989). *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley. CA: University of California Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder.

Friedan, B. (1974). *The feminine* mystique. New York: Dell.

Goldberg, H. (2001). *Improving TANF program outcomes for families with barriers to employment.* Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

Glaser, B. G. (1969). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. In G. J. McCall & J. L. Simmons (Eds.), *Issues in participant observation: A text and reader*, (pp. 216 – 228). New York, NY: Random House.

Glaser, B. G. & Staruss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Gold, J. M., & Rogers, J. D. (1995). Intimacy and Isolation: A validation study of Erikson's Theory. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 35, pp. 79.

Gorback, K. F. "Going Back: A study of Women Re-entering Adult Education through Greater Avenues for Independence." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1992.

Grassley, C. (2001). *Education accelerates earning power.* Washington, DC: EDCH Press Releases.

Grubb, N. W., Badway, N., Bell, D., Chi, B., King, C., Herr, J., Prince, H., Kazis, R., Hicks, L., & Taylor, J. C. (1999). Toward order from chaos: State efforts to reform workforce development systems. (MDS-1249). Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Grumet, M. & McCoy, K. (1997). Education: Discipline analysis. *Women in the Curriculum.* Baltimore, MD: National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

Grumet, M. & Stone, L. (2000). Feminism and curriculum: Getting our act together. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32, 183 - 197.

Gueron, J. M. (1995). Work programs and welfare reform. *Public Welfare*, 53, (3).

Hardi, J. (2000). State and federal governments urged to improve training of welfare recipients. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46, (24).

Harrison, B. & Weiss, M. (1998). Workforce development networks: Community-based organizations and regional alliances. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hayes, E. (2000). Creating Knowledge About Women's Learning. In E. Hayes & D. Flannery (Eds.), *Women as Learners: The significance of gender in adult learning,* (pp. 217 - 245).

Hayes, E. & Flannery, D. (2000). Women's Learning: A Kaleidoscope. In E. Hayes & D.

    Flannery (Eds.), *Women as Learners: The significance of gender in adult learning,* (pp. 1

    - 22).

Hedges, E. (1997). Getting Started: Planning curriculum transformation. *Women in the*

    Curriculum. National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

Johnson, A. G. (1997). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia, PA:

    Temple University Press.

Judy, R. W. & D'Amico, C. (1997). *Workforce 2020: Work and workers in the 21st century*.

    Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Kates, E. (1999). Public assistance and workforce development. *Connection: New England's*

    Journal of Higher Education and Economics, 14, (1).

Kaufman, L. (2001, October 6). From welfare to work, and then, to what? *New York Times*.

    Retrieved October 11, 2002, from http://www.nytimes.com.

Kazis, R. & Kopp, H. (1997). Both sides now: New directions in promoting work and learning

    for disadvantaged youth. Bost: Jobs for the Future.

Kellner, L. A, Haddad, D. & Forcier, A. G. (2001). "She even walked the dog": The roles of

    relational context and goal-setting in a welfare to work program. *The Qualitative Report*,

    6, (3).

Kelly, G. P. & Nihlen, A. S. (1996). Schooling and the reproduction of patriarchy: Unequal

    workloads, unequal rewards. In D. H. Kelly (Ed.), *International Feminist Perspective on*

    Educational Reform: The Work of Gail Paradise Kelly, (pp. 41 - 59). New York:

    Garland Publishing, Inc.

Kendall, S & Tannen, D. (2001). Discourse and gender. In Schifrin, D., Tannen, D, &

    Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis,* (pp. 548-567). Malden,

    MA.: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Kimmel, M. S. (2000). The Gendered Society. New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Kinsler, K. (1997). CUNY Panel: Rethinking the discipline. *Women in the Curriculum*.

    Baltimore, MD: National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*: *Andragogy vs. Pedagogy.*

    New York: Association Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1950). *Informal Adult Education.* New York: Association Press.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated*

    approach. (2nd ed). New York: Addison- Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand

    Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.

LeCompte, M. D. & Preissle, J. ((1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational*

    research. (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Lindsey, L. L. (1994). *Gender roles: A sociological perspective* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ:

    Prentice Hall, Inc.

Loughlin, K. A. & Mott, V. W. (1992). Models of women's learning: Implications for

    continuing professional education. In H. K. Baskett & V. J. Marsick (Eds.), *New*

    Directions for Adult and Continuing Education: *Professionals' ways of knowing: New*

    findings on how to improve professional education, (pp. 79 – 88). San Francisco, CA:

    Jossey-Bass Publishers.

MacGregor, S. (1994). *Feminist approaches to planning thought and action: Practical lessons form Women* Plan. Unpublished masters thesis, Queen's University of Toronto.

Marquis, J. (2000, March 10). A Huge Dose of Change. Los Angeles Times. Retrieved January 5, 2007, form http://losangelestimes.com

Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. Philadelphia, PA: RoutledgeFalmer, Taylor & Francis, Inc.

McCall, G. J. & Simmons, J. L. (1969). *Issues in participant observation: A text and reader*. New York, NY: Random House.

McClelland, D. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In M. L. Anderson and P. H. Collins (Ed.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology.* (pp. 76-87). New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). Assessing and evaluating qualitative research. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis.* (pp. 18 – 36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20, 405-416.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. & Simpson, E. L. (2000). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults* (2nd ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Mitchell, M. & Jolley, J. (2001). *Research design explained* (4th ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt

   College Publishers.

Mizen, P. (1998, Summer). 'Work-welfare' and the regulation of the poor: The pessimism of

   post-structuralism. *Capital and Class*, 65.

Negrey, C. (2001, Summer). Job Training under welfare reform: Opportunities for and

   obstacles to economic self-sufficiency among low-income women. *Georgetown Journal*

   on poverty, Law and Policy, 7, (2).

Parsons, S. F. (1990). Feminist challenges to curriculum design. *Studies in the Education of*

   Adults, 22, (1).

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park,

   CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

   Publications, Inc.

Platt, T. (2003). The State of Welfare: United States 2003. *Monthly Review*. Retrieved

   February 5, 2007, from https://.sirs.com.

Rahder, B. L. & O'Neill, K. (1998). Women and planning: Education for social change.

   Planning Practice and Research, 13, (3).

Retrieved December, 12, 2003, from http:quickfacts.census.gove/qfd/states/13/13051.html

Rinehart, Sue T. (1992). *Gender consciousness and politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rossman, G. B. & Rallis, S. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative*

   research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Sandercock. L. & Forsyth, A. (1992). A gender agenda. *Journal of the American Planning*

   Association, 58, (1).

Scott, S. M. & Schmitt-Boshnick, M. (1996). Collective action by women in community-based

    program planning. In R. M. Cervero & A. L. Wilson (Eds.), *What really matters in adult*

    education program planning: Lessons in negotiating power and interests, (pp. 69 - 79).

    San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, J. & Murray, B. (1997). Fast food and welfare reform. *U. S. News and World Report*,

    123, (7).

Sheared, V. (1998). *Race, gender, and welfare reform: The elusive quest for self-*

    determination. NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Slater, Mariam K. (1979). Language, sex and gender: Does la difference make a difference? In

    J. Orasanu, M. K. Slater, & L. L. Adler (Eds.), *Annals of the New York Academy of*

    Sciences (pp. 121). New York, NY: Academy of Sciences.

Sork, T. J. (2000). Planning educational programs. In A. L. Wilson & E. R. Hayes (Eds.),

    Handbook of adult and continuing education, (pp. 171 – 190). San Francisco, CA:

    Jossey-Bass.

Sparks, B. (1999). Critical issues and dilemmas for adult literacy programs under welfare

    reform. In L. G. Martin & J. C. Fisher (Eds.), *New Directions for Adult and Continuing*

    Education: The Welfare-to-Work Challenge for Adult Literacy Educators, (pp. 15 – 28).

    San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sweeney, E., Schott, L., Lazere, E., Fremstad, S.,Goldberg, H., Guyer, J., Super, D. & Johnson,

    C. (2000). *Windows of opportunity*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy

    Priorities.

Tang, T. L. & Smith-Brandon, V. L. (2001). From : The endorsement of the money ethic and
the work ethic among welfare recipients, welfare recipients in training programs, and
employed past welfare recipients. *Public Personnel Management*, 30, (2).

Tanton, M. (Ed.). (1994). *Women in management: A developing presence*. New York, NY:
Routledge.

Toussanit, L. & Webb, J. R. (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between empathy and
forgiveness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145, (6).

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.* Chicago: University of
Chicago Press.

U. S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *2000 State and County Quick Facts*. Retrieved December 18,
2003, from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd//states/13/13051

United States Department of Labor Women's Bureau. (n.d.) *Women, work, and wages: How to
get the job and pay you want*. Retrieved December 13, 2001, from
http://www.dol.gov/dol/wb/public/wb_pubs/www.htm

Vidich, A. J. (1969). Establishing field relations. In G. J. McCall & J. L. Simmons (Eds.), *Issues
in participant observation: A text and reader*, (pp. 78 – 87). New York, NY: Random
House.

Walker, D. F. (1971). A naturalistic model for curriculum development. *School* Review, 80, 51
– 65.

Zweig, M. (2000). *The working class majority: America's best kept secret.* Ithaca, NY:
Cornell University Press.

APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM

Primary Participants

I, _____ agree to participate in the research titled "Women Program Planners: Negotiating for Interests" conducted by Sandy L. Jennings from the Department of Adult Education at the University of Georgia under the direction of Dr. Laura Bierema, Department of Adult Education at (706) 542-6174. I understand that I do not have to take part in this study if I do not want to participate. I can discontinue my participation at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have all of the information about me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The purpose of this research project is to determine how women program planners negotiate power, politics, and interest in designing programs for predominately female learners as part of training programs for welfare recipients.

If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:
1. Respond to several open-ended questions in an interview of approximately one hour in duration concerning how I use power, politics, and interests in the program planning process.
2. Participate in an audiotaped interview of approximately one hour.
3. Supply a copy of my job description.
4. Supply a copy of my curriculum design for the training program.
5. Complete a sociodemographic data questionnaire.
6. Allow other individuals who are familiar with my work to be interview concerning how I get things done.

While there are no direct benefits to me for participating in the study, it is hoped that I will enjoy this opportunity to share my experiences and stories with the researcher. Studying how women program planners create adult education and training programs will aid in the future development of programs that address women's concerns and provide a research base for addressing inequities in the learning environments of welfare training programs.

No discomforts or stresses are anticipated. Likewise, no risks are expected.

All information concerning me will be kept confidential. No information gained from me or any other participant will be shared with others except in a way that cannot be recognized as coming from me. If information about me is published, it will be written in a way that I cannot be recognized. However, research records may be obtained by court order. The information generated will be used for academic research and publication. All written documentation and documents will be kept confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my written consent. All audiotapes and transcriptions will be destroyed within three years of after the dissertation defense.

PAGE 1 OF 2

The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project (706-353-9828).

I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.

_____ _____
Signature of Investigator/Date   Signature of Participant/Date

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Francis A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

PAGE 2 OF 2

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

Key Informants

I, _____ agree to participate in the research titled "Women Program Planners: Negotiating for Interests" conducted by Sandy L. Jennings from the Department of Adult Education at the University of Georgia under the direction of Dr. Laura Bierema, Department of Adult Education at (706) 542-6174. I understand that I do not have to take part in this study if I do not want to participate. I can discontinue my participation at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have all of the information about me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The purpose of this research project is to determine how women program planners negotiate power, politics, and interest in designing programs for predominately female learners as part of training programs for welfare recipients.

If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:
1. Respond to several open-ended questions in an interview of approximately one-half hour in duration concerning how the program planner I work with uses power, politics, and interests in the program planning process.
2. Participate in an audiotaped interview of approximately one-half hour.

While there are no direct benefits to me for participating in the study, it is hoped that I will enjoy this opportunity to share my experiences and stories with the researcher. Studying how women program planners create adult education and training programs will aid in the future development of programs that address women's concerns and provide a research base for addressing inequities in the learning environments of welfare training programs.

No discomforts or stresses are anticipated. Likewise, no risks are expected.

All information concerning me will be kept confidential. If information about me is published, it will be written in a way that I cannot be recognized. However, research records may be obtained by court order. The information generated will be used for academic research and publication. All written documentation and documents will be kept confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my written consent. All audiotapes and transcriptions will be destroyed within three years after the dissertation defense.

The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project (706-353-9828).

I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.

_____   _____
Signature of Investigator/Date   Signature of Participant/Date

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Francis A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Primary Participants

Miscellaneous data:

1. How does your organization try to effect change through its programs, both personal change and in the community?

2. How do you, as a program planner, try to effect change through your programs, both personal change and in the community?

3. What are your required job duties?

4. What is your agenda in your work?

Program planning process:

5. Please describe a typical program you have recently planned and developed and tell me about its purpose.

   a. Who were the people involved?

      1. What were their titles and roles?

      2. Who were you accountable to for your decisions and what degree of freedom did you have in making decisions?

      3. How do you delegate tasks?

   b. How many participants were involved?

      1. What were their titles and roles?

      2. How were they referred?

   c. Who do you feel should have been involved, or not been involved, in planning the program? Why?

   d. Were there any particular interests you looked after?

   e. How long did you have to plan the program?

   f. What resources, both financial and otherwise, did you have to use?

   g. Was there anything unique or different you encountered or were experiencing when planning this program?

6. How were you able to get things done?

7. What were you able to influence how things got done?

The inclusion of women's needs into the program content:

8. How did you create an environment in which individuals wanted to do their best?

    a. In what ways did the participants help to plan the program?

    b. How did planning for this specific group affect your planning process?

    c. How did the participant's mandatory participation affect how you planned the program?

9. What kind of things did you do to accommodate the differences the participants brought to the classroom? (i.e. race, class, social status, etc.)

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Key Informants

Miscellaneous data:

1. What does your organization accomplish through its programs in the community?
2. What is your goal toward this effort?
3. What are your required job duties?

Program planning process:

4. Please describe a successful program that the program planner you work with recently planned and developed and tell me about its purpose.
    a. Who were the people involved in the planning process?
    b. How well do you feel the program planner delegated tasks?
    c. Who do you feel should have been involved, or not been involved, in planning the program? Why?
    d. Were there any particular interests you feel the program planner looked after?
    e. Was there anything unique or different about this program?
    f. What specific methods did the program planner use to make this a successful program?
5. How do you feel the program planner used power or influence to get things done?
6. How do you feel the program planner used negotiation skills to get things done?

The inclusion of women's needs into the program content:

7. How did you feel the program planner created an environment in which individuals wanted to do their best?
    a. How do you feel planning for women affect her planning process?
    b. How do you feel the participant's mandatory participation affect how she planned the program?
8. What kind of things did the program planner do to accommodate the differences the participants brought to the classroom? (i.e. race, class, social status, etc.)

APPENDIX E: DFCS AUTHORIZATION LETTER

Jim Martin, Commissioner
Juanita Blount-Clark, Director

DHR

Georgia Department of Human Resources • Division of Family and Children Services, Two Peachtree Street, NW, Suite 19.490, • Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3142 • Phone: (404) 65U8409 • Fax: (404) 657-5105

August 28, 2003

Ms. Sandy L. Jennings
137 Amanda Court
Athens, Georgia 30605

Dear Ms. Jennings:

This is to certify that we are approving your request to interview certain individuals who are employees of the Department of Family and Children's Services. The employees are those who work with, supervise, and/or plan programs for welfare recipients with the intent to assist them in becoming self-sufficient and independent from cash assistance. This approval is valid for one year.

I understand that the purpose of your study is to determine how women program planners negotiate issues of power, politics, and interests in designing programs for predominately female learners in Welfare to Work programs.

Sincerely,

Steven E. Love, Deputy Director Division of
Family and Children Services

SEL:mw

APPENDIX F: SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC DATA QUESTIONNAIRE
Primary Participants

1. What is your job title? _____

2. How long have you worked here? _____

3. What formal/non-formal education have you completed?

     a. GED or High School Diploma

     b. Associate Degree Major: _____

     c. Bachelor Degree Major:_____

     d. Masters Degree Major: _____

     e. Doctorate Degree Major: _____

4. How long have you worked:

     a. In the area of adult education? _____

     b. With low-income individuals? _____

     c. In the area of program planning? _____

5. What is your age?

     a. 21 – 30

     b. 31 – 40

     c. 41 – 50

     d. 50 - over

6. How do you describe yourself? _____

     a. _____ American Indian or Alaska Native
     b. _____ Asian
     c. _____ Black or African-American
     d. _____ Hispanic or Latino
     e. _____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
     f. _____ White

7. Have you ever been on welfare/poor?

     a. Yes

     b. No

8. What is your salary range?

     a. $20,000 - $30,000

     b. $31,000 - $40,000

     c. $41,000 - $50,000

     d. $51,000 – over