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Abstract

This work examines the use of community outreach programs by professional sport and arts organizations located in Columbus, OH, and their utility in generating perceived public value for these organizations. The study uses a sample of four organizations, the Columbus Blue Jackets, Columbus Crew, Columbus Museum of Art, and Opera Columbus. This sampling provides equal representation for both fields and allows for the pairing of organizations for analytical purposes. Additionally, the opportunity for interactions and the sharing of knowledge between these organizations and fields is explored, retaining outreach programs as the area of focus.

The study has been conducted using both document analysis (drawing on a body of documentation that includes web sites, playbills, and game programs) and interviews with the individuals charged with overseeing and administering the outreach efforts of the four included organizations. The study is structured as a multiple comparative case study, presenting the information for each organization and using that data as a platform for deriving meaningful findings and conclusions.

Upon analyzing the available data for these four organizations, the conclusions that have been arrived at are that these organizations make use of a variety of methods to generate the perception of public value and that there does exist reasonable opportunity for knowledge sharing and interactions that could prove mutually beneficial. It remains unclear, however, if the organizations could actually be compelled to do so.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

This project was conceived in the basement of a bar. During a night out drinking with a friend, I lamented the fates of several failing arts organizations. When arts organizations hit a slump, they tend to lose public support and face the threat of folding. When the same thing happens to sports teams, I noted, the public maintains its support (albeit in a begrudging state) and the organizations are quick to make drastic changes to reverse the situation. My friend said that was true, but that it was not fair comparison as comparing sports and the arts was akin to comparing apples and oranges. I responded by pointing out that there are any number of similarities between the two fields\(^1\): adoring fans, superstars, organizational structures, operations, etc. My friend then asked why it was, if the fields were in fact so similar, that the two fields were not working together. For this question I had no answer. There was not a particularly good reason for the two fields to act as mutual exclusivity, but it occurred to me that looking into this could yield applicable, meaningful, and helpful findings for both sports and the arts. As a sign of appreciation, I picked up the tab.

This discussion highlighted for me an underlying issue in the city of Columbus: while the city has strong “scenes” in both sport and the arts, the two seem to exist in

\(^1\) In this work, the word “field” is used to refer to sport or the arts on the whole. Individual components of each field (such as hockey, opera, or soccer) are referred to as “disciplines.”
opposition to rather than in conjunction with each other.² Each is a vital component of
the city’s culture, but the lack of interaction between the two prevents the development of
a cohesive cultural concept within the city. As an enthusiastic patron of both fields, I find
myself as part of two seemingly divergent communities, rather than one that latches onto
inherent similarities between sport and the arts. Indeed, in addition to the aforementioned
broad similarities, there are others more specific to Columbus that serve to tie the two
fields together. Both fields have agencies (the Greater Columbus Sports Commission
[GCSC] and Greater Columbus Arts Council [GCAC]) funded by the city through
legislatively determined percentages of the city’s hotel bed tax. Both have strong
presences in local schools and colleges. Both engage prominent local citizens and
companies as patrons and sponsors (many, in fact, are patrons or sponsors of both fields).
This research allows me to examine these two fields with an eye towards their
convergence, hopefully contributing findings that will prove useful in creating a cohesive
concept of the culture of Columbus.

Statement of Problem

The primary reason this study was undertaken was to better understand the roles
that these two fields may play in creating and promoting a cohesive cultural concept for
the city of Columbus. Sport and the arts are two fields with a number of parallels
between them that provide opportunity for information to flow between them and

² Columbus is home to three professional sport teams that play in the top American leagues for their sport,
one that plays in the tier immediately below that, and hosts many recreational leagues, in addition to
hosting national events and state championships. The city also boasts more than 50 professional arts
organizations (Columbus Arts Marketing Association, 2011), as well as myriad recreational artistic
activities and venues.
interaction to occur. Despite this, there is little to no direct interaction between the two. I believe that, if this pathway were opened and interaction facilitated, the two fields could learn from each other and work towards a mutually beneficial concept of Columbus’
culture.

Rather than examining all sport and arts organizations in Columbus, I utilized a
cross-section of four organizations that represent the various disciplines within each field. Additionally, as an avenue to facilitate cross-comparison, the organizations were paired such that each group has some tie, be it from its component organizations’ places within the city or the roles played by their respective disciplines. The four organizations and their pairings are as follows:

- Columbus Blue Jackets: the only sport organization in Columbus belonging to one of the “big four” leagues (the NHL), it is also the largest sport organization in Columbus from a financial standpoint (paired with Columbus Museum of Art)

- Columbus Museum of Art: one of the oldest and largest arts organizations in Columbus; this pairing represents large, “cornerstone” organizations

- Columbus Crew: a member of Major League Soccer, it has strong ties to Columbus’ Hispanic community

- Opera Columbus: an Opera America budget level III company (annual budget between $1 million and $3 million); this pairing represents disciplines that have niche but growing audiences in the United States

These pairings allowed for cross-comparison between the component organizations of each, as well as provided a starting point for comparisons between all four of the organizations of the two fields which they represent.
Creating a concept of culture for Columbus that encompasses both sport and the arts requires consideration of public value, as the public, to support the existence of these cultural organizations, must perceive some value being added to the community by their presence. Public value, or the benefit provided by an organization as perceived by the public beyond what they are willing to pay for it, is the basis by which these organizations succeed or fail (Mariner, 2006). Because public value relates to not only those who are active patrons of an organization, but also those who reside in the community or have some other stake in the locale, creating and maintaining it requires an intense and diversified effort on the part of an organization. This need for diverse approaches and methods makes public value an ideal area of focus for this study. This allows me to focus not just on what the two fields could learn from each other, but also why and how they do what they do that they can learn from each other. This has created a deeper, more meaningful solution (or, at least, insight) into the underlying problem. In light of this, this study has used community outreach programs offered by the four subject organizations as a means to examine the generation of public value. These programs are those that represent to the public the cultural contributions of a community or organization using a variety of media and interactive experiences, and therefore serve to express their value to the broader community, not just patrons (Williamson, Brecher, Glasser, & Schensul, 1999).

A component of establishing a cohesive cultural concept is identifying that the two fields and their programs serve distinct purposes, thereby demonstrating that a convergent model would not prove redundant. Although there are similarities in the way that sport and the arts function, the two fields operate to provide different content and
therefore serve different purposes. While the similarities in function that tie the two fields together are the focus of this study, an understanding of the differences in their purposes and content is necessary as a basis for understanding how they generate public value and how they may interact with each other. In this instance, it should be noted that the terms “sport organization” and “arts organization” refer to those organizations that provide to consumers a direct product (performances, exhibitions, games).

The primary purpose of a professional sport organization is to provide the public the opportunity to watch a particular sport played at a professional level as a means to generate profit. These organizations may serve additional functions (for instance, entertaining patrons), but they are ancillary to providing the opportunity to witness the sport. By providing access to sport through a competitive team, these organizations create a community of similarly inclined fans of the game, united by the team representing their locale (Cialdini, 2001). Because the focus of the organization is on providing the public with an opportunity to come together around the team, the content of the specific programs that they offer are geared towards serving that community. A cursory examination of the non-game related initiatives of Columbus’ sport teams shows a heavy emphasis on service to the public and community enhancement. These programs include partnerships with charitable organizations, food and clothing drives, and educational programs that make little or no direct reference to the sports that the organizations present.

The primary purpose of a professional arts organization is to provide to the public the opportunity to experience an art form. Whereas sport organizations focus on the experience of watching a sport, arts organizations allow audiences to both view the
discipline in practice and participate. Although the modes of available consumption are considerably more diverse than with sport organizations (performances, museum exhibitions, and gallery shows, as opposed to just games), they serve the united purpose of providing exposure to their respective art forms as a means to both provide enjoyment to the patrons and foster interest in and understanding of the art form amongst new patrons. Because the focus of the organization is on providing exposure and building interest, the content of the programs offered all have either a distinctly educational bent to them or are meant to make the artistic product more widely available. A cursory examination of the non-performance/exhibition/show related initiatives of Columbus’ arts organizations shows a heavy emphasis on arts education, as well as some emphasis on accessible exposure. Almost every professional arts organization in Columbus has some measure of educational program intended to teach youths about that organization’s particular art form. Some of the performing arts organizations have their artists perform around the city as a way to increase awareness and interest. For instance, Opera Columbus, while in season, has artists perform at the North Market and at Worthington Square Mall to increase visibility and promote the product.

Additional differentiation is evident in examining Moore and Moore’s (2005) “strategic triangle” for public value (figure 1, below). This triangle, a component of the public value framework, makes visual the three issues that public managers (which, as per Bozeman (1987), leaders of both sport and arts organizations qualify as) must address in developing strategic vision for their organizations (Moore, Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government, 1995). The three components of the triangle (public value, legitimacy and support, and operational capacity), particularly the latter

---

3 This figure is revisited in the subsequent review of the literature.
two, highlight differences in the environments in which sport and arts organizations operate. As non-profit organizations, arts organizations necessarily have to deal with a political authorizing environment, as they rely on governmental funding for some portion of their revenue.\(^4\) Similarly, this use of public funds, as well as the section of the federal tax code that grants non-profit status, requires operational capacities that best serve not only the organization’s patrons but also the broader public. In contrast, the more private nature of sport organizations means that they operate in an environment that requires less political authorization and does not necessitate operational capacity that can serve the broader public, only their patrons.\(^5\) There are elements within the sport organizations (namely, their foundations) that require operational capacities similar to those of the arts organizations, but these elements do not represent the organizations in their entirety.

---

\(^4\) It must be noted that there are for-profit arts organizations. However, this study examines only those that operate as non-profit organizations.

\(^5\) Although many sport organizations do receive some form of public assistance by way of tax subsidies, they do not rely on public funding as a means of revenue.
While both sports and arts organizations aim to enhance the community of which they are part, their purposes and content differ enough that they are not mutually exclusive. It is noteworthy, however, that the primary difference in their approach lies in whether or not they are trying to directly promote themselves in the process. The content being offered by professional sport organizations generally has little to do with directly promoting the organization itself, instead being focused on enhancing the community of which it is part through service. In contrast to this, the content offered by arts organizations serves as direct promotion, building appreciation of the art form so that those involved in the programs will become patrons. This basic difference informs the approach that both types of organizations take in establishing their content, and it is this content difference that positions them to utilize their conceptual similarities to learn from each other. However, it is also these differences that make both necessary components of a community.

A secondary purpose for undertaking this study is that there is a lack of literature that directly ties these two fields together. An initial search yielded few articles, and these were almost all written from the standpoint that the two fields were either unrelated or marginally related, although they did so in the context of culture (Cowen, 1998; Throsby & Withers, 1979; Throsby D., 2001). One article addresses the two fields in direct relation to each other, but does so to address the possible applications of ideas from sports economics in the arts (Seaman, 2003). Due to this dearth in the literature, there is potential to explore more significant qualities, strategies, and interactions between them, allowing this study to make a significant contribution to the academic literature.
Research Questions

The primary research question this study seeks to answer is as follows:

How do professional sport and arts organizations within the city of Columbus utilize community outreach programs to generate their perception of public value?

In other words, this study looks at how each organization perceives public value and how their community outreach programs are used to create that perception. From this initial question, several other sub-questions present themselves as ways to organize, focus, and refine the structure and content of the study. These questions are as follows:

- Might the different organizations be able to work together to form a unified concept of public value or bolster their outreach efforts?
- How do the differing business structures used to run these organizations (for-profit and non-profit) impact their conceptions of public value and their outreach programs? Is one of these structures inherently better suited to the task and why? Why not?

---

6 This study focuses on the organizations’ perceptions of public value rather than the public’s due to limitations in resources to conduct the study. Although the public’s perception is a vital component of public value, examining those things which the public is given to perceive and ways in which they might lead to organizational interaction better align with the goal of this work.
Significance

This study is meant to serve as an extension of my thesis research, a pilot study that focused on the community outreach programs of the Columbus Crew and Opera Columbus. The two organizations were selected due to the similar places that they occupy within their fields (both niche disciplines with strong support and origins in Europe and devoted and growing bases of support in the United States) as well as their accessibility in being located in Columbus. The focus on community outreach programs was based on the previous personal experience in preparing and administering arts outreach programs and having been involved as a participant in sport outreach programs. Through these personal experiences, I realized that both fields ran programs that were fairly similar, and therefore there might be opportunity for interaction and exchange of ideas between the two. The initial study yielded findings that have spurred on this additional work. For instance, the programs offered by each organization were complementary to those offered by the other, showing strength and expertise where the other organization was weak. What this means is that opportunity was evident for inter-organizational interaction that bolster each organization’s programs by drawing on the other’s expertise. Also, it was shown that the programs offered by both organizations largely ignored a large segment of the population (ages 18-35), and that this problem was especially prevalent with Opera Columbus’ programs. The desire to explore these issues and findings and their potential implications is what has driven the concept of this study.

As the study is expanded for this new work, the concept of organizational interaction will be expanded horizontally, applying the same concept and focusing the
line of questioning on additional organizations rather than delving further into the two
organizations used for the pilot study. The city of Columbus will remain the focal point
of the study due to the diverse slate of both sport and arts organizations present in the city
and the desire to expand on findings from the original study.

The primary focus of this dissertation further refines the original concept
introduced in the thesis study. The thesis took two organizations and analyzed their
community outreach programs, looking for ways in which the two might work with and
learn from each other for their mutual benefit. The analysis focused on the age range,
targeted segment of the population, and program content. This study still relies on
outreach analysis, but adds the dimension of public value, studying how the subject
organizations use their outreach initiatives to create perceived value for their organization
amongst the public. This additional layer provides a better understanding of how these
organizations earn and maintain their place in Columbus.

The findings from this study contribute to the literature of both fields, sport and
the arts, by addressing the lack of crossover writings. Sport and the arts are two fields
with much in common, yet with rare exception, there is no literature that ties the two
together. Even these exceptions tend to take concepts from one and highlight ways in
which the other may use similar ideas, rather than creating a framework for mutually
beneficial interaction between the two. This study establishes such an interactive
framework, paving the way for the two fields to work together.

The value of this study comes from its potential to open up interdisciplinary
communications between the two fields, not only in Columbus, but in other locales that
choose to utilize the proposed framework. Through the use of this framework, sports
teams and organizations will be able to learn from and work with each other, benefiting from each other’s varied expertise. This will enable expanded organizational capacity as well as help reduce the costs associated with hiring new personnel or extraneous professional development to gain the same knowledge, thereby contributing to enhancing organizational capacity by freeing resources that would otherwise be committed to these efforts. As a person with a vested interest in both fields, and as someone who has worked with the types of organizations that could use this information but cannot afford to pay for it, I see the practical significance of this study helping ensure the continued health of both fields, from the largest organizations down to the smallest. This work may have some measure of controversy to it, as both fields tend to be insular when it comes to incorporating new ideas, but it is my hope that the work will provide justification enough to convince both sides to look beyond their own boundaries.

Conceptual Framework

The brief discussion of the relevant fields of literature above highlights the components of community outreach programs and their use that can be found in the existing literature from both sport and the arts. However, these components form only part of the conceptual framework that guides this study. That conceptual framework, visualized below, illustrates the interrelationships and processes that inform this work. The map follows the process of the programs to be studied, from creation and oversight through their completion and the effects derived from them. Rather than viewing public value as an output or an outcome, this map instead places public value as the mid-point of
the diagram, serving as the agent of change from input to output. By repositioning public value this way, the focus is shifted from heavily favoring the programs that create public value to balancing the importance of those programs and the output and outcomes that follow the generation of public value.

The map sets as a starting point marketing and education/community outreach, as these are the departments within each of the subject organizations that oversee the programs to be studied. Additionally, these departments speak to the aforementioned use of stakeholder theory, as they are concerned with influencing a particular group of stakeholders (to be elaborated on the literature review). The outreach programs are

---

7 It should be noted that, whereas the programs in the arts organizations are overseen by the head of that department, in at least two of the sport organizations, that is not the case. In those organizations, semi-independent foundations oversee those programs and then report to the applicable department head.
divided into four broad categories that encompass the entire spectrum of programs offered by the subject organizations. Education programs are those that involve working with local schools through curriculum enhancement, experiential, or extracurricular modes. Service programs are those that involve direct community service, such as adopting and maintaining a park or stretch of road. Community programs are those that involve developing and reaching to a specific community within Columbus, particularly when such communities are based on nationalities. Charity programs are those in which the organization partners with an outside charitable organization as a means to achieve their goal.

Rather than positioning potential benefits of these programs as outcomes, they are positioned as outputs from public value, with the programs serving as inputs. These outputs (community appreciation, future patrons, enhanced patron devotion, and partnership opportunities) represent what is gained by the organizations through their generation of public value, thereby drawing attention to public value and focusing the study. By positioning them as outputs, the map also allows for the inclusion of a cohesive cultural concept as an outcome of public value, rather than as an ancillary component of the map. These outputs represent a mix of quantifiable and non-quantifiable benefits as perceived by the organizations experiencing them.

The map also makes note of the interrelations between the input and outputs of this model, as they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. That is to say, an outreach program may incorporate two or more of the defined categories, and an organization may reap more than one of the benefits from the public value generated by these programs. It
also warrants mention that there is no direct correlation between inputs and outputs and, as such, any number of inputs from this model may result in any number of outputs.

This study, and the conceptual framework designed to guide it, are based in grounded theory. Grounded theory is distinguished from other theoretical constructs by the presence of six characteristics: simultaneous data collection and analysis, creation of analytic codes based on the data rather than preconceived hypotheses, the use of middle-range theories as a means to explain behavior and processes, the writing of analytic notes to explicate categories, theoretical sampling, and delay of the literature review (Charmaz 1983, 1990; Glaser 1978, 1992; Glaser & Strauss 1967; Strauss 1987; Strauss & Corbin 1994). This approach, rather than establishing a projected outcome based on theoretical conceptions, allows for findings to be arrived at heuristically as the research progresses, making it well suited for methods that are simultaneously exploratory and analytic, such as interviews (Atkinson & Delamont, 2005; Charmaz, 2001). Utilizing grounded theory also allows for relevance to impact the patterns and data that emerge, rather than adherence to a theoretical expectation (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Although the form of the study is known ahead of time, the use of grounded theory helps to avoid establishing pre-conceived notions regarding the findings.

It should also be noted that the selection of case study as the primary methodology for this work aligns with the use of grounded theory as the guiding theoretical frame for the project. Since grounded theory is based on the concept of allowing the data to develop into findings and allowing relevance to impact the patterns
and findings that emerge, rather than making a projection of the outcome based on theoretical conceptions, this construct fits an approach that prioritizes the selection of the cases (in this instance, the subject organizations) over the formation of codes, which are informed by theoretical preconceptions (Atkinson & Delamont, 2005; Charmaz, 2001; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As such, the use of case study methodology for this project is both functional and logical.

Limitations

This study, while intended to serve and inform those working in a wide variety of locations, is being conducted within a limited context. The reasoning behind limiting the geographical context of this study is that, within a given locale, it is possible to account for local variables, such as funding, demographics, regimes, and the like. Were the geographical context to be expanded to include one or more additional locales, the focus of the work would necessarily shift away from a deep examination of the one locale to a broad examination of each locale, as well as cross-comparisons between them. Such a study, while certainly valuable as an addition to the existing literature, would require resources in excess of those available for this work.

The organizations included in this study are all located/headquartered in the city of Columbus, OH. This limitation is intended to serve purposes both practical and theoretical. The practical purposes of limiting the scope of the study to organizations in Columbus include temporal consistency (all organizations may be accessed within a reasonable time frame, rather than having organizations change while those in another
locale are being studied) and access (both in terms of permission to study and physical access, organizations based in my current city are easier to work with than those based in other cities). The theoretical purpose of limiting this study to organizations in Columbus is that the wide variety of sport and arts organizations within the city allow for a study with greater validity than would be possible in a city with little organizations diversity. Additionally, as extensive outside documentation exists for both sport and arts organizations in Columbus, be it from their respective local councils/commissions or from independent research initiatives, this geographical limitation does not provide a constraint on the availability of data for this study to use.

A limit for this study also exists in regards to the data to be used. All data pertaining to public value and its generation is taken from the organizations being studied, not independently collected for the purposes of this study. The reasons for imposing this limit are two-fold. First, resources are currently unavailable to conduct a statistically significant and valid poll to establish whether or not the public perceives any benefit from having these organizations in Columbus. Second, by focusing on the organizations’ conceptions of public value and the extent to which they perceive that and/or can show that they are generating it, I was able to better examine sections of the community that may be over- or under-served by these programs and how the different organizations’ conceptions could feed into a city-wide concept of culture.

As noted previously, this study is intended to serve as both an independently valid academic work and a guide to other researcher who may want to foster similar connections within their own locale. As such, providing a method which requires extensive effort and organizational cooperation would prove detrimental to these hopes.
By limiting the documents from which data are to be culled to those that are available either publicly or with minimal organizational cooperation, this study remains replicable by other researchers in other contexts. While the inclusion of interviews with those responsible for overseeing the programs being examined is an integral component of this study, they are not entirely necessary to an attempt to duplicate this approach, and therefore exist outside of the limitation on data collection.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

As with any academic study, this work requires a review of relevant literature that serves to both inform and contextualize the new findings and conclusions. By examining the works and ideas of others, one can come to better understand both the meaning of the original content generated by this study and where that content fits within the existing discourse. To this end, the reviewed literature is separated into two sections, each covering material related to one of the major elements informing this work. The first section, theory literature, examines the literature regarding the organizational theories that inform how the organizations being studied function, their role in their locale, and how both impact their outreach programs. The second section, the public, public value and CSR literature, examines the literature regarding the titular concepts, how they are conceptualized and constructed, and how they tie into the creation and administration of outreach programs.

Given that this work is a practical study, rather than a theoretical work, the included literature review includes a substantial section that addresses applications of the literature to this particular study. Within this section, the concepts introduced and examined in the discussions of theory and public/public value/CSR literature are tied to the focuses and organizations of this work, thereby establishing their relevance and
providing to the reader a clear contextualization of the data presented in the subsequent chapters.

Theory Literature

Theoretical perspectives on a subject provide both an avenue to understanding the fashion in which the subject functions and structural guidance for conducting the study itself. Given the complex nature of the organizations included as subjects in this particular, stakeholder theory (to be explained below) provides a means to explore the various groups that have some say in or are impacted by the operations of these organizations. Additionally, the inclusion of regime theory provides insight into how cooperation in a chaotic environment (in this case, the city of Columbus) emerges to benefit participatory entities and organizations. Through the examination of these theoretical concepts and their related perspectives, the answers to the above questions provide insight into how the subject organizations impact those who have a stake in them, each other, and the community as a whole.

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory was introduced to the academic literature by R.E. Freeman in 1984 with the publication of Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach (Steib, 2009). In this initial form, stakeholder theory was a philosophical contribution to the
study of business and management ethics to be applied to corporations. Rather than focus on a corporation’s obligations to deliver value to those who have invested money (shareholders), Freeman’s approach instead focuses on shifting decision-making power and the benefits of labor to groups and/or individuals (stakeholders) who can affect or be affected by the activities of the corporation (Freeman, 1984).

This initial conceptualization of the stakeholder theory was intended to inform, as the title of Freeman’s work suggests, management practices in a corporate setting. To this end, Freeman (1984) specifically notes that, utilizing this theory, one “must address real strategic issues and not so-called ‘social responsibility’ issues.” Freeman also states that any list of stakeholders must be winnowed down such that it excludes those who, while potentially affected, are too small or insignificant to warrant the worry of those making decisions. Similarly, no component of the theory as originally presented advocates equal treatment of the various stakeholders, or taking from one group of stakeholders to give to another.

Although stakeholder theory was originally developed strictly as a corporate management concept, Freeman (with Harrison, 1999) concedes that “For all of the analytical power stakeholder theory offers…there is relatively little agreement on the scope of this theory.” As such, perspectives on the theory have moved away from a corporate-centric focus in which stakeholders are subordinates to be managed and towards a relational focus in which stakeholders form a component of a network, along with the organization in which they have a stake (Andriof & Waddock, 2002). This is
spoken to by Steurer’s (2006) proposed typology that suggests that stakeholder theory must be considered from three distinct perspectives: corporate (how corporations deal with stakeholders), stakeholder (how stakeholders try to influence corporations), and conceptual (how particular concepts relate to corporation-stakeholder interactions).

Beginning in the mid-1990s, a trend began to emerge in literature relating to stakeholder theory that has extended to the present. This trend holds that, despite Freeman’s aforementioned claims that his theory was not meant to delve into social responsibility issues, stakeholder theory had strong potential to be a means to explore corporate social responsibility (Argandoña, 1998; Gregg, 2001; Orts & Strudler, 2009; Wood & Jones, 1995).8 Some literature that comprises this trend, particularly the work of Argandoña, makes the case for framing examination of stakeholder theory from the perspective of the common good (harkening to Steurer’s conceptual perspective), invoking the civic element. It is from this viewpoint that stakeholder theory has begun to move from a concept which necessarily holds a corporation at its center to one that be centered on any any organization or entity which has a diverse set of stakeholders, such as a municipality. Although public stakeholder theory currently lacks the extensive development that corporate stakeholder theory can lay claim to, it is the most recent conceptualization of the concept, and perhaps offers the opportunity to develop the rich literature base that its corporate counterpart currently enjoys.

Stakeholder Theory in For- and Non-Profit Environments

8 Although corporate social responsibility does factor heavily into stakeholder theory literature of the last 15 years, a lengthy discussion of this is being omitted here due to the discussion of the topic that follows in the last question.
As previously noted, Freeman (1984) developed stakeholder theory as a tool to be utilized in corporate management. In light of this, much of the existing literature on the topic relates to its application in for-profit environments. As literature has been developed applying stakeholder theory to non-profit environments, strong enough distinctions between the two applications have emerged that brief examinations thereof are warranted, based on Steurer’s (2006) aforementioned typology. This approach explores how the theory functions in both environments from each of the three perspectives: corporate, stakeholder, and conceptual.

The corporate perspective (that which addresses how corporations deal with stakeholders) offers perhaps the starkest contrast between the two environments. Friedman and Miles (2002) contend that, in for-profit environments, managers identify legitimate stakeholders based on salience to the manager or their organization. Mitchell et al. (1997) concur, adding that this salience is based on perceptions of a potential stakeholder’s power, legitimacy, and urgency (Agle et al. [1999] tested this approach and concurred). Doh and Guay (2006) argue that, while Sternberg (1997) may have some validity in claiming that stakeholder theory is incompatible with legitimate business objectives, it does lead to corporate social responsibility (to be discussed later), thereby potentially aiding the business. Additionally, Jones and Wicks (1999) argue that one of the essential premises of stakeholder theory in for-profit environments is its focus on decision-making by managers, resulting in the corporate perspective being over-emphasized in relation to the two other perspectives.

The corporate perspective in non-profit environments is inherently different from that in for-profit environments. Whereas for-profit organizations are able to determine
stakeholders based on saliency, non-profit organizations, through their status as 501(c)3 institutions, hold a broader accountability that reduces or eliminates this ability. Knox and Gruar (2007) assert that, although these organizations lack the ability to winnow stakeholders based on Mitchell et al.’s (1997) saliency test, they do have the ability to emphasize certain stakeholders or groups thereof in their considerations. The status of non-profit organizations as 501(c)3 institutions also impacts how the organizations interact with their stakeholders. Whereas Jones and Wicks (1999) argue that, in for-profit environments, the corporate perspective is emphasized over the stakeholder and conceptual perspectives, Hill and Jones (1992) and Calton and Kurland (1995) provide models for use in non-profit organizations that hold the corporate and stakeholder perspectives on equal footing. Hill and Jones’ model puts forth that stakeholders function as resource holders, and their relationships with non-profit groups function as a series of contracts, whereby the actions of the organization (in terms of actions and capacity-development) and the stakeholders (in terms of seeking resource consumption) work towards facilitating a transaction. Calton and Kurland’s model, a self-described postmodern approach to stakeholder “enabling,” de-emphasizes managerial privilege in favor of multilateral dialogues between the organization and stakeholders. These approaches represent a substantial contrast to the heavy emphasis placed on the corporate perspective in for-profit applications of stakeholder theory.

The distinctions between for- and non-profit environments and the applications of stakeholder theory are somewhat less pronounced when considering the stakeholder and conceptual perspectives than they are with the corporate perspective. This issue is highlighted by the fact that what references are made to the conceptual perspective in the
literature either fail to differentiate between the two environments or fold the perspective into discussions of the corporate-stakeholder interactions that constitute the other two perspectives.

The differentiations between the two environments in regards to the stakeholder perspective face two issues in their representation in the literature. First, what literature exists from the stakeholder perspective draws on some of the concepts also applied to the corporate perspective, making it difficult to draw distinctions between the two. For example, Pajunen (2006), in discussing the actions and influences of stakeholders in organizational survival, applies Mitchell et al.’s (1997) salience test in explaining who should be considered a stakeholder in organizations struggling to survive, coming to the conclusion that the legitimacy is largely tied to control of resources (this is to say, money) and positions of power (generally managers). Similarly, in discussing the role of stakeholder actions in shaping the cultural environments that impact for-profit organizational actions, Patriotta et al. (2011) view the matter through the lens of institutional theories of organizations.

These two examples draw attention to the second issue, that being that, while there is fairly robust literature applying the stakeholder perspective to for-profit environments, the literature directly applying the stakeholder perspective the non-profit environments is sparse. For example, Lea (1999), while devoting some time to discussing the stakeholder perspective in non-profit and public organizations, spends much of the discussion talking about the indeterminacy of stakeholder legitimacy in these situations. Much of the literature tied to for-profit applications can be made to fit a non-profit environment by re-working the viewpoints on stakeholder legitimacy. For
instance, the aforementioned work by Pajunen would only require a reconsideration of what constitute resources (taking a broader perspective than simply the financial one previously taken) to work in a non-profit environment. While this represents an improvement over the available literature examining the conceptual perspective, the lack of directly applicable material for both the conceptual and stakeholder perspectives mark a substantial gap in the existing literature.

_Criticism of Stakeholder Theory_

Although stakeholder theory has proven a popular addition to management literature, it has also drawn some measure of criticism, both based on Freeman’s original presentation of the concept and subsequent elaborations and interpretations of it. One common point of criticism is that stakeholder theory does not serve the best economic interests of the organizations that are meant to employ it. Gregg (2001) argues that, in an environment where corporations are increasingly competing for the investment dollars of casual investors, utilizing stakeholder theory would undermine the ability of these corporations to deliver shareholder value, therefore limiting their ability to raise capital. Similarly, Friedman (1993) suggests that the implementation of a stakeholder approach acts to reduce organizational efficiency by focusing on the interests of non-shareholders rather than focusing solely on generating profits. Additionally, it has been argued that shareholders maintain a special moral status in relation to corporations due to the fiduciary duty owed them, and therefore the implementation of a stakeholder approach
would shift considerations away from those corporations have both a moral and financial obligations to serve (Goodpaster, 1991; Goodpaster & Holloran, 1994).

Another common point of criticism is that stakeholder theory creates or exacerbates moral and ethical problems. As noted above, Goodpaster and Holloran have addressed the moral dilemma that implementing a stakeholder approach creates by forcing corporations to choose between serving those to whom they have a fiduciary duty and those who may be broadly affected by the corporation. Marcoux (2003) concurs with this viewpoint, contending that stakeholder theory only allows corporations to best serve either shareholders or stakeholders, meaning that some moral obligation is necessarily neglected. Kaler (2006) explains the shifted moral obligation from shareholders to stakeholders as being akin to making a car or house available for use to those who do not own it.

Although economic and moral concerns are the two primary points of criticism that one finds in the literature regarding stakeholder theory, there are several other points of criticism that arise somewhat less often. Amongst those who tend towards a more libertarian viewpoint, stakeholder theory threatens property rights (since those who hold shares in the corporation own it), and the additional constraint of serving the interests of stakeholders functions as regulation, hampering free corporate enterprise (Steib, 2009; Sternberg, 2006). There are also those who view stakeholder theory as far too broad/disorganized/immature a concept to be held valid in the same fashion as more
focused or mature theoretical concepts (Friedman & Miles, 2002; Mainardes, Alves, & Raposo, 2011; Orts & Strudler, 2009).

These criticisms may draw attention to some of the shortcomings of stakeholder theory as a theoretical concept, but they do not necessarily discredit it. Some of those who levy criticisms against the theory also offer either praise or constructive insight on the matter (Kaler and Mainardes, Alves, & Raposo, in particular). It would seem, from the particular criticism given, that stakeholder theory is best viewed not as a replacement for shareholder theory, but rather as a supplement. The only critical viewpoint that cannot be accounted for from this perspective is the libertarian one, but that is tied to the ideology of the writer, rather than taking the theory on its own merits. As such, viewing stakeholder theory as supplemental rather than as replacement allows, in some way, shape, or form, for criticism to be acknowledged and addressed.

*Prime Beneficiaries*

The concept of the “prime beneficiary” is one found often in literature pertaining to any number of fields, but a functional definition is rarely, if ever, given. As such, one is left to construct a definition of the concept from the contexts in which it is employed by various authors. Perhaps the clearest of these implied definitions is the one given by Blau and Scott (1962), which, through the development of a typology based on *cui bono* (who benefits), states that the prime beneficiary is not the sole beneficiary of an organization, but rather the one that draws the most direct and/or substantive benefit from the organization. To further this point, Blau and Scott give the example of a business.
While the public-at-large and employees benefit through tax contributions and job opportunities, respectively, it is the owner of the business that is the prime beneficiary as they established the business as a means to generate a personal profit. This interpretation of the prime beneficiary is corroborated by the works of others (Lipsey, 2006; Papadimitriou, 2001).

Although the literature does not necessarily provide a direct and functional definition of what a prime beneficiary is, it does delve into the matter of who may be considered the prime beneficiary of various organizations, specifically within the realm of sport. Slack and Parent (2006) invoke Blau and Scott’s aforementioned typology, which sorts sport organizations into four categories: mutual benefit organizations (the prime beneficiary is the membership), business concerns (the prime beneficiaries are the owners), service organizations (the prime beneficiaries are the clients), and commonwealth organizations (the prime beneficiary is the public at large). This typology is also mentioned by Chelladurai (1987), who adds additional clarity to Blau and Scott’s definition of the prime beneficiary by stating that the prime beneficiary is the group whose benefit is the organization’s reason to exist and who benefits from the organization are not diverted or thwarted.

Taking into consideration the contributions of Blau and Scott, Slack and Parent, and Chelladurai, one can begin to assess who may be considered the prime beneficiaries of various sport organizations. For those professional organizations that are privately held, the prime beneficiary is the individual or group that owns the organization, thereby
classifying these organizations as business concerns. Those organizations that feature a pay-to-play structure, or require membership even in the absence of dues (for instance, youth leagues and recreational leagues), the prime beneficiaries are those who are members of the organization, thereby classifying them as mutual benefit organizations. These may be the only sport organizations which are easily classifiable, but constitute the majority of top-tier professional and amateur sport organizations.

Within the realm of professional sport, several other structures exist that make defining the prime beneficiary somewhat difficult. An example of one of these structures would be the Green Bay Packers. The Packers are run as an organization that has shareholders but functions as a non-profit organization (Green Bay Packers, Inc., 2011). Additionally, shares pay no dividend and have a permanently fixed face value, but do give holders voting privileges within the company. Because of this structure, it is difficult to differentiate between the status of shareholders as owners or clients, clouding the distinction between the Packers as a business concern and as a service organization. A similar situation arises with the consideration of some minor league teams. As will be discussed in the following section, some minor league teams are owned by a municipality or other civic entity (i.e., a county), but fall under the auspices of the major league team whose system they are part of. In these instances, it is not necessarily clear who should be considered the prime beneficiary, the major league team (which would presumably qualify the minor league team as a business concern) or the locale (which would make the team a service or commonwealth organization).
A pervasive type of sport organization that defies categorization is the scholastic athletics department. Although such an organization at the secondary level can be readily classified as a commonwealth or service organization (as schools are funded through tax or tuition dollars, depending on whether the institution is public or private), the case of intercollegiate athletics is not as clear. Many collegiate athletics programs are underwritten by student fees which, in conjunction with the status of such organizations as being representative of an institution, seems to classify them as either business concerns or service organizations, depending on whether one considers the money paid by students as qualifying them as owners (or, perhaps, the host institution as the owner). There are those schools which do not require student subsidies of athletics, which conflates the matter further. The use of athletics as a means for schools to solicit donations also clouds the matter, as one could contend that the purpose of the athletics is to allow the school to draw in money. Chelladurai (1987) brings this point up, referencing Cameron’s (1986) concept of the “presence of paradox,” or the inherently paradoxical nature of effective organizations due to the need to serve any number of groups which may have valid claims as beneficiaries. Chelladurai does not state which of these groups does function as the prime beneficiary, although he does allude to it being alumni, by virtue of the control they hold over necessary resources for the organization (i.e., donations).

Regime Theory

In addition to the above-mentioned stakeholder theory, another theoretical concept that might help in understanding this study is regime theory. This theoretical
concept deals with instances of cooperation to create regimes, and, while primarily focused on city-level regimes, has also been used on scales as large as international and as small as a neighborhood (Mossberger & Stoker, 2001). Krasner (1982) offers what appears to be the widely-used functional definition of regimes, describing them as “sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given area.” He clarifies this explanation by further defining principles (beliefs of fact, causation, and rectitude), norms (standards of behavior defined by rights and obligations), rules (specific pre- or proscriptions for action), and decision-making procedures (prevailing practices for making collective choice). This definition is in line with others’ conceptions of regimes (Haas, 1980; Keohane & Nye, 1977).

Although this concept is widely referred to as a distinct and independent theory, regime theory is held by some to be not a theory, but more of a model (Dowding, Dunleavy, King, Margetts, & Rydin, 1999). This standpoint seems to based on the idea that regime theory, while adequate as a tool to examine the regimes themselves, is limited in its capacity to explain the formation, change, or maintenance of regimes (Lauria, 1997; Orr & Stoker, 1994). Mossberger and Stoker (2001) contend that this standpoint is enforced by the inductive development of the urban regime concept, which they hold to be contrary to the deductive development of theories. Additionally, Stone provides several aspects of a regime in various works that seem to form the basis of the concept (in contrast to Krasner’s definition):
• A regime is informal, yet fairly stable and has access to institutional resources (Stone, Regime politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988, 1989).

• Regimes serve to bridge the divide between the public control of government and the private control of economic resources.

• Cooperation must be achieved, and cannot be assumed to exist.

• Regimes are stable enough to span multiple civic administrations (Stone, Regime politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988, 1989).

• Regimes have policy agendas that are influenced by participants and the resources they control (Stone, 1993).

• Regimes do not need full agreement over guiding values and beliefs between members, but require a functional consensus over policy.

Whether the regime idea is held to be a theory or a model/concept, it has strong potential relevance to this study. The basis of the regime idea is the establishment of stable partnerships in which each partner is able to contribute resources and a mutually beneficial agenda is acted upon. Such a partnership could act as the cornerstone of a proposed framework for interaction between sport and arts organizations as a conclusion of this project. The complex nature of regimes allows for such a framework to potentially address multiple issues, including, but not limited to, knowledge sharing for the betterment of outreach programs, increased public funding, and image development (see below). In light of this potential, the regime idea, as either model/concept or theory,
warrants consideration in analyzing existing structures and compiling future recommendations.

_Criticism of Regime Theory_

As is the case with stakeholder theory, regime theory has proven a popular addition to the literature that has nonetheless drawn some measure of criticism. The broad application of regime theory as the literature relevant to it develops has led to similarly broad criticism.\(^9\) Taking into account the wide array of their specific applications, these criticisms fall roughly into two categories: regime theory is inherently incomplete and regime theory is premised on flawed concepts.

The first of these categories of criticism, the critiques that hold that regime theory is inherently incomplete, hold that, while regime theory as it currently exists may not be incorrect, it is incapable of standing on its own as a means to explain the cooperative actions that lead to regime formation. Within this set of critiques, two distinct groups emerge. The first group argues that regime theory must be combined with another theoretical concept to be applicable. For instance, Irazábal (2009) contends that regime theory must both inform and be informed by communicative action theory in order to establish an approach that is more comprehensive in its approach to the linkages between planning and governance.\(^10\) Similarly, Cox (1997) states that regime theory lacks consideration of the mechanisms underlying the cooperation inherent in and the role of

---

\(^9\) Regime theory appears in the literature relating to any number of topics, ranging from urban planning to forestry to turbot management.

\(^10\) Irazábal’s viewpoint reflects her the viewpoint (previously mentioned) that regime theory should be viewed less as a theory and more as a model for understanding interactions.
space in regime formation, and Neumayer (2001) offers the economic theory of international environmental cooperation as a potential complement to regime theory.

The second group of critiques regarding the incomplete nature of regime theory focuses on the non-theoretical concepts neglected by the theory. Mossberger and Stoker (2001) identify demographic shifts, economic restructuring, federal grant policies, and political mobilization as concepts that are necessary to understand regime formation and change but that regime theory cannot account for. Like Neumayer, Imbroscio (2003) highlights regime theory’s failure to engage economics in a sustained and systematic fashion (this is to say, while regime theory can account for economics, its origin in regional planning and political science tends to make economics an inconsistently present component). In these critiques, regime theory is not said to be wrong, but rather is simply incomplete as it currently exists.

The second category of criticism regarding regime theory occupies a substantially smaller portion of the literature than does that which contends that regime theory is simply incomplete. Criticism that focuses on regime theory being premised on flawed concepts comes across as tangentially related to criticism that focuses on regime theory being incomplete in that it does not assert that the theory is wholly incorrect, but rather that there are incorrect components to it. Domhoff (2006) provides a strong example of this type of criticism, contending that Stone’s work on the city of Atlanta, widely considered the genesis point of regime theory, is flawed in both its views of “power to” in relation to “power over” and its presumption that there is a lack of fixed preferences at the local level. Domhoff also cites Stone’s work as being far too optimistic, but this is a matter of debate. Davies (2003) criticizes regime theory for being fundamentally
American in its construction, and therefore being invalid as a theoretical construct in other countries. Davies contends that regime theory, developed from works based on American cities, fails to provide valid conclusions when applied to coalitions in the UK, and therefore is flawed in its geographical applicability. The bodies of criticism relating to regime theory, both that which focuses on the theory as incomplete and that which focuses on the theory as being premised on flawed concepts, serve to highlight areas in which this still-developing theoretical concept can develop in the future.

*Additional Relevant Theories*

While stakeholder and regime theories are viable theoretical concepts for exploring this study, they are not the only applicable theories. The nature of this study, as the intersection between two fields, invites the testing and application of various theories as a means to make a novel impact (Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan, 2007; Zahra & Newey, 2009). Another applicable theory in the same mold as regime theory is communicative action theory. Whereas regime theory focuses on the interactions between cooperating organizations, communicative action theory instead approaches the matter from the viewpoint as urban planning, focusing on how designed participatory processes that involve multiple stakeholders can create consensus and foster political will to foment change (Irazábal & Neville, 2007). This form of planning draws on models that are inherently interactive, conflict-mediating, and consensus-building, a seemingly ideal framework for fostering the creation of beneficial regimes (Sager, Deliberative planning and decision making: An impossibility result, 2002). This theory does present
some challenges, such as creating a common understanding of relevant issues as a means
to address them in planning efforts and, as Sager (1993) and Dryzek (1987) suggest,
creating a communication environment in which no party is dominant, all parties have
equivalent communicative competence, and the only motive is reaching agreement.
While these conditions may be impossible to achieve, Irazábal (2009) contends that their
approximation is sufficient. This theoretical approach, in advocating for communicative
action as a component of planning, seems to imply that an outside organizing entity is
necessary to create the guiding plan that leads to this communicative action, although
such is never explicitly stated.

Another planning-based approach, although not necessarily a theory, is Talvitie’s
(2009) concept of “theoryless planning.” Talvitie (2008) contends that through the
deconstruction of post-post-modern planning, one can see how potential exists to
construct a civic plan without the guiding hand of theory. This approach is built on
“experimental incrementalism” and makes use of Spotnitz’s (1985) contact function,
which calls for responses to the issues that an inquiry raises without introducing the
planners’ ideas or theoretically guided interpretations. This approach, which opts for
reaction rather than proaction, may be a functional option to address short-term needs,
but does not seem as though it is well-suited to fixing problems or addressing goals in the
long run. As such, while it might serve some purpose a means to initiate action, it would
likely be inadequate to craft framework that would sustain action into the future.
The ideas of public value and corporate social responsibility are central components of the conceptual framework for this study. These concepts, both in general and as manifested by the four study subject organizations, will be explored in the answers to this question. Through the examination of the definition and operationalization of both concepts, as well as how they compare to and contrast with each other, an understanding of both concepts at a level functional enough to complete this project should be achieved.

The Public

The concepts that underlie and relate to public value (to be discussed in the following pages) have entered the discourse and evolved over a substantially longer timeframe, making them more difficult to track and conceptualize. The most basic of these, the concept of the “public,” proves especially challenging to pinpoint as, while it is found often in the literature, a direct explanation of the concept is rarely given. Rather, one is generally left to infer from context the nature of this concept that is central to understanding public value and its related ideas.

Crouch (2011) provides a nuanced conceptualization of “public,” initially positing that public exists, at its most basic, as the opposite of “private” (a single individual in an environment that contains some element of hostility, as per the concept of state of nature). As such, Crouch holds public to be, at the very least, “the full range of that which is ‘out there,’ external to the individual and potentially hostile to him or her (pg. 53).” From this baseline (referred to as “Public 1”), however, Crouch establishes an
additional four versions of public, each adding a layer of complexity to the one preceding it. These additional versions are:

- Public 2 - adds to the initial open state unbounded groups of people
- Public 3 - groups of people are bound by communal polity, markets, or values
- Public 4 – like Public 3, except that persons have some rights with regards to how the collective should act
- Public 5 – groups of persons neglected by rent-seeking within the institutions established by Public 3

Based on the applicable populations identified in the earlier discussion of stakeholder theory and beneficiaries, Publics 3 and 4 are the two interpretations most relevant to this study. Jørgensen and Bozeman’s (2007) interpretation of the public sector provides a point of comparison, stating that the public sector “must serve society as a whole; the public sector is there for everybody (pg. 361),” and that the public sector is intrinsically tied to a set of values and bonds that bind people together. This viewpoint seems to reinforce Publics 3 and 4 as viable constructs, as both provide for the unification of people by communal values. Eder (2006) offers a concurring standpoint based on the development of the public (written about as the “public sphere,” to be returned to later) from a historical perspective. These three viewpoints on the matter allow for a triangulation of the concept, as the authors’ backgrounds and biases shape distinct approaches to understanding the idea of “public” that allow for the construction of a functional conceptualization. Crouch approaches the concept from the standpoint of a sociologist and economist, basing his view on exchanges between persons, whereas Jørgensen and Bozeman approach the idea from their
standpoints as political scientists, wherein the public sector exists for, rather than being constructed by, persons. In contrast, Eder approaches the idea from a historical standpoint, which emphasizes the idea of the public as a theoretically physical space. These viewpoints not only allow for a functional understanding of the base concept that underlies public value, which is at the heart of this work, and those terms that are related to it, such as public purpose, public interest, and public good, but serve to highlight the inherent issue in defining “public” due to discipline-based assumptions and conceptions.

Values and The Public

As per the conceptualization of the public put forth in the previous section, there is an intrinsic connection between the public and values. Before exploring this relationship, it is first necessary to examine the two distinct ways in which values are discussed in the literature. The first of these are as active contributors, whereby values represent the enhancing of a particular aspect of a community. Scott (2006) divides this approach into three categories, each representing the particular aspect of the community being enhanced: individual, societal, and economic. McCarthy, et al. (2004), identify five types of benefits, which include some concordance with Scott’s categorization: cognitive, attitudinal and behavioral, health, community-level social, and economic. Additional viewpoints on this interpretation of values tend to focus on only one or two of the three categories (for instance, Clark and Kahn (1988) examine social and economic value as manifested by cultural amenities while Martin (1994) focuses only on economic value through the lens of appropriate subsidies). This mode of discussing values speaks
to the concept of instrumentality, or the idea of indirect outcomes tied to experiences or events (McCarthy, Ondaatje, Zakaras, & Brooks, 2004). From this viewpoint, an experience or event does not stand on its own merit, but rather is judged based on how it impacts the things (people, organizations, communities) around it. The instrumental approach to values focuses on how something actively contributes to its surroundings, impacting it via outcomes. In this way, these public values function as public benefits, in that they are identifiable things from which the public at-large derives and enjoys a benefit.

The second way in which values are discussed in the literature are as stable, intangible concepts of importance to individuals. In this interpretation, rather than acting to actively enhance an aspect of a community, values represent things that have existing value to individuals (or, on a civic basis, a collective thereof). This viewpoint is seen in the work of Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007) and Alford and O’Flynn (2009), which reference it as a basis for the construction of public value. In contrast to the instrumental approach from the first perspective on values, this approach embraces an intrinsic approach, wherein something stands on its own merit. It is important, in considering these two viewpoints, that they are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they are two ways of presenting the same concept. The former approach to values shows them as active contributors, whereas the latter shows them as stable concepts that are capable of only gradual or consensus change. In both cases, however, values represent that which has worth and importance to an individual or collection thereof. An understanding of this, that there are multiple ways of presenting this concept, allows for an exploration of how values and the public interact to lead towards public value and its related concepts.
The most basic union of values and the public, the concept of public values, can be seen to comprise a body of literature independent of the literature on public value (Bozeman, 1987; Jørgensen & Bozeman, 2002; Van Wart, 1998). In this body of literature, public values are held to be the predecessors of public value, whereby the things that have worth to a body of individuals shape what they, as a collective, come to value. Benington (2011) contends that, while this approach does allow for the shaping of communal public values, it fails to account for competing values amongst segments of the populace. However, Keeney, von Winterfeldt, and Eppel (1990) point out that dominant values for a populace emerge when members of the group are allowed to participate in marketplace, whether such a marketplace exists for selection of commodities or candidates. This view ties to Crouch’s (2011) concept of Public 4, with group members utilizing their stake in the marketplace as a means to shape the values of the collective. With the concept of public values established, and accepting Jørgensen and Bozeman’s (2007) contention that public values are the direct predecessors and informers of public value, it is necessary to examine the concept of public value and its related terminology.

/Public Value and its “Cousins”: Comparing and Contrasting/

This study makes use of the concept of “public value,” but this iteration is not the only form of this idea present in the discourse. As the question notes, similar ideas have been presented as “the public interest,” “public benefit,” and “public purpose.”

---

11 Although the concept does not fit neatly within this section, public goods warrant mention, as they are a component of public benefits. Public goods, those goods that are non-rival and non-excludable, inherently
Although “public value” has, especially in the realm of the arts, established itself as the dominant form in use at present, an examination of the related concepts and their use should shed light onto how and why public value has become the standard.

Before attempting to trace the evolution of these ideas, a brief overview of how they differ is necessary. It has been acknowledged in the literature (Benington & Moore, 2011; Wyszomirski, 2000) that these terms are interrelated and have, to some extent, been used interchangeably. However, the distinct meanings of each term inform the places that they occupy within the discourse. The concepts of the public interest and public benefit are, semantically, the most closely related. Both imply action based on what is best for the public. Public purpose implies action based on what is being done for the public, rather than the value judgment of whether or not the action is beneficial. In contrast to these three terms, public value implies the importance of how an action is perceived by the public. This is an important distinction to make as it marks a shift from measuring impact from the standpoint of the actor to measuring impact from the standpoint of the impacted. The differentiation inherent in the semantics of the concept helps to establish a narrative that mirrors the intellectual development of how the concept has been used over time.

Examining the appearance of these terms in the literature, one seems to find a division. Public interest and public benefit appear to be used, albeit with decreasing frequency, from at least the 1950s, where they were used in connection with the

serve as a public benefit. Meerman (1980) speaks to this, arguing that benefits derived from public goods are measurable to individual households.
justification of legislating federal support for the arts. Jørgensen and Bozeman (2002) make mention of this fact, postulating that the decline in their use (particularly public interest) stems from heavy criticism in public administration research during the late 1950s due to the diffuse nature of the concepts. In contrast, public value and public purpose move to prominence at approximately the same time that the Culture Wars of the 1990s were hitting their stride (Miller, 2000; Moore, 1995; Wyszomirski, 1997). Alford and O’Flynn (2009) peg this emergence slightly earlier, beginning in the late 1980s, but also state that this emergence and popularization was a process that ran through the early 1990s, and therefore lining up with the previously mentioned timeframe. Taking into account the semantic significance of each of these phrases, one can see a shift from the presumption of the arts being intrinsically beneficial to the public as justification for their being funded to the arts as serving an instrumental and supplemental purpose from which their worth is derived.

Focusing on the post-shift use of public value and public purpose, one finds that each has a well-established literature base that supports it as a valid evolution of public interest/benefit. The literature for public purpose largely focuses on the arts as a means for development, manifesting itself in forms such as the formation of community identity, enhanced education, economic growth, and promoting general prosperity, all of which appear to be evaluated and measured on the producer’s side (Strom, 2001; The American Assembly, 1997; Wyszomirski, 2000). Additionally, because of public purpose being a producer-side concept, it maintains a measure of flexibility (Alford & O’Flynn, 2009).
That is to say, if a certain purpose is not achievable within certain constraints, then the purpose must be tailored to fit the situation. In contrast, the literature for public value focuses on the importance of producing content that can generate appreciable value on part of the consuming public, and therefore lacks public purpose’s measure of flexibility (Benington & Hartley, 2009; Benington & Moore, 2011; Moore, 1995; Moore & Moore, 2005).

In both cases, the literature indicates the aforementioned shift away from assuming that the arts are good for the public (intrinsic) and towards convincing the public that the arts are beneficial (instrumental). Similarly, Alford and O’Flynn (2009) make a case that public interest and public benefit, rather than simply decreasing in use (as Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007) asserted), have actually become, in the context of public value, components of the argument for valuing something. They state that people will value something, if not inherently, than because it is in their interest or to their benefit to do so. These interests and benefits may be either collective or individual, and if they are collective, then they are inherently tied to the idea of public purposes. As such, the concepts can be seen to not be mutually exclusive, but rather interconnected and complementary.

Interconnections of Public Concepts

Although the preceding section, in accord with the focus of this study and the current tenor of the literature, places some emphasis on public value in comparison to
related public concepts, this should not be taken to imply that public value is inherently
dominant to these concepts. With a brief return to and elaboration on the concept of the
“public sphere,” a case can be made for a model in which each term is inherently
interconnected and can be emphasized as needed.

The public sphere, as mentioned previously (in reference to Eder’s (2006) use of
the concept), is one conceptualization of the public. Rather than utilizing an approach
such as Crouch’s (2011), wherein the public is a wide and varied assortment, the public
sphere invites the visualization of a physical (albeit theoretical) space, an arena in which
the public and its associated actions occurs. Benington (2011) even goes so far as to
define public value in context of the public sphere, stating that public value is a
combination of what the public values and what enhances the value of the public sphere.

If one is to visualize the public sphere in a fashion akin to a Hoberman sphere (a
toy which is an expandable sphere, comprising several overlapped and interconnected
rings), then applying this concept to the interconnected nature of public terminology
allows for the creation of a functional model. Such a model presents the public concepts
as being part of the “shell” of the public sphere, the outer constraints that define the
interior space. In this model, each of the nexus points on the exterior of the sphere
represents one of the public terms (value, purpose, good, etc.). While no particular nexus
is inherently dominant, as need be, the model can be rolled so that is rests on a particular
nexus, thereby framing that as the idea on which the model rests for that given example.
The additional nexuses can be seen as, while interconnected, ultimately feeding into the
dominant one for the case at hand. For example, in the context of this study, the model
would rest on public value and show the other concepts feeding into that. This model
does not necessitate the emphasis of a particular public concept, meaning that all terms can be held in balance of each other if need be. By defining the quasi-physical concept of the public sphere, as well as providing for the interconnectedness of the aforementioned public concepts, such a model shows how, while a given concept may be emphasized in a given work, such emphasis is added, rather than being inherent.

While this examination of the evolution from the use of public interest and public benefit to public purpose and public value, as well as the interconnectedness thereof, is by no means exhaustive, it does provide a proper context for understanding the dominant use of public value and why that is the appropriate conceptualization to utilize for this study.

Public Value and Corporate Social Responsibility Definitions and Operationalizing

Public value and corporate social responsibility, as central components of this study, require some measure of explanation to clarify both their meanings and how they are operationalized, both in general and in the specific context this study, as there is some measure of difference. In examining the nature of these concepts, a frame of reference will be established to allow the later comparison of the two concepts and show how they represent two facets of the same core concept.

Public value is being conceptualized, for purposes of this study, in accordance with Bunting’s (2007) interpretation: the worth that the public ascribe to the presence of
an organization, good, or service which is made available to them. This interpretation is notable for that fact that, in accord with the previously discussed concept of stakeholder theory, it considers the general public that may have standing to be stakeholders, whether or not they choose to act as consumers. As such, even though one may not opt to attend an opera or a baseball game, the perception of individuals of the public value of the organizations that provide those opportunities is as valid as that of one who opted to partake (Blain & O'Donnell, 2000; Bunting, 2008). It should also be noted that the “public” in public value refers not to the organizations, good, or service, but to the perception thereof, meaning that the idea is equally applicable to both public and private organizations, covering all four study subjects.

Public value, in a broad context, may be operationalized using a variety of tools and approaches. From a production-side perspective, Moore and Moore’s (2005) “strategic triangle” presents the three components that must be addressed by public managers (as per Bozeman [1987]) in establishing a strategic vision to generate public value. From this perspective, public value is not an independent concept, but rather a construct that requires a balance of public perception with organizational capacity and support from the authorizing body or environment for the organization. Within this conceptualization, the public value component refers to the perception thereof, requiring some measure of proof that organizations generate public value. To support this component, the legitimacy and support aspect represents a formal acknowledgement of public value, as entities outside of the organization are unlikely to offer support to that
which they do not find valuable. The operational capacity component accounts for the ability of the organization to deliver to the public the generated value.

From a consumption-side perspective, public value is operationalized via measuring public perception and appreciation. Such an approach requires significant resources, as it would necessitate a statistically significant sample of the general public to be polled utilizing a rigorously constructed instrument, both of which take time and the former of which takes money to accomplish. For purposes of this study, public value will be operationalized through the use of two methods, providing both internal and external (relative to the subject organizations) perspectives. The first method relies on organizational conceptualizations of the idea. This approach, which allows each subject organization to identify their individual conceptualization of public value, should highlight the connection between the strategic triangle components and the public perception that each organization feels that or can prove that they have fostered.
Organizations will have the opportunity to provide various sources of evidence to support their public value, including (but not limited) proxy measures such as donation levels, public recognition, or examples of impacting the public agenda. Additionally, this approach has the benefit of providing insight into public value across multiple fields, giving perspective on how the fields and component organizations see it. The second approach relies on a critical analysis of the outreach programs offered by each organization through the lens of the aforementioned Hoberman sphere model. This approach allows for the examination of how such programs imply public value through the use of other public concepts. This dualistic approach incorporates both the organizations’ perspectives and those of an outside researcher.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is being conceptualized, for purposes of this study, using Kotler and Lee’s (2005) definition: “a commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources.” Additional definitions for CSR have been offered that emphasize components such as sustainability and exceeding ethical expectations, but the common elements of these definitions comprise the Kotler and Lee definition (Osgood, 2009; World Business Council for Sustainable Development, 2002). It should be noted that the above definition emphasizes that CSR relies on discretionary, or voluntary, contributions and practices, implying that those actions undertaken and resources allocated by the organization serve to recognize the inherent value in such a venture. These same actions and resources, and the outputs and outcomes associated with them, also serve as the
means by which improvement of community well-being may be measured. Kotler and Lee also use the term “corporate social initiative” (CSI) to identify the actions taken by corporations to fulfill their CSR obligations. As such, initiatives that fit within Williamson, et al.’s (1999) definition of a community outreach program may also fit within the realm of CSR.\textsuperscript{12} It could be argued that the inclusion of the word “corporate” in CSR is intended to preclude the application of the concept to non-profit organizations (which, while incorporated, are not commonly perceived as corporate entities), even though the concept would be otherwise applicable with the substitution of the word “organizational.”

Given the various definitions that have been employed to describe it, operationalizing CSR is a complex task. The concept of CSR provides one mode of operationalization, as it represents the tool by which CSR may be enacted. However, to fully understand the operationalization of CSR, some attention must be paid to the driving organizational attitudes and incentives that result in CSR. The examination of such factors has existed in the literature for some time, but a distinct change began to occur in the mid-1990s when Craig Smith (1994) noted that corporations were beginning to back philanthropic efforts with corporate muscle because such actions gave them real competitive advantages. This began to mark a shift in conceptualization of the topic from a moral or ethical obligation that served to civic commitment and altruistic purposes to a vital component of corporate strategy intended to boost consumer loyalty and trust

\textsuperscript{12} This definition refers to programs that represent to the public the cultural contributions of a community or organization using a variety of media and interactive experiences.
through strategic branding (Cone, Inc., 2000). In light of this shift, and the consistency of this new conceptualization over the past decade, it can be said that, both in general and for purposes of this study, CSR is being operationalized as the use of CSI to back strategically-selected efforts in order to enhance consumer image.

Comparing and Contrasting Public Value and Corporate Social Responsibility

As two central components of this study, and as inherently related concepts, the ideas of public value and corporate social responsibility warrant some measure of comparison to and contrast against each other. The examination of the relationship between these two concepts will provide insight into how each may be utilized for this project, with particular regards to the applicability of each concept to the two fields being studied. Such an examination will contextualize the study of the programs offered by organizations in each field, as it will provide an understanding of the reasoning behind offering such programs.

To provide a basis for comparison and contrast, one need only return to the aforementioned definitions of public value and CSR. To briefly recapitulate these definitions, public value is held to be the worth that the public ascribe to the presence of an organization, good, or service which is made available to them (Bunting, 2007), and CSR is held to be “a commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources (Kotler & Lee, 2005).” One can see in the definitions the inherent importance of the public, although
such is iterated as the “community” in Kotler and Lee’s work. As such, an argument can
be made for the two concepts serving as representative of two sides of the same coin,
with public value representing the consumer side and CSR being representative of the
producer. As a corollary to this, one could claim that public value, while not exclusive to
the concept of CSR, can be utilized as a measure thereof. A corollary of this is the
viewpoint that public value represents an existing acknowledgement of organizational
worth, whereas CSR serves to build such acknowledgements, meaning that the two
concepts are components of the same idea, applied at different phases (CSR coming pre-
acknowledgement, and public value coming post-acknowledgement).

Despite these similarities, public value and CSR do have a number of points of
contrast. A primary example of this, again derived from the definitions of the two
concepts, is the inclusion of the concept of worth. Public value is a measure of the worth
which is generated by the presence of an organization, good or service, but CSR does not
explicitly include a worth-based component. CSR aims to enhance the well-being of the
community, but does not provide either a built-in mechanism to measure this well-being
or a definitive statement of whose perspective on well-being is accounted for. As such,
while public value requires a broad appreciation of generated worth, CSR does not
necessarily require the same. This differentiation means that public value focuses on the
worth inherent in the existence of the generating organization, whereas CSR focuses on
the voluntary additional actions of the organization, which may or may be tied to the
worth of the corporation.
Another point of contrast is the suitability of use for the two concepts. Although the presence of the word “public” could be taken to imply a bent towards public sector organizations, such an interpretation would be incorrect. Since public value is a measure of the assumed or accepted worth (as viewed by the public-at-large) generated by an organization, good, or service, it can be applied to either public or private sectors with equal effectiveness. CSR, however, is necessarily a private sector concept. By definition, it requires corporate resources, implying the constraint of operating within the private sector.13 If one were to look for a more appropriate public sector analogue to CSR, they could turn to the concepts of public benefit and/or public interest. Although both could, as with public value, be applied to the impact of a private sector action, they imply an inherent benefit to the public-at-large rather than a measure which is dependent on public perception. This also allows for the public to benefit from something without perceiving it as having value (this is to say, someone may derive benefit while, for some reason, failing to assign that benefit value).

A final substantive point of contrast between public value and CSR deals with the nature of each concept. Public value is a measure that is employed as justification for the continuation of an organization, good, or service. This measure is particularly valuable in making the case for public funding, as it shows that the tax dollars paid by the public-at-large are being spent in a fashion that produces appreciable worth. CSR is not a measure

---

13 Although public sector corporations do exist, they are a rarity within the United States and other nations that shun state-run industry. A recent example in the United States would be General Motors following its federal bailout, but even in that instance, the corporation continued to function as a private sector entity with a majority share held by the federal government, and it has since returned to a traditional private corporation.
but a set of practices intended to enhance a corporation’s standing through voluntary action (Kotler and Lee [2005] stress the point that CSR is not legal or moral in nature, and therefore is not obligatory). As such, CSR may be a means to the ends of public value, resulting in an enhanced sense of worth that may be reflected in public funding or corporate valuation, but their respective natures do not facilitate a closer relationship.
Applications of the Literature

The previously discussed elements drawn from the literature require examples of their application to this particular work so as to demonstrate their relevance. The following sections serve to tie the literature that underpins this work to the practical and specific elements of the study itself. This also functions in accord with the point made in this chapter’s introduction that, as a practical (rather than theoretical) study, relevance and applicability are key components to establishing validity. In addition to showing the relevance of the previously examined literature, the following sections introduce and review new elements drawn from the literature that are more specific to the study at hand than the aforementioned broad concepts.

*Prime Beneficiaries of Study Subjects*

The prime beneficiaries of the four subject organizations for this study can be identified by utilizing Blau and Scott’s typology to analyze the nature of the organizations, and therefore discover the individual or group that serves as the prime beneficiary. As noted in the previous section, privately held sport organizations function as business concerns, intended primarily to generate profit for those who own the team. This categorization applies to both the Blue Jackets and Crew, although identifying the prime beneficiary for the former is a somewhat simpler task than for the latter. The Blue Jackets are owned and operated by a private company, so they can be identified as the team’s prime beneficiary. The Crew, however, are members of Major League Soccer,
which operates teams as franchises independently overseen, but owned by the league. As such, one could make a case that either the franchisee or the league is the prime beneficiary. For this study, the league, as overseer of the franchise, will be held as the prime beneficiary.

Venturing away from sport and towards the arts, the two subject organizations provide an interesting challenge in determining who the prime beneficiary is. Both organizations offer some opportunity for membership or subscriptions, which might lead one to think that they are mutual benefit organizations with the members/subscribers being the prime beneficiaries. However, while such opportunities do offer additional benefits to those who choose to partake of them, the organizations are not strictly for the use of those who do. As such, an argument can be made that the arts organizations operate as either service organizations, where the prime beneficiaries are the members of the public who opt to be patrons, or as commonwealths, given the obligation for public service derived from their status as 501(c)3 organizations. Most likely, the two arts organizations represent a hybrid between service organization and commonwealth, given their dual obligations.

Additional Beneficiaries of Study Subjects

Identifying additional beneficiaries for each of the study subjects requires additional examination of Blau and Scott’s (1962) typography. While the primary function of the typography is to sort organizations into four categories based on the prime
beneficiary, it also serves to identify the various groups (members, owners, clients, and the public-at-large) that may serve as beneficiaries, prime or otherwise. By determining which group is the prime beneficiary for each organization, the other groups, such that they have some measure of interaction with the organization, can be held to be additional beneficiaries.

The Blue Jackets are a business concern, with the owners of the team being the prime beneficiaries. However, the other three groups derive benefit from the organization. Members, in this case the employees, benefit from their employment, receiving pay and benefits. Clients, those who pay to watch the team, benefit from the opportunity to watch a live sporting event, the camaraderie that develops amongst a fan base, and the entertainment value of events related to the team. The public-at-large benefits from the economic impact of having a major league sport franchise in the city, including taxes paid by both the organization and the other organizations that it hosts and spending at hotels and restaurants tied to game attendance.

The Crew, also a business concern, may be said to have the same additional beneficiaries as the Blue Jackets. However, the aforementioned differentiations in their organizational structure (as a franchise owned by the) allow for additional non-prime beneficiaries. In the case of the Crew, the league is the prime beneficiary, but the team exists as an organization independent of its members (employees). As such, the team benefits from the support, both financial and logistical, of the league and from its own
reputation as it functions in supplemental roles, such as when the organization acts as a charitable instrument.

As with the sport organizations, the similarities amongst the arts organizations (both are service organizations/commonwealth hybrids, making their clients and the general public the prime beneficiaries) allows for some overlap amongst additional beneficiaries. One could contend that, since these organizations do not have owners, their boards of directors assume this function. Rather than reaping financial benefits from this association, however, the directors benefit socially through opportunities for interactions and the esteem of others. The members/subscribers of these organizations derive their benefit from the opportunities that they enjoy through their devotion and contributions to the organization. As with the directors, these include social benefits, but they also include the financial benefit of saving money on attendance through subscriptions and access to special events and publications. The public-at-large derives benefit from the economic impact of attendance at events or visits to the organizations similar to those described above for sport organizations.

*Stakeholder Theory and Relationship/Social Marketing*

Marketing, as the practice of making the public aware of something’s existence, establishes the public as salient stakeholders via Mitchell et al.’s (1997) and Hill and Jones’ (1992) takes on the concept. The public is established as salient from Mitchell et al.’s viewpoint through the power and urgency that is implied in the attempt to compel
them to become consumers. Similarly, Hill and Jones’ viewpoint would establish them as stakeholders due to their status as controllers of resources (in this instance, money). In this sense, community outreach programs are a form of marketing utilized by sport and arts organizations, intended to generate value for the public and convince them to become patrons of the organization that is sponsoring the program. In this capacity, the organizations are utilizing both relationship and social marketing, or the practices of indirectly inducing consumption through an established relationship between an organization and a person/people or through community enhancement (Andreasen, 1994; Payne, Ballantyne, & Christopher, 2005). In considering sport and arts marketing, it becomes evident that there are two distinct audiences for these efforts: those that live in the organization’s locale and those that would have to travel to make use of the organization’s offerings.

This first group, those already in an organization’s locale, represents the primary audience for community outreach programs, as organizations focus their efforts on those with the most immediate access to their product. It is these people who benefit from the social marketing aspect of outreach programs, and they also derive a substantial part of the benefit attributed to relationship marketing as developed through outreach (Christopher, Payne, & Ballantyne, 2004; Andreasen, 1994). The second group, those that live outside of an organization’s locale, must be drawn in by other means, as they do not directly benefit from the social marketing component outreach programs that acts as an enticement to locals. If the offerings of an organization are of particular interest to these people, then the organization may be able to draw them in via special interest
tourism, or travel to partake in or visit a single event or institution rather than to take in the entirety of the area visited (Weiler & Hall, 1992).

A pervasive issue in organizational marketing in Columbus is competing for attention and spending against Ohio State. Ohio State represents a significant draw for special interest tourists to the city, particularly in acting as host of athletic events. In this capacity, Ohio State has the potential to serve local residents (by generating revenue and community spirit) and visitors (by increasing awareness and familiarity with the city) on a large scale (Garnham, 1996; Gibson, Willming, & Holdnak, 2003; Higham, 1999; Irwin & Sandler, 1998; Walo, Bull, & Breen, 1996). Additionally, Ohio State athletics, in particular football, provide a comprehensive social experience that creates its own community that cannot be matched in scope by the city’s other sport or arts organizations (Gibson, Willming, & Holdnak, 2002).

Organizational and location branding will be key to non-Ohio State sport and arts organizations establishing themselves as draws to tourists, as well as the attention of locals. The use of community outreach programs, in conjunction with other marketing efforts, allows these organizations to establish a brand with local residents that either take part in the outreach programs or derive benefit from them (O'Shaughnessy & O'Shaughnessy, 2002; Williamson J., 1988). For non-local residents, these programs and the organizations that offer them serve as a gateway to a destination brand, a conception of Columbus that extends beyond being home of the Buckeyes to one that includes all aspects of the city’s culture (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006; Ekinci, Sirakaya-Turk, & Baloglu, 2007; Hosany, Ekinci, & Uysal, 2007; Pike, 2009).
As noted in this section’s initial question, an important component of this study deals with how communities might perceive the public value and/or corporate citizenship of arts and sport organizations, with particular regards to economic development and image marketing of cities. This section will not delve into the definitions or modes of operationalization for these concepts, as those will both be addressed in answering the final question of this exam. Rather, this section will address the role of community perception in this study and how stakeholder and regime theories fit into the issue.

Community perception is an important part of this study as it is the measure of the effect of public value and corporate citizenship enhancement efforts on the part of sport and arts organizations. These organizations serve valuable purposes for economic development and image marketing for the city (for instance, the development of the Arena and King-Lincoln Districts around the building/renovating of Nationwide Arena as a home for the Blue Jackets and the King Theatre, respectively), but they must make a positive impact on how the public-at-large perceives them if they are to continue to receive support, be it through attendance, participation, or public funding. Although numerous studies exist to show that these organizations are economic drivers for the city and they have become ingrained as part of the city’s culture, the community must see and accept these benefits to find value in the organizations’ presence. In short, community perception is how one tells if the programs that this study examines are serving their purposes.
Stakeholder and regime theories help to explain the organizational component of public perception; particularly, how they can work, individually and collaboratively, to enhance community perception. The inclusion of stakeholder theory serves to help identify the various groups within the community whose needs and concerns must be, if not addressed, at least considered by the individual organizations as they plan their efforts. This is particularly true for the arts organizations that need to maintain positive perception as a means to establish value not only amongst patrons, but also amongst various governmental, corporate, and foundational funders. While stakeholder theory accounts for how individual organizations analyze their various constituencies, regime theory accounts for inter-organizational cooperation intended to enhance not only the organizations themselves, but also their perception within the community. The establishment of these regimes enhances the capabilities of the participant organizations, thereby allowing them to better serve the community, creating enhanced perception. Additionally, the cooperative efforts would theoretically produce a unified group to represent the city, creating a less disparate image for Columbus than currently exists. Through the use of these two theoretical perspectives, the perception of these organizations, both within and outside of Columbus, has the opportunity to be enhanced.
Potential Further Studies in Sport and the Arts Utilizing Stakeholder and Regime Theory

While this study aims to make use of stakeholder and regime theories as conceptual guides in interpreting findings, it is far from the only study that could be conducted utilizing these theoretical guides. In considering potential future studies utilizing these theories, three opportunities become evident that would make both substantial contributions to and develop new thought streams in the existing literature. The first such study is a stakeholder theory-only examination of who the sport and arts organizations perceive to be their stakeholders. Whereas this study considers the stakeholder groups as a component of a broader idea, a study that focuses entirely on stakeholder analysis across both fields will provide a clearer representation of which groups are being served or, perhaps more importantly, which groups the organizations feel a need to serve due to their stakeholder status. Such an analysis would benefit not only sport and arts organizations, but also other existing or new organizations in the city that would have a point of reference regarding the service provided to sections of the community.

The second potential study would make use of only regime theory. Whereas this study examines the opportunities and benefits of regime formation, such a study would focus on the capacity and incentive within the organizations to form cooperative regimes. This potential study would make a significant contribution to the broader academic literature for both fields as little to none currently exists that explores how organizational structures or practices in either field serve to develop or enhance the capacity for regime
formation. Therefore, such a study would represent a strong step towards the understanding of how regimes may form in such organizations in other cities, allowing the practical benefits of this project to spread with greater ease.

The third potential study would be similar in construction to this current project, but would apply stakeholder and regime theories to the entireties of the two fields across a city rather than working with a representative sample. Such a study would impact the future use of representative samples by providing a point of comparison by which the validity of the current project and its sampling may checked. Additionally, the adjustments made from the current framework to one suited to a full-scale study would provide the flexibility to conduct a similar study in locales where the approach being applied to Columbus may not be applicable or sufficient.

Contributions of this Study to Theory-Based Literature

Although additional studies utilizing stakeholder and regime theories would make substantive contributions to the academic literature, both in the bodies thereof pertaining to the respective theories and the fields to which they would be applied, this current study is not without its own contributions. It stands to be one of the first studies to apply stakeholder and regime theories to a cross-field context, and the first to make those particular fields the arts and sport. Additionally, as alluded to above, it will establish a replicable framework for similar studies should other locales wish to conduct them with their own sport and arts organizations. Lastly, it establishes a precedent for constructing
studies in the same vein utilizing theoretical constructs that allow for the perspectives of all involved parties to be accounted for without having to generate multiple data sets.

*Literature-Based Proposed Indicators and Measures for Evaluative Purposes*

A final consideration in the use of both public value and CSR in this study is the establishment of indicators and measures to be used in analyzing the cases of the four study subjects.\(^\text{14}\) It should be noted, that, although both public value and CSR are referred to in the question as evaluations, in accord with the previous section, only public value will be considered as an evaluation, whereas CSR will be considered as a set of practices, the implementation of which can be evaluated. As such, whereas public value is a measurable outcome which necessitates indicators of its existence, CSR requires the establishment of measures so as to gauge the outputs and outcomes. However, practical constraints on the completion of this study raise a problem.

An issue facing this study, both with regards to public value and CSR, is that an adequate gauge of public perception of each would require resources, in terms both financial and physical, that exceed those available for the completion of this study. In light of this concern, this study is being conducted by utilizing a multi-faceted approach to evaluating the public value generated or the CSR undertaken by the study subjects. The first component of this approach is collecting data on the measure of public value

\(^{14}\text{A note of clarification regarding the uses of the terms indicators, measures, outputs, and outcomes: indicators refers to signs of an event or programs impact that are not necessarily quantifiable, whereas measures are the quantifiable equivalent thereof. Outputs are the immediate results of an event or program, whereas outcomes are the long-term results of these immediate results.}\)
and CSR from the study subjects. The advantage to utilizing this approach, aside from feasibility, is that focusing on organizational conceptions of public value and CSR enables an examination of the sections of the community that are being served by the organizations, as well as provide insight into differences in how the four organizations conceive and operationalize these concepts. To clarify this, utilizing the concept of stakeholder theory (as discussed earlier in this chapter), the entire citizenry of Columbus are stakeholders (as they are potential patrons, donors, and contributors through public funding). As such, by seeing which sections of the community are being served and catered to through each organization’s conception of public value, it will also be possible to see which stakeholders are being neglected (and, perhaps, how such neglect negatively impacts their perceptions of the organizations/how the organizations are trying to counteract such perceptions). Such an approach also allows for the various organizational conceptions to feed into a new, combined understanding, which aligns with the stated use of grounded theory as a theoretical basis for this study (Atkinson & Delamont, 2005; Charmaz, 2001). This method of analysis for these cases requires not the establishment of indicators and measures unique to this study, but rather the thorough examination of those that are currently being employed by the study subjects. This approach makes note of organizational intentions and employs organizational self-evaluations, which potentially poses the problem of the study subjects skewing evaluations or retroactively altering intentions so as to create a self-fulfilling prophecy of sorts. This issue leads to the use of the two additional components of analysis.
The second component of this analytical approach involves utilizing the aforementioned Hoberman sphere model for understanding the public sphere to identify outcomes and indicators of public value. The interconnected nature of this model allows one to see how, by focusing on a specific public concept, the other related public concepts can feed into and construct that one, making it an outcome thereof. As such, by focusing the model on public value, one can examine how it acts as an outcome of the other public concepts (benefit, interest, etc.). Conversely, by focusing the model on another public concept, one could examine how that concept acts as an outcome of public value. This approach, coupled with the examination of public support for and agenda setting by the organizations, allows for the identification of both indicators of public value and outcomes of public concepts.

The utilization of this multi-faceted approach potentially facilitates the use of a competing values framework (CVF) as a means to gauge public value (Talbot, 2008). This approach, which is built on the contradictions of the desire for flexibility and autonomy versus the need for stability and control, results in a model that does not function on binary oppositions, but rather, explores organizations’ abilities to balances these distinct and contrasting ideas. This model is designed to function in much the same way as a balanced scorecard, a tool that, while originally designed to improve organizational performance, can serve to demonstrate outcomes to various organizational stakeholders (Brookes & Wiggan, 2009).
Conclusion

The use of theories as a means to guide the construction and completion of an academic study is standard practice, but the selection and implementation of appropriate theories is critical. For this study, stakeholder and regime theories have been identified as the applicable theoretical concepts that best inform the understanding of the perspectives involved. Additionally, the use of communicative action theory and, to a lesser extent, theoryless planning add supplemental insight that creates a theoretical framework that accounts for the various parties involved in the study. Through the implementation of this framework, a precedent is established that allows for any subsequent studies to borrow an existing and functional model.

Public value and corporate social responsibility are central components of the conceptual framework for this study. Although intrinsically related, these two concepts contrast with each other to such a degree that they provide a diverse perspective from which to analyze the cases to be studied. Despite constraints on financial and physical resources constraining the establishment and implementation of indicators and measures specifically for this study, a thorough understanding of how public value and CSR may be operationalized allows for the use of organizational conceptions of these ideas in both analyzing the cases themselves and establishing a composite conception for the two fields involved and the city as a collective. Such an approach will provide a strong sense of both the social responsibility being practiced and the value being generated in regards to the public-at-large.
The confluence of these bodies of literature is this study, wherein the literature on public value and CSR inform the establishment of purposes of the outreach programs being studied while the literature on organizational theories complements this by elaborating on who is served by these programs and how they function in a broader context. From this baseline understanding for contextualization, the following several chapters will contribute to the literature by applying these concepts in an examination of the use of outreach programs by professional sport and arts organizations in Columbus.
Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods

This study is somewhat unusual and challenging in nature, in that it focuses on locating intersections between two apparently different fields. As is the case with any significant study, appropriate research strategies and studies must be employed that establish a sound foundation for the inquiry. In addition to the selection of appropriate strategies and methods, an understanding of the theoretical underpinnings and mechanisms of each is required so as to maintain a reasonable level of transparency while conducting the study. As such, this chapter will address the selected methodology, my current understanding and interpretation thereof, and the research methods, as well as the strategies of inquiry that informed these viewpoints (with particular emphasis on the work of Robert Yin and Robert Stake). Additionally, as a means of reflexive criticism, the potential weaknesses and issues inherent in these methods will be addressed. Through this examination and explication, the methodological underpinnings of this research should be well-conveyed to the reader.

Methodology

Due to the nature of this research, it will require an approach that employs triangulation or multiple intersecting qualitative methods. The overarching methodology to be employed in this work is comparative case study, with each subject organization
serving as a case. Additionally, this methodology will be situated within relevant literature, so as to be more likely to advance knowledge and understanding on the topic (Yin, 2003). As per Schwandt (2007), this methodology allows for the comparison of multiple cases (in this case, the sport and arts organizations) and the use of these comparisons as the basis for analysis. This approach also has the benefit of keeping the cases the focal point of the research, rather than a set of variables (or, in other words, the focus is on the selection of good cases, rather than identifying ideal variables). The nature of the data is well-aligned with case study methodology which, according to Robert Stake (1995), emphasizes creation of knowledge based on the particular, a specific example rather than a conglomeration of examples and ideas. Similarly, from Robert Yin’s (2002) viewpoint of appropriate use for case study research, this study meets the qualifications of the inquirer having no control over what is being studied, the object of study being a contemporary phenomenon, and it being desirable to use multiple sources of evidence. The choice to use comparative case study methodology in this study was a design choice derived from what Yin (1989) refers to as replication logic: the idea that additional cases are chosen for study because they will yield similar information or findings.

This study, and the methods selected to conduct it, are based in grounded theory. Grounded theory is distinguished from other theoretical constructs by the presence of six characteristics: simultaneous data collection and analysis, creation of analytic codes based on the data rather than preconceived hypotheses, the use of middle-range theories as a means to explain behavior and processes, the writing of analytic notes to explicate

\footnote{An argument can be made for the study of Columbus as a singular case (as a collective case study) with the organizations as components of that case, but such an approach would be best suited to a study focusing on the culture of the city and not the programs offered by individual organizations.}
categories, theoretical sampling, and delay of the literature review (Charmaz 1983, 1990; Glaser 1978, 1992; Glaser & Strauss 1967; Strauss 1987; Strauss & Corbin 1994). This approach, rather than establishing a projected outcome based on theoretical conceptions, allows for findings to be arrived at heuristically as the research progresses, making it well suited for methods that are simultaneously exploratory and analytic, such as interviews (Atkinson & Delamont, 2005; Charmaz, 2001). Utilizing grounded theory also allows for relevance to impact the patterns and data that emerge, rather than adherence to a theoretical expectation (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Case Study Research

Before examining the viewpoints of methodologists Yin and Stake that have informed my interpretation of case study as a methodology, I feel it is necessary to explain the selection of this methodology as a means to establish a lens to view the influence of these two authors on the case studies at hand. Case study methodology, particularly comparative case study, allows for the use of each subject organization as a distinct, yet related, example, creating an avenue to examine each organization (i.e., the Blue Jackets, Crew, Columbus Museum of Art, and Opera Columbus) on its own while cross-comparing it against the other subject organizations (Schwandt, 2007). This approach also carries the benefit of keeping the cases as the focal point of the research, rather than focusing on the selection of ideal analytic variables. The importance of these

16 It should be noted that a valid argument could be made for studying Columbus as a singular case (thereby utilizing collective, rather than comparative, case study) with each organization serving as a component of the case, but this approach would be better suited to future studies focusing on making the findings of this study actionable on a city-wide basis rather than this work which focuses on programs offered by individual organizations.
variables should ultimately not be downplayed, but they are universal (that is to say, they may be applied to additional fields in further research), whereas these cases are representative of the set of data applicable to the specific study at hand.

It should also be noted that the selection of case study as the primary methodology for this work aligns with the use of grounded theory as the guiding theoretical frame for the project. Since grounded theory is based on the concept of allowing the data to develop into findings and allowing relevance to impact the patterns and findings that emerge, rather than making a projection of the outcome based on theoretical conceptions, this construct fits an approach that prioritizes the selection of the cases (in this instance, the subject organizations) over the formation of codes, which are informed by theoretical preconceptions (Atkinson & Delamont, 2005; Charmaz, 2001; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As such, the use of case study methodology for this project is both functional and logical.

Case Study According to Yin

Robert Yin provides perspectives on the nature of case study methodology, the various approaches to conducting this form of research, and the usefulness of this approach. Yin argues that case study methodology distinguishes itself from other research methodologies in that it allows for study of a phenomenon that is not readily distinguishable from its context (Yin R. K., 2003). That is to say, case study methodology allows for the consideration of the environment in which the object of study
exists in developing findings. Given that the scope of this study requires two such contextualizations (setting the programs being examined within the context of their respective organizations, and setting those organizations within the context of the city of Columbus), Yin’s explanation of case study makes this methodology ideal for the task at hand. Similarly, Yin asserts that case study is appropriate in instances when the researcher lacks control over what is being studied (this is to say, they can only shape the collection of the data, not the generation of the data), the object of study being a contemporary phenomenon, and the desirability of using multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2002). Since this study fits all of these qualifications, this reaffirms the selection of case study as the appropriate research methodology for the project.

In describing approaches to case study, Yin suggests that there are at least six fundamental types of case studies, and these may be represented in a 2x3 matrix (Yin, 2003). This matrix distinguishes between types of case studies based on whether they are single- or multiple-case studies and whether they are exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory in nature (see table 1). Yin notes that, in multiple-case studies, the cases should be selected based on replication such that they provide either similar results or contrasting results for predictable reasons (Yin, 1989, 2003).
Yin goes on to explain the three purposes that a case study may serve.

Exploratory case studies serve to define the hypotheses or questions that may guide a subsequent study or to determine if research procedures for such a study are feasible.

These types of studies seem to manifest themselves as pilot studies, such as the thesis study that preceded this current project. Descriptive case studies provide a complete and contextualized account of a phenomenon. Interestingly, despite Yin’s contention that contextualization is one of the indicators of case study as an appropriate methodology, this is the only form of case study for which he explicitly notes the importance of context.

Explanatory case studies focus on the cause and effect relationships inherent in the collected data, explaining how and why events occur. Although Yin holds each of these purposes as distinct, there does appear to be room, in practice, for overlap. For example, this study will require both descriptive and explanatory elements, examining how programs are operated both by their organizations and within the context of the city. As such, although Yin does not claim that the purposes may overlap, it seems as though the borders between the purposes may be blurred.
Case Study According to Stake

Though Robert Stake’s contribution to the literature on case studies may not cover as wide a scope of the topic as does Yin’s, he nonetheless offers significant input, with particular focus given to executing case studies as a means to conduct qualitative inquiry. In contrast to Yin’s assertion that case study is a distinct methodology, Stake claims that case study is not a methodology, but rather a choice of what is to be studied (Stake, 2000, 2008). This school of thought, then, places the onus for academic rigor on the researcher and their selection of methods by which they plan to examine the case, not on some existing and concrete approach to examining the case. This highlights the importance of appropriate utilization of interviews and document analysis in this study, as will be discussed later in response to this question.

Stake offers his own taxonomy of forms of case study, whereby all case studies can be classified as being of one of three forms: intrinsic, instrumental, or multiple/collective (Stake, 2000). Intrinsic case studies are those undertaken because the researcher’s primary motivation is a better understanding of the particular case (for instance, an organizational history). These individual cases are not necessarily representative of others, and therefore their use for such purposes as theory construction and extrapolation are limited. Instrumental case studies are those undertaken as a means to come to a generalized conclusion or understanding, rather than limiting the findings to the specific case (for instance, an examination of an organization and its context within its locale). As such, the case itself is still important, but so are the contexts in which it
exists. In this instance, the use of the label “instrumental” refers to how the case being examined impacts or represents its surroundings (rather than the more self-contained approach utilized with intrinsic case studies). Stake notes that there is not a distinct boundary between intrinsic and instrumental case study, but rather that there is a “zone of combined purpose” (Stake, 2008). This implies that there are benefits to be found in an approach that thoroughly examines both the individual case and the role of the case within a larger context. Multiple, or collective, case studies are those in which a number of cases, rather than a single one, are the focus of study (for instance, examining all organizations of a certain type within a locale). In these studies, the group of cases examined form a single collective case from which understandings about the entire group and a larger group of similar cases may be derived. The purposes of these studies are similar to those of instrumental studies, differentiated only by the fact that they are comprised of multiple cases rather than a single case. This minor differentiation seems to reinforce the concept that these forms of case study are not distinctly different, but rather share some combined purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Multiple/Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a better understanding of a particular case; cases may not be representative of others</td>
<td>Provide a generalized conclusion or understanding; contexts are as important as the case</td>
<td>Same as instrumental, but using more than one case to draw the conclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Types of Case Studies, Stake
In addition to discussion of the forms of case study research which may be undertaken, Stake discusses the situations that are best suited to case study rather than other modes of inquiry. Stake states that case study is best employed when the research emphasizes the creation of knowledge based on the particular rather than on a conglomeration of examples and ideas (Stake, 1995). Although this point may seem to undermine the concept of multiple case studies, the two ideas are not mutually exclusive. Multiple case studies draw the particular from a related set of cases, whereas Stake mentions a conglomeration in reference to drawing ideas from disparate sources to then construct an example. Additionally, in situations in which the contexts that shape the phenomenon or entity being studied factor into shaping understandings, the use of case study research is warranted. Whereas some other forms of qualitative research either strip the study subject of its contexts or present the contexts without fully exploring their impact on the study subject, case study research calls for a thorough examination of the contexts, as they shape the case and explain the relationships inherent in it. This additional information allows the researcher to create a richer, more comprehensive representation of the case than would be possible with other forms of research. Given the nature of this study (an examination of the subject organizations and their outreach programs contextualized within the city of Columbus), Stake’s approach to case study research is ideal.
Potential Vexations

Although, as noted and explained above, case study methodology is appropriate for this particular study, there exists the potential for issues, questions, or bedevilments to arise through its use in this particular study. A fundamental issue that may arise regards the permanence of cases. Unlike other research methodologies, which may provide for the collection of new data from a similar sample, the focus of case studies on the particular requires the use of certain cases. As such, if these cases cease to exist, the opportunity to examine them in the dynamic context of a contemporary phenomenon also vanishes. This is a legitimate concern for this study with regards to at least two of the subject organizations. Opera Columbus has recently shifted management responsibilities to the Columbus Association for the Performing Arts (CAPA), switched from producing shows to presenting touring productions, and cut staff in an attempt to curb costs and keep the organization functioning in some capacity (Grossberg, 2011; Columbus Business First, 2011). While this move is intended to preserve the organization, it changes the existing contexts that it has existed in, thereby altering the case to be examined.

A similar, and perhaps more dire, example is the city’s hockey team, the Blue Jackets. The Blue Jackets, according to sources, have lost approximately $50 million over the last three seasons, with an estimated $10-12 million per year being due to the current lease agreement with Nationwide Arena (Portzline, 2011). An agreement was struck between Nationwide and Ohio State to allow the school to oversee the
management of Nationwide Arena in an attempt to alleviate the current financial problems, and while this agreement has reportedly led to approximately $1 million in savings, it is not yet known to what extent this will serve to benefit the Blue Jackets (Pyle, 2011). This financial instability could lead the team to either be retracted by the league or seek another city where such issues might not persist. Were the team to leave Columbus, this would eliminate one of the cases, thereby necessitating a restructuring of the study.

It should be noted that, in addition to the above-mentioned agreement that allows Ohio State to oversee management of Nationwide Arena, the city of Columbus has engaged in actions to alleviate the team’s financial issues and keep them from relocating. In the fall of 2011, the city began exploring a plan to utilize tax revenue from the forthcoming Hollywood Casino to purchase Nationwide Arena and renegotiate the team’s lease with the venue (Portzline A., 2011). This plan, which was approved in October of 2011 and put into action in March of 2012, includes the purchase of the arena by the Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority for $42.5 million, a $52 million investment in the team and a $28.5 million agreement for a decade of naming rights by Nationwide (which will take a 30% ownership interest in the team), and an agreement by the team to stay in Columbus until 2039 in exchange for a rent-free lease (Caruso, 2012). This alleviates concerns about the team’s relocation for the near future, but required an extensive amount of civic intervention to do so.
A question that might be raised due to the use of case studies is whether or not the cases selected are appropriate for the subject at hand. Given that the scope of this project encompasses professional organizations, the two sport cases leave little room for question, as they are two of the only three established organizations that fit the description.\footnote{The Ohio Machine, a Major League Lacrosse franchise, begins play in Central Ohio in the 2012 season. However, as a new entity, the team lacks the track record that would make it a suitable subject for this study.} However, the two cases selected for the arts are by no means a comprehensive representation of professional arts organizations in Columbus.\footnote{A cursory examination of the organizations that are members of the Columbus Arts Marketing Association reveals no fewer than 30 organizations covering all artistic disciplines.} Although Rubinstein (1994) and Baum (2002) contend that there are no clearly defined rules regarding appropriate sample sizes for qualitative studies, the relatively small sample size is supported by Miles and Huberman (1994) and Patton (1990), who assert that sampling in qualitative studies is focused on the ability to study in depth and detail. Although these cases were selected to represent professional arts organizations based on perceived parallels with the sport organizations (via purposive sampling), their status as the best examples, or of the validity of only selecting three of them to represent the entirety of professional arts organizations, could be called into question. Since the appropriate selection of cases impacts the understanding of the phenomena being examined, finding that either the cases themselves or the sample size are invalid would undermine the study and the quality of its findings (Patton, 1990; Vaughan, 1992; von Wright, 1971).
An issue related to the above concern over the selection of appropriate cases is, if the selected cases are deemed inappropriate (due to sampling method) or insufficient (due to sample size), how new or additional cases might be selected. As noted in the introduction, this project is “unusual and challenging” for several reasons, not the least of which is the lack of substantial precedent for such a study. As such, determining a method to select new cases (if one or more of the current ones were to become unusable) would require the formulation of new set of criteria by which potential replacements could be evaluated. I am, at present, uncertain of the methods applicable to developing such criteria, which further compounds the issue. However, if such a method is derived, the benefit of introducing it is that, through its repeated use in similar instances, an effect similar to that described in accumulation theory is achieved, whereby a hegemony is created through repetition and corroboration (DeFleur & Dennis, 1998). In other words, by introducing the method and having others follow it, a method developed for this study could become an accepted practice.

Data Collection

Data for this research has been collected using techniques associated with qualitative comparative case study methodology. These qualitative data, program descriptions from organizational documents and organizational interviews, give information regarding the intent, execution, and intended audiences for the outreach programs being examined. Although there are quantitative aspects to the data in these
documents, and they are discussed in this section as well, the quantitative data are derived from the original qualitative form.

The data for this study were collected from four sources: the internet, internal organizational documents, external organizational documents, and organizational interviews. The internet served as the primary source of data, as all included organizations’ have websites with information on the majority of their programs. The internet was also useful in collecting data from sources other than the organizations’ websites, such as patron or supporter groups. The internal documents of each organization, such as development plans and memos, were collected as primary documents in instances where programs exist that are not listed on the internet and are not discussed in external documents and as supplemental documents in instances where program information is available elsewhere. External documents, in the form of playbills and game programs available to those attending events, were also a source of information. These were used with organizations whose websites have information on their current programs, but offer no insight into past efforts.

Organizational interviews, conducted with those who administer the programs, are used to help contextualize and compare the written program descriptions against what actually happens, as well as to add information that might not be available from any of the other data sources. These interviews, conducted over several weeks, act as a window, allowing for insight into the organizations and drawing out how they perceive the programs that are the focus of this study (Hyman, Cobb, Feldman, Hart, & Stember, 1975; Gabriel, 2000). The interview process consisted of a set of two-part set of semi-structured interview questions (that is to say, based on a guide but allowing for free
response) interviews with each organization (Bernard, 2006). The first section consisted of a preliminary overview of the project with the interviewee, as well as a request for materials on their organization’s programs and having them talk me through the programs (in several instances, this information was provided ahead of time and discussed in the interview). The second section occurred after analysis of the program documentation and allowed for clarification where necessary and insight into any deviation in practice from the descriptions in the documents. As a means to ensure that all information from these interviews, not just verbal, is included, notes were taken during the interviews akin to stage direction, allowing me the opportunity (ultimately passed on, given that it yielded no additional data of value) to transcribe the interviews as drama and capture deeper meaning than were I to only transcribe the words spoken (Ely, Vinz, Downing, & Anzul, 1997; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; Richardson, 1994; Tripp, 1983).

It should be noted that the data collected refers only to the nature of the programs rather than offering any indication, be it qualitative or quantitative, of their success. By avoiding discussion of whether a program is a “success” or “failure,” the focus remains on the content and structure of the outreach programs offered by the organizations rather than whether the program is popular in this locale or whether their administration of the program is well executed.

**Interviews and Document Analysis**

In order to collect the data necessary to complete the case studies in this project, the use of interviews and document analysis were selected as research methods. Although each method made a vital contribution of data by which the cases may be studied, they also each presented unique issues inherent in their respective mechanisms...
that needed to be accounted for in planning and executing the project. By examining these potential issues, they could be accounted and accommodated for in planning to execute the proposed project.

*Mechanisms and Issues in Document Analysis*

Utilizing document analysis in conducting case studies allows the researcher to capture a static impression of a likely dynamic organization or phenomenon, creating a “snapshot” of a particular aspect of what is being examined. It should be noted, before delving into the issues inherent in document analysis, that this question is being addressed bearing in mind Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) concept of a document: a written text that was prepared to attest to some formal transaction. This does introduce the first issue, though, in that documents require a contextualized interpretation of its content (Hodder, 2000). If the researcher makes use of documents for which they lack the proper context, then their interpretations may, at least, lack the richness of context and may, at most, be invalid.

On a similar note, the researcher must be sure that they can ascertain not only the context implied by the content of the document, but also the context in which it was created. Details such as whether the document was based on first- or second-hand accounts, whether it was edited, and whether it was signed or anonymous all impact the construction, and therefore content, of the document (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, &
Sechrest, 1966). As above, if the researcher lacks the proper context, it can undermine the value of the findings.

Another issue that may arise through the use of document analysis is whether or not the necessary documents can be obtained. Given the nature of this particular study, the availability of the documents needed to examine the subject organizations is partially dependent upon the cooperation of the organizations themselves.19 If the organizations are either unwilling or unable to share the necessary documents, than this component of the study falls apart. Given the aforementioned turmoil that two of the subject organizations currently find themselves in, this may potentially impact the availability of the documents needed to conduct the studies.

As with the issues inherent in using interviews, those tied to the use of document analysis may be minimized through careful and thorough advance preparation. To establish the context necessary to properly interpret collected documents, one may ask question during the course of interviews that would establish context, or one may look to outside sources (blogs, news articles, and the like) that may also serve to establish the necessary context to allow for proper interpretation. Similarly, discussion with the organizations of what documents are and are not available will allow for the location of outside materials to help fill the information gap that their absence creates. By finding out in advance what materials are available, one can also alter the proposed study and

---

19 The organizations will be responsible for sharing documents such as internal documentation, programs, playbills, and others that are not freely and publicly available. Other documents will be gathered independent of the organizations through the internet and local news publications.
methods as needed so that the available materials can be utilized in a feasible research framework. In both cases, by addressing possible issues in advance, potential problems with using document analysis can be alleviated.

**Analysis**

The analysis of the data collected for this study has relied on content analysis conducted through the use of documents and the aforementioned interviews. Krippendorff (2004) refers to content analysis as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use.” Since Krippendorff’s interpretation is broad enough to cover both written documents and audio recordings (applicable for interviews), it is suited to this study. Additionally, Miller (1997) contends that the study of texts allows researchers to identify their social context, which ties into the contextual element of case studies according to Stake (1995). Document analysis allows for the use of multiple forms of documentation (playbills, game programs, memos, development plans, and websites) in establishing a data set. These various document forms, both public (in the case of those procured on the internet and external documents) and private (internal documents), fall inside the parameters that Schwandt (2007) establishes for documents on which this analysis technique may be used. The method used in this particular example, as opposed to the broad concern of narrative analysis, is focused on content analysis. This form of analysis involves “comparing, contrasting, and categorizing a corpus of data,” making it ideal for the available data sources (Schwandt, 2007).
As the first step in my document analysis, I established a set of codes meant to organize and clarify the raw data. The codes were created in the content-specific scheme described by Schwandt (2007), meant to be applied to specific parts of the textual data in order to type them into distinct categories. The coding I used sorted each of the programs based on three factors: target age, target segment of the population, and stated content of the program. The use of target age, split into distinct age brackets, shows which age groups each organization is gearing their programs towards. Similarly with targeted population segments, this makes it possible to show what groups that the organizations are serving and which may be underserved. These two categories allow for the possible identification of over or underserved segments of the population. Examining the content of the programs made it possible to see what sorts of programs each organization is offering and how it is being delivered. With these three categories in place, it was possible to make a direct comparison between the scope and intent of the programs offered by the two organizations, and therefore see both similarities between the two organizations and areas in which one might learn from the other. Although there are other factors to consider than those on which the coding system is based, such as administration, fund raising, and advertising, these do not tie directly into the content of the outreach programs that this study is based on. However, as these are concepts that were touched on in discussion of relevant literature, they will be explored and developed as this study is expanded in the future.

Following the application of these codes as part of the document analysis, cross-comparison was employed to compare the resulting data from the four organizations generated through the coding process, as well as a final comparison taking into account
not only the document-based data set, but also the information gathered from interviews and presented during the review of the literature.

_Mechanisms and Issues in Interview Methods_

Utilizing interviews in conducting case studies allows the studies to draw not only on the observations made by the researcher, but also on those provided by research participants with intimate and relevant knowledge of the topic at hand. Despite this benefit, conducting interviews raises a number of issues which must be taken into consideration so as not to sully the value of the project. Perhaps the most basic of these potential issues is that, by inviting interview subjects to share, the researcher necessarily sacrifices objectivity. The interview conversation has inherent potential to be a source of information bias and misunderstanding due to the personal biases and interpretations of both the interview subject and the researcher (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). Although this issue may not be alleviated while keeping interviews as a research method, the impact may be minimized through careful construction of the questions to be posed and rehearsal of the delivery and interaction such that the researcher does not inadvertently influence the responses given by the interview subject (Fowler & Mangione, 1990; Hyman, Cobb, Feldman, Hart, & Stember, 1975). This approach to question construction and delivery practice will ensure that undue biases (that is, the biases of the researcher) do not impact the answers given. While the biases of the interview subjects are beneficial (as, from a phenomenological viewpoint, they reflect the experiences that make one a suitable
interview subject), the biases of the interviewer should be kept, as far as possible, from impacting the answers given (Sorrell & Redmond, 1995).

Another issue to be addressed is how to best establish the appropriate interview site, both in regards to physical and social settings, in which the interviews are conducted. The social milieu in which interviews are conducted can influence both what the interview subject chooses to say and how they choose to convey it (Pool, 1957). Similarly, the physical setting of the interview can impact the interview subject. If the interview subject is not comfortable with their surrounding during the interview, an effect such as that noted in regards to the social milieu may occur. The researcher must also be certain to familiarize themselves with both the organization which the subject represents and the location of the interview so that they may not only craft proper questions accordingly, but also interpret what impact each might have on the answers given by the subject (Briggs, 1986; Cicourel, 1964). This issue is compounded by the fact that organizations, as institutions, are not natural habitats in which storytelling occurs (Gabriel, 2000). As such, the onus is on the researcher to draw out the stories inherent in the organization through analysis of interviews and documents, increasing the importance of employing appropriate analytical methods.

A final issue to be found in the use of interviews, and one raised by the proposed method of interviewing only those who directly oversee the programs being examined, is that having a single person handle all facets of the topic can skew their responses (Moeran, 2006). By only having one person addressing all facets of the topic, they are
likely to answer interview questions by addressing the context of the whole, rather than just the context of their particular facet. As such, the respondents may give answers that require significant guidance or paring on the part of the researcher to have them fit within the scope of the study, creating another avenue for personal biases to impact the validity of the final product. While this issue could be alleviated by conducting interviews with others in related capacities within the subject organizations, this would also potentially skew findings due to the fact that the number and availability of persons involved in related capacities varies from organization to organization. With either approach, there is the potential for skewed findings. As a result, this study will advance with the initially proposed method of interviewing the person with direct oversight so as to keep all organizations on a level playing field.

While these issues may not be completely avoided, they may be minimized such that they do not invalidate the findings. One way to minimize these issues is, as noted above, through careful construction of questions and practicing the method of delivery by the researcher. Since the preformulated questions may serve as catalysts for respondent answers, but any number of interactional factors may shape the response or subsequent questions that are asked, thorough preparation by the researcher allows them to handle these diversions from the planned questions as they would answers given in response to the planned questions (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). These issues may also be minimized by utilizing Moser’s (1958) continuum, whereby interviews range from investigative to abstract and academic. By deciding before interviews are conducted where on the
continuum the interviews should fall, the researcher avoids attempting to simultaneously occupy both ends of the spectrum, making achieving either difficult. Lastly, transparency in the selection of interview subjects can serve to minimize potential issues. By identifying the experiences and perspectives that make each interview subject relevant to this study, and their accompanying biases, the reader is made aware of how and why these interviewees were selected.

*Interview Conduct and Analysis*

The interview data for this study were collected, as per the prior section on data collection, with each of the staff members at the subject organizations charged with overseeing the outreach programs that are the focal point of this study. These interviews were semi-structured, with each utilizing a brief list of questions to which the interviewees were able to respond as they chose (the interview sheets with these questions are attached as Appendix A). The interviews were conducted through a mixture of in-person meetings, telephone, and Skype, depending on the schedule and/or technological abilities of the interviewee.

The first of the two interview sections collected basic information on each interviewee’s organization and the programs that they offer. In addition to descriptions of the individual programs, this interview solicited information regarding the process behind the development and implementation of new programs, the mission or philosophy guiding each organization’s outreach programs, and how each organization
conceptualizes and measures public value. The longer of the interview sections, these interview sessions each lasted approximately 30 minutes.

The second of the interview sections gave interviewees the opportunity to add to, retract, or amend the information given during the first interview (the content notes on which they were supplied with prior to the second interview). These interviews focused primarily on soliciting information regarding the administration of the outreach programs and how that might differ from the written descriptions collected as part of document collection and analysis. These questions were intended to refine the information collected regarding the outreach programs, as well as to potentially provide useful contextualization on the machination of the organizations. These interviews lasted approximately 15 minutes each.

During the course of conducting these interviews, as well as during the analysis of the answers given, notes were taken and a set of codes were developed to align with the data collected during document analysis. The application of these codes allowed for the organization of interview content around prevalent themes from the documents, facilitating a deeper understanding of the information collected from them. Additionally, the information collected regarding the procedural and philosophical underpinnings of the programs have been assembled into a brief narrative chapter that conveys information that, while pertinent, may not have fit in neatly with other sections of this study.

Conclusion

Establishing a proper methodology is the backbone of any substantive research project. For this project, case studies served as the methodological framework, carried
out through the use of interviews and document analysis. Although case study seems to have been, whether interpreted by Yin or Stake, the proper methodological choice for this project, it is not without its sticking points and vexations. Similarly, the use of interviews and document analysis as methods by which to conduct case studies carry a set of unavoidable issues with them. However, careful preparation and planning have, if not eliminated, at least minimized the impact that these issues have had on the overall study. Through this planning, interviews and document analysis were used to carry out successful case studies of the four subject organizations, thereby facilitating this research project.
Chapter 4: Organizational Sketches

In order to better comprehend the contexts surrounding the outreach programs offered by each of the four organizations being examined, it is necessary to have a basic understanding of the organizations themselves. To this end, this chapter includes brief sketches of each organization, offering insight into the history and development of each. These sketches will aid in connecting the background of each organization with the outreach programs that they offer. Although these sketches are by no means exhaustive, they do provide enough information to establish a functional understanding of the history of each organization.

Columbus Blue Jackets

The Columbus Blue Jackets, the city’s National Hockey League (NHL) franchise, are one of the latest iterations of professional hockey in Ohio. The state has had or currently has minor league professional teams based in Dayton, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Youngstown, Troy, and Toledo, and formerly had an NHL team, the Cleveland Barons, for several years in the 1970s (American Hockey League, 2012; Central Hockey League, 2012; East Coast Hockey League, 2012; Tank Productions, 2006). Prior to the Blue Jackets beginning play, the city of Columbus was host to the Columbus Chill, a member of the East Coast Hockey League from 1991 through the end of the 1998-1999 season before relocating to Reading, PA.
The beginning of the Blue Jackets franchise in Columbus was November 1, 1996, when a partnership of five investors acting under the name Columbus Hockey Limited (headed by John McConnell) submitted an application for an expansion team and franchise fee to the NHL office in New York (Columbus Blue Jackets, 2012). In the months after submitting the franchise application and fee, the members of Columbus Hockey Limited made a formal presentation to the NHL, and league officials visited Columbus to assess its suitability as home to a team. In May of 1997, Columbus voters defeated a ballot issue to publicly fund a new arena for the team, but Nationwide Insurance announced that it would privately finance the venture (Columbus Blue Jackets, 2012; Kohn, 2011). The next month, the NHL awarded Columbus an expansion franchise, and the team name was announced the following November.

In the time between Columbus being granted a franchise in May of 1997 and the team’s beginning of play in October of 2000, the organization worked to fill itself out structurally so that it would be a fully active member of the NHL. In 1998, the organization announced the hiring of Doug MacLean (a former coach) as its first general manager and president, allowing it to begin normal league business operations (Columbus Blue Jackets, 2012). Also in 1998, ground was broken for Nationwide Arena. The following year, the Blue Jackets added the Syracuse Crunch (an American Hockey League team) as their minor league affiliate and first unveiled their home and road jerseys.

In March of 2000, the team formed the Columbus Blue Jackets Foundation, a charitable semi-independent organization tied to the team intended to handle the franchise’s community outreach and fundraising programs. The establishment of the
foundation was a reflection of majority owner John McConnell’s belief that the team should not just exist in the community, but serve it as well (Columbus Blue Jackets, 2011). Over the last dozen years, the foundation has grown to oversee a wide variety of programs intended to enhance the Greater Columbus community, ensuring the success of McConnell’s vision for the organization.

In May of 2000, the NHL determined that the Blue Jackets had met all established requirements for admission into the league and granted them recognition as a franchise, allowing them to participate in league-related matters. Over the next several months, the team worked to fill its roster through free agency, an expansion draft, the NHL draft, and trades. Additionally, the team signed its first coaching staff in July, setting up the team’s first training camp in September. In October of 2000, the Blue Jackets began play in the NHL with a loss against Chicago in a sold-out Nationwide Arena (Columbus Blue Jackets, 2012).

The years following the Blue Jackets’ entry into the NHL saw the team make a positive impact on the Columbus community. Following a number of sellouts during the team’s inaugural season, they had a streak of 58 consecutive home sell-outs, beginning at the end of their first season and ending in October of 2002. The team leveraged its popularity in the community into strong charitable fundraising. Shortly after 9/11, the team hosted a “Red, White & Blue” scrimmage at Nationwide Arena as a fundraiser for the victims of the tragedies, helping to raise over $35,000 (Columbus Blue Jackets, 2012). The next year, the team participated in a fundraiser to help mark the creation of the Columbus Sports Commission.
Even as the team made a positive impact on the surrounding community, it struggled to find success in the NHL. In the first decade as a team, the Blue Jackets only qualified for the Stanley Cup playoffs once, following the 2008-2009 season. The Blue Jackets were swept in their first round series against the Detroit Red Wings, and have not returned to the playoffs since, regularly finishing at or near the bottom of their conference. The team has faced similar issues with attendance, struggling to sell-out games beyond their home openers and games against marquee rivals. The team has also faced financial problems, including revenue shortfalls that ultimately forced a deal by the City of Columbus and Franklin County to purchase Nationwide Arena and allow the team to remain as tenants without paying rent (Trimble, 2011). Despite the issues facing the organization, the investments by the city and county, as well as a smaller-but-fervent fan base, will keep the Blue Jackets a part of Central Ohio for the foreseeable future.

Columbus Crew

Unlike the Blue Jackets, the Columbus Crew, the city’s Major League Soccer (MLS) team does not represent a current iteration of a long-standing professional sporting presence in Columbus. Although youth-league and recreational soccer existed in Columbus prior to the mid-1990s, the Crew were the first professional team to be based in central Ohio.

In December of 1993, in fulfillment of a promise to the sport’s international governing body (FIFA) as part of their World Cup bid, U.S. Soccer announced the formation of MLS (Columbus Crew, 2011). The following June, Columbus was awarded one of the league’s initial 10 member clubs. Columbus’ bid for a team was backed by
more than 11,500 season ticket deposits and plans to build the United States’ first soccer-specific stadium (Columbus Crew, 2012). In accord with the league’s single-entity operating structure, the club was owned by the league but largely run by local investor-operators. In June of 1995, Lamar Hunt and family were announced as Columbus’ investor-operators. In October of the same year, Mayor Greg Lashutka unveiled the team’s name (chosen as the winner of a month-long “name the team” contest), logo, kit, and colors.

Shortly thereafter, in December of 1995, the league allocated South African national Theophilus Khumalo to the Crew, giving them their first player. Over the next few months, through March of 1996, MLS conducted a player combine and continued to allocate established players to teams, assigning Columbus three additional players prior to the initial player draft (Columbus Crew, 2011). Following these player allocations and the initial player draft, the league held both supplemental and player drafts, allowing teams to round out rosters with a mix of league-appointed and team-selected players. With a set roster and staff, the Crew opened their first preseason and spring training camps in Dublin, Ohio and Boca Raton, Florida, respectively. During this time, the team also secured and announced an agreement with 1460 WBNS Radio to air all 32 games.

The Crew began league play on April 13, 1996, by defeating D.C. United by a score of 4-0 in front of a crowd of over 25,000 in Ohio Stadium (although the city included plans for a soccer-specific stadium in its pitch to the league, it would not be constructed for several years) (Columbus Crew, 2011). The following month, the team established a deal with a conglomeration of three television channels to air eight Crew matches throughout the season. Although the team struggled through its first season,
needing a late-season surge to finish fourth in their conference and then losing in the first round of the playoffs, the organization continued to grow and prosper. The team added several additional players through allocation, reached an agreement with the village of Obetz to build a state-of-the-art training facility, had general manager Jamey Rootes recognized with the first MLS Executive of the Year award, and had the “Crew Experience,” referring to the complete game experience as perceived by fans, rated as “outstanding” by an outside research company.

Over the next several years, the Crew built on this initial success by continuing to develop as a part of the Columbus community. In March of 1997, the Crew became the first MLS team to land a local network television affiliate through an agreement with WTTE Fox 28 (SportsChannel Ohio, part of the conglomerate from the inaugural season, would also air some games) (Columbus Crew, 2011). Also in March, the Crew Radio Network is established, growing from the initial one station to include 16 affiliates across the state. Additionally that month, the Crew made one of their first major charitable efforts, playing in the Dayton Cup for Charity in an exhibition game against the Kansas City Wizards in Centerville, Ohio. In May, residents of Franklin County vote down a .5% tax increase to fund a downtown stadium (the same vote that would have funded Nationwide Arena), leading the team to negotiate a lease extension with Ohio State through the end of the following season. In February of 1998, a vote in the suburb of Dublin to build a new stadium there failed.

In May of 1998, the Ohio Expositions Committee approves a land lease to build a soccer-specific stadium on the grounds of the Ohio Expo Center, and the state’s Controlling Board approved the lease three days later (Columbus Crew, 2011). The next
day, the team officially announced plans for construction of the stadium, a 22,500 seat facility to be built on the land leased for 25 years from the Ohio Expositions Commission. In the following weeks, the team received approval for both the lease and their plans from the Ohio Department of Administrative Services and then-governor George Voinovich, clearing the way for construction to commence. Ground was broken for the new stadium on August 14th, at which the league’s commissioner announced that the venue would play host to the MLS All-Star Game in 2000 and the 2001 MLS Cup. Team efforts to use the new venue as a selling point proved successful as ticket demand caused the team to increase the number of club-level loges by 50% and almost 1,200 season tickets were sold on the first day of their availability. Within the first week of season ticket sales for the new stadium, all club-level seats were sold.

The Crew opened Crew Stadium on May 15th, 1999 in front of an overflow crowd of 24,741 with a 2-0 victory against the New England Revolution (Columbus Crew, 2011). The new venue would later be named the 2000 Foremost Sports Facility of the Year by the International Sports Summit, edging out the Staples Center in Los Angeles. The team continued to make use of the new stadium to draw in fans, setting a new organizational record for season tickets sold. The team also continued its charitable endeavors, playing an exhibition against the Cincinnati Riverhawks to raise money for tornado relief in the Greater Cincinnati area and again playing in the Dayton Cup for Charity. The Crew also continued working to enhance fan experience, sponsoring a post-game concert by the pop band BoDeans and creating the Buck-a-Brat night promotion. By the end of the 1999 season, despite being MLS’ smallest market, the Crew had managed to secure the league’s highest attendance, averaging 17,696 fans per game.
The decade following the opening of Crew Stadium brought consistency to the team and the league. There were some changes initiated at the league level (increased roster sizes and count-up game clocks for instance), and several of the Crew’s media partnerships changed from one station to another, but the somewhat tumultuous nature of the first few years subsided (Columbus Crew, 2011). The Crew continued to develop their charitable efforts, working with Ohio State to create the annual Connor Senn Memorial Match, an exhibition between the two teams with proceeds going to the scholarship fund commemorating the former Ohio State player who died after collapsing during a 2001 game. This decade also saw the Crew win its first two championships, first in the U.S. Open Cup (2002) and later the MLS Cup (2008), providing Ohio with its first top-flight professional championships since the Cincinnati Reds won the 1990 World Series.

In the last three seasons, the Crew have undergone substantial roster and coaching changes, including the retirement or cutting of several star players and a new head coach being named immediately following the MLS Cup victory. As a result, the team has struggled at times on the field and has faced declining attendance. However, the presence of the Crew Soccer Foundation (the organization’s charitable instrument) and the economic impact of the team as a professional sport organization have allowed the team to continue to make its mark in Central Ohio.

Columbus Museum of Art

The Columbus Museum of Art is the oldest currently operating arts organization in Columbus, having been originally formed in 1878 as the Columbus Gallery of Fine
Arts. The museum also holds the distinction of being the first art museum to register its charter with the state of Ohio. The original home of the museum, the Sessions Mansion, was located on the same plot of land on East Broad Street as the current building, which replaced the mansion in 1931 (Sheban, 2010). The current building, designed by Columbus architectural firm Richards, McCarty and Bulford, was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1992 under the museum’s original name (that is to say, it is listed in the register as the Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts, not the Columbus Museum of Art) (Rai, 2011).

The museum’s standing collection is built predominantly around late nineteenth and early twentieth century modern art from both Europe and America (Columbus Museum of Art, 2012). This portion of the permanent collection focuses heavily on works that represent Impressionism, German Expressionism, and Cubism. These works may form the heart of the museum’s collection, but the collection also includes examples of works representing later Modernism and Contemporary, Folk Art, and the Old Masters. While some of this collection has been purchased by the museum, much of it has been acquired through gifts and bequests from the community. In addition to portions of the collection dedicated to specific styles, the museum collection also includes topic-specific (such as the Schiller Collection of American Social Commentary Art) and artist-specific (an expansive selection of works by Columbus artists Aminah Robinson and George Bellows) portions (Columbus Museum of Art, 2011). The museum also presents a diverse slate of traveling exhibitions that allows the institution to provide artistic exposure and experiences to the community beyond what the standing collection provides. Similarly, the museum actively contributes works from its collection to
exhibitions at other institutions, both domestically and abroad (The Columbus Foundation, 2010).

Beyond serving as a showplace for its collection of works, the museum is an active part of the community, partnering with other organizations (Ohio State, Ohio Arts Council, Franklin Park Conservatory, COSI, etc.) to mutually enhance programming and spread arts experiences throughout Central Ohio (Columbus Museum of Art, 2012). This connection to serving the community is reflected in the museum’s mission statement: “Great experiences with great art for everyone.” The museum maintains a number of avenues to facilitate these experiences. The aforementioned partnerships allow them to expose audiences beyond their own to art, as well as co-sponsor visual arts fellowships to foster the creation of new works (Goldstein, 2011). The museum also offers a broad slate of arts-based experiences, grouped by demographic-appropriateness (adults, families, and teachers/schools), that offer community members of different backgrounds and interest levels the opportunity to interact with the museum and its art (Columbus Museum of Art, 2012).

The museum is currently undertaking a substantial reconstruction and renovation project being funded through an $80 million building and endowment campaign (Sheban, 2010). The initial phase of this project has already been completed, involving reconstruction of elements of the main building. The second phase, which will add 45,000 square feet of new space, is currently in process. This building project is intended to not only expand the museum’s space, but also to make it more visitor-friendly, affording community members greater opportunity to have their own great experiences with great art.
Opera Columbus

Opera Columbus was established in the spring of 1981, making it the youngest of the arts organizations being examined for this study. Although the organization traces its origins to 1981, that date represents when the organization become independent from, rather than an artistic function of, the Columbus Symphony Orchestra (CSO) (Opera Columbus, 2010). With the orchestra’s assistance, a committee was formed to select a board of trustees to oversee and build the new company. The committee also crafted a three-year transitional program that was designed increase community involvement, enhance growth, and create a better product through the creation of Opera Columbus as an independent organization. While the committee was assembling both the board and the transition plan, Opera Columbus produced its first season at the Ohio Theatre, including *Tosca*, *Il Trovatore*, and *Don Giovanni*.

In 1983, during the transition period, Opera Columbus created its annual vocal competition, an event that served a dual purpose of providing performing opportunities to gifted young artists and exposing Columbus audiences to exciting new vocal talent outside of a traditional operatic performance (Opera Columbus, 2011). The transition process ended in 1984 with the committee having installed both a full board and a professional management team as well as growing the patron base. At the same time, the company moved its productions from the Ohio Theatre to the Palace Theatre and began using English supertitles during productions. Two years later, the young company produced its first world premiere, Pasatieri’s *Three Sisters*, leading to recognition from the Greater Columbus Arts Council with an Artistic Award of Excellence.
In 1991, Opera Columbus faced the first of several financial crises, leading to a “Save the Opera” campaign that allowed the company to re-open following a brief closure (Opera Columbus, 2011). Although the company continued to find success in its programming, including earning recognition from OPERA America for its educational programs in 1998 and merging with Columbus Light Opera in 2001, financial issues continued to plague the company. In 2004, the company was forced to end their summer production series, and in 2006 the company faced a near-closure, resulting in a reorganization that included staff reductions. In 2008, the company successfully completed a fundraising challenge backed by Huntington Bank that allowed them to eliminate most of their long-term debt, but year-to-year issues remained, and another challenge was needed in 2010 to settle that fiscal year’s debts. In 2011, the company entered into a five-year management agreement with the Columbus Association for the Performing Arts, a change that maintained fiscal solvency but led to reduced staffing and a shift from producing to presenting shows (Grossberg, 2011).

Unlike the other five organizations being examined for this study, Opera Columbus currently has competition for Columbus’ opera audience. Opera Project Columbus was founded in 2011 with the dual intent of providing local singers early in their careers performing opportunities in smaller venues and giving local audiences more chances to hear opera performed (Opera Project Columbus, 2012). Unlike Opera Columbus, which presents its productions in a single theater, Opera Project Columbus aims to make use of various local venues (recent performances have taken place at the Pontifical College Josephinum and Ohio Wesleyan University) that are suited to the production at hand. Additionally, the new organization uses only local singers, rather
than Opera Columbus’ mix of local (for small and chorus roles) and national performers. Although it remains to be seen what long-term impact this competition and internal changes will have on Opera Columbus, they are unlikely to derail this organization that has survived many challenges over the past 30 years.
Chapter 5: Data

As presented in the methodology chapter, information from this study was drawn from a variety of sources, including websites, programs, and interviews conducted with the staff members charged with overseeing outreach programs at each organization. The data collected from this study is presented herein, with the collected data on each organization being presented separately (whereas the data is presented here in a format similar to the rest of this work, see Appendix B for a full description of each program and the coding information used for analysis). For each organization, a summary is given of what they consider their outreach programs to be, the outreach programs that they offer, and a brief segment discussing how the organization conceptualizes and measures the public value that they generate. Although the majority of the data is taken from the documents examined, additional information and quotes taken from the interviews will be woven throughout, serving to bolster and contextualize the data derived from the documents.

In addition to the data presented for each organization, there is a brief section at the end of this chapter that summarizes the collected data for both fields being examined. This section serves to encapsulate the data from each organization with one of the fields in a convenient fashion so as to provide a field overview. This overview, in addition to discussing the apparent themes present in the programs within sport and the arts, also
serves as a final recapitulation before the data analysis is presented in the following chapter.

As a final note before the data is presented, it should be taken into consideration that there are minor variations, from organization to organization, with regard to what constitutes a community outreach program. The interview subjects were provided with the definition included in the literature review chapter and allowed to interpret it as they so chose, leading to these minor variations. Rather than addressing these as issues to be smoothed out, they and their implications are discussed in the analysis chapter, as they provide some insight into what each organization considers to be an outreach effort as opposed to some other organizational action.
Columbus Blue Jackets

“The goals of our programs are to be good citizens in the Columbus community and create excitement and a love of hockey in the Columbus community.”

~Kellie Yoskovich, Community and Foundation Development Manager

The community outreach programs offered by the Columbus Blue Jackets represent a diverse programming slate intended to include the entirety of the local community. The outreach programs are overseen by two entities that share a staff and work in conjunction with each other to bring these efforts to fruition. The first of these, the Community Relations department, utilizes grassroots efforts designed to positively impact Central Ohio. The second entity, the Blue Jackets Foundation, is the charitable instrument of the team (and a semi-autonomous 501(c)3 organization) and provides a vehicle for those attached to the team to contribute time and financial resources. Whereas the Community Relations department is geared towards utilizing grassroots efforts for the betterment of the local community without specific further constraints, the Blue Jackets Foundation focuses on four pillars: the fight against pediatric cancer, education, children’s health and safety, and the development of youth and amateur hockey. For the purposes of this study, the two entities are considered together.
“The mission of the Columbus Blue Jackets is to provide world class, major league sports entertainment for our fans and corporate partners that delivers a high level of value worthy of their support and investment in us.”

~Kellie Yoskovich, Community and Foundation Development Manager

The Community Relations department and Blue Jackets Foundation offer their outreach efforts not as stand-alone attempts to enhance the Central Ohio community, but as part of the Blue Jackets’ organizational mission to deliver a product that warrants the community and corporate support given to the team. Because these outreach programs are so diverse in their intent (encompassing both grassroots endeavors from the Community Relations department and the four pillars of the foundation), targeted age group, and mode of function (some are run directly by the team, some are partnerships with outside organizations), they are difficult to organize for the purpose of explanation. To aid in their discussion, they will be organized here-in by the four pillars of the foundation and the grassroots efforts of the Community Relations department.

“The Community Relations department is committed to a variety of grassroots outreach programs designed to have a positive impact in Central Ohio and beyond.”

~Kellie Yoskovich, Community and Foundation Development Manager

The outreach programs overseen by the Community Relations department constitute those that fall outside of the scope of the four pillars of the Blue Jackets Foundation. These programs, which are largely focused on utilizing team resources to
drive the efforts of other organizations (hence the repeated use, by both Yoskovich and the team, of the word “grassroots”), cover a wide assortment of approaches to establishing the team’s presence and value in the community. The team divides these outreach efforts into two broad categories: Your Team in the Community and Community Initiatives. The former category is comprised of efforts that directly connect strictly local groups to the team’s resources. For instance, the team’s speakers bureau provides local groups the chance to bring in an upper-level member of the team’s staff to talk not only about their job, but about the team and their role in the community. Additionally, the donations and Fundraising with the Jackets programs allow for the team to either give autographed merchandise to outside non-profits for use in fundraising (donations) or allow outside non-profits to work with the team to raise funds at Nationwide Arena during a game (Fundraising with the Jackets).

The latter category, Community Initiatives, is similar to the above category, but is not limited strictly to local non-profit groups. Perhaps the most similar program is Tickets for Charity, which allows season ticket holders to donate tickets to games that they will not attend to local non-profit organizations. Also in this category is Hockey: It’s in Your Blood, a program which partners the team and the American Red Cross by providing tickets and Blue Jackets gifts as incentives to donate blood. This sort of partnership is also present in the other two community programs, Jackets for Jackets and the Lady Jackets Hockey Holidays Toy Drive. Jackets for Jackets collects winter coats at several locations around Columbus and then distributes them to the needy through the Salvation Army, while the toy drive, run by the wives and girlfriends of team members, collects
toys at Nationwide Arena to be donated to the needy through the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve’s Toys for Tots program.

“The Blue Jackets Foundation, the charitable arm of the hockey club, is a vehicle through which the franchise’s athletes, coaches and staff contribute time and financial resources to organizations supporting the Foundation’s four pillars of giving: the fight against pediatric cancer; education; children’s health & safety and the development of youth & amateur hockey.”

~Kellie Yoskovich, Community and Foundation Development Manager

Each of the four pillars of the Blue Jackets Foundation is represented by a well-developed slate of outreach programs. The fight against pediatric cancer includes what the team refers to as its signature philanthropic endeavor, Hats for Heroes. This program uses program-specific merchandise (shirts, hats, and pins), sold at Nationwide Arena and online, as a means to raise funds both for pediatric cancer research and to provide fun opportunities for children battling cancer. At the same time, the program collects and distributes hats to children whose appearance signals the side effects of their cancer treatments. To date, this program has raised over $1 million in support of pediatric cancer research.

The foundation has also partnered with Nationwide Children’s Hospital for several programs supporting this pillar. These programs, referred to as “support programs,” are meant to help ease the strain that patients and their families deal with while battling pediatric cancer. The Family Resource Center is an area at Nationwide
Children’s Hospital, appointed in a Blue Jackets motif, that is designed to provide some of the comforts of home for families that are spending large amounts of time with patients. The center includes a television, movies, game systems, a kitchen, laundry and shower facilities, and a library and resource center that can be used to learn about patients’ conditions and care methods for them. The sibling support program provides education, resources, and counseling services to the siblings of pediatric cancer patients, helping them to cope with their sibling’s condition. The final program in support of this pillar is Stinger’s Bravery Beads, a program that allows patients to collect beads of different shapes and colors to correspond with various stages of their treatment. Each patient receives a starter kit and a new bead with each stage of their treatment. At the conclusion of their treatment, they are left with a tangible record of what they have been through and overcome.

Of the four pillars of the Blue Jackets Foundation, education has the largest number of programs supporting it. The core program in support of education is Blue Jackets at School, which offers classroom-ready lesson plans and activities in a number of academic disciplines. The materials accompanying each of these lessons or activities feature either Stinger (the team’s mascot) or one of the current Blue Jackets players. The program is designed so that is may be tied to appearances by the players featured in certain lessons as the students are working on those particular lessons.

Whereas Blue Jackets at School essentially creates a multi-disciplinary curriculum, most of the other education-based outreach programs are either discipline-specific or are not tied an academic discipline at all, focusing instead on a broad educational concept. Book Jackets, for instance, makes use of Blue Jackets prizes
Blue Jackets Student Achievers, a program co-sponsored by Bob Evans, allows teachers and administrators at local schools to recognize students who have accomplished an academic feat worth of note (perfect attendance, high grades, significant improvement, etc.) by giving them a voucher good for two tickets to a Blue Jackets home game. The foundation also seeks to reward prolonged academic excellence and character development by administering the John H. McConnell Scholarship, a $10,000 scholarship awarded to a graduating senior from a local high school who has, over their educational career, displayed superb academic skills and strong character and leadership abilities.

Children’s health and safety and youth and amateur hockey development in Central Ohio are both pillars that, while substantive in the scope of their impact, are supported by a smaller slate of outreach programming than the previous two pillars. At present, the health and safety pillar consists of two standing programs. The first of these, the Nationwide Children’s Hospital Sport Safety Helmet program, is a partnership between the team and the hospital that provides team-branded bicycle helmets for children visiting the hospital as a result of head trauma. The second program, the 61 Club Good Health Challenge, is run in conjunction with the Columbus Dispatch’s Newspapers in Education program and is fronted by Rick Nash. The program allows students to download a healthy habits scorecard and record their choices for a month. If they have made a required number of healthy choices, they are rewarded with two tickets to a home game, two 61 Club shirts, and a chance to have Rick Nash appear at their school.

The youth and amateur hockey development pillar also primarily consists of two programs at present. Street Jackets, a part of the league-wide NHL Street program,
consists of the team donating equipment, training sessions, and manuals so that local youths can learn the basics of the game by playing street hockey at school or community centers. Junior Jackets serves as an introduction to ice hockey for children young enough to still participate in local youth leagues. The program consists of professional instructors running multiple sessions over the course of a year to prepare youths with no prior hockey experience to participate in a youth league the following season.

“I’m not certain that you can really measure public value. We could look at our ticket sales numbers, the sales of merchandise in our stores, the amount of money spent by corporate partners, the number of donation requests we receive, the amount of money the Foundation gives out every year and the number of youth who are playing hockey but I don’t think that we can actually measure our public value.”

~Kellie Yoskovich, Community and Foundation Development Manager

The Blue Jackets’ conception of public value is notable in that, while they seem to acknowledge that it exists and that they benefit from it, there is no firm conceptualization of what it actually is. Yoskovich, in discussing the team’s views on the matter, makes mention of several potential indicators of public value (see above quote), but the extent to which several of these represent a concept of public value, or even a measure thereof, is highly questionable. The one form of measuring, or at least recording, public value that the team embraces is tracking qualitative responses to the team’s efforts.\textsuperscript{20} The use of

\textsuperscript{20} Yoskovich cites a rally calling for the dismissal of the team’s upper management as indicative of public value as it shows the passion of local fans and how much they care about the team’s success.
qualitative accounts of public value is not unique to the Blue Jackets, as it is seen in the cases of the three organizations examined in the following pages.
Columbus Crew

“Soccer is what we do best.”

~Robin Ungerleider, Community Relations Manager

The community outreach programs offered by the Columbus Crew comprise a wide array of options geared towards a number of distinct segments of the community. The outreach programs are led not only by the team itself, but also by the Crew Soccer Foundation, a semi-autonomous 501(c)3 organization that serves as the team’s charitable instrument. For purposes of this study, the programs offered by the two entities are considered together, as they are often administered in conjunction with each other and the main point of differentiation tends to be from which source funding is drawn. Both entities, in their outreach efforts and other functions, take great care to make soccer the central focus of what they are doing, as it is both their business and core competency.

“The Crew mission statement focuses on many areas but a key element is to be a respected, valued and influential community leader committed to enhance quality of life in Columbus and our region.”

~Robin Ungerleider, Community Relations Manager

The Crew and the Crew Soccer Foundation’s outreach programs are intended to establish the organization as a leader in the city, as well as a vehicle for enhancing the quality of life for those who live in and around the city. Although these programs cover
a wide array of functions for various components of the Columbus community, they can be broadly sorted into three groups, based on which segment of the population is targeted by the program. The three targeted groups are Hispanics, youths (with a particular emphasis on inner city, disadvantaged, and special needs youth), and the general populace. The programs geared towards each of these groups, while somewhat different, all tie back to the use of soccer a means for community enhancement.

“We do have a Hispanic business development coordinator but the role is not just about business development, it’s about community development by bringing local soccer to that community and encouraging them to be part of the Crew experience.”

~Robin Ungerleider, Community Relations Manager

The first of these targeted groups, Columbus’ Hispanic population, is reached out to through a series of programs aimed at growing the social connection between the community and the team. The largest of these programs, in terms of visibility, is the annual Copa Victoria tournament. This event brings together teams from five Hispanic soccer leagues in and around Central Ohio (both men’s and women’s) in a single-elimination tournament, with preliminary games played at the Crew’s practice facility and the championship played on the field at Crew Stadium. The games are free and open to the public, creating a social event in addition to the competition. To enhance the social aspect of the tournament, a draw party was added in 2009 which allowed not only coaches and captains of the involved teams, but also other players, friends, and family to come together for the tournament draw, dinner, and dancing.
For Hispanic fans who not only enjoy playing soccer, but also enjoy following the game, the Crew has created the Asociacion Internasional de Futbol Crew (AIFC), an association that allows members to not only keep track of the Crew, but also information regarding local leagues and foreign leagues of interest. The AIFC website is designed in a user-friendly blog format, intended to increase interaction amongst members. Also, members of the AIFC get membership cards, entitling them to discounts at local businesses that sponsor the group. Another, non-web based, outreach program offered involves the Crew’s away game remote radio broadcasts. Whereas the games used to be broadcast from a studio, which did not provide any of the fan noise of an actual game, they are now broadcast from Garcia International (a restaurant on High Street). The restaurant subsidizes the cost of broadcasting from their restaurant rather than from a studio, and Hispanic fans are invited to come to the restaurant to watch/listen to the game, giving the broadcasts a more authentic atmosphere.

The Crew utilize a text message program, which they perceive to be the best way to reach their Hispanic fans, to allow said fans to receive updates on the go (Terreros, 2009). Fans only need to text the word “futbol” to a specific number and they thereafter receive updates about the team in Spanish. By joining, fans also give the team a usable database of contact information. Another benefit of joining the text message program is that those who are registered are eligible for drawings held at Crew home games, games of local Hispanic leagues, and other local events of particular interest to the Hispanic community.

A recently discontinued program, and one that is specifically targeted at the Mexican portion of Columbus’ Hispanic population, is the TRASH Chivas USA
program. This program, meant to drive up tensions between fans before annual games between the Crew and Chivas USA, also allowed Crew fans to generate charitable donations. Chivas was chosen for this program because they are the sister organization of a team located in Guadalajara, and therefore have a strong Hispanic following around the country. This program was sponsored by three local Hispanic markets that subsidized the cost of several hundred tickets to the game between the two teams in Columbus. Tickets that normally sold for $15 were sold for $5 to any fan who brought any Chivas (USA or Guadalajara) item and threw it in the “trash”. The collected items were then donated to the Chivas USA Foundation, which helps needy children in both Los Angeles and Mexico.

“We have tried, as much as we possibly can, to align the goals and focus areas of both the Crew and our affiliated charity, the Crew Soccer Foundation. Our core area of focus is utilizing soccer as a vehicle to promote education and healthy lifestyles for at-risk youth, and there’s certainly plenty of need for that. We’ve done a lot with visits and appearances by players and staff to bring the game to kids that otherwise wouldn’t be able to hear about it, learn about it, know about it, and understand the benefits that soccer brings.”

~Robin Ungerleider, Community Relations Manager

The second targeted group consists of inner city residents, the disadvantaged, and those with special needs. They are combined here for two reasons: the natures of the programs that target them are similar enough to justify it, and taken individually they
only have a few programs each, whereas combining them creates a group large enough to
easily organize and analyze. The first two of these programs, which work in conjunction
with one another to help bring organized soccer to the inner city, are the soccer field
development and referee scholarship programs. The former is an initiative through which
the Crew help to keep soccer fields in urban Columbus sodden, mowed, and covered in
proper field markings. The latter is a program, created in 2008, that helps youths in
Columbus that have the desire but not the means to obtain referee training, certification,
and equipment. In addition to giving these youths a marketable skill and potential source
of income, this program also helps to make sure that there are qualified referees available
for the inner city youth leagues that the team works with.

Since 2007, the Crew have worked with two inner city youth leagues in
Columbus, Near East Inner City Youth Soccer and Kids Inner City Developmental
Soccer. With both leagues, the Crew helps in recruiting players as well as qualified
coaches. In addition to donating tickets to players in these leagues through their Kicks for
Kids program (which is discussed later), Crew players and the team’s mascot donate their
time to practices and league games. To help supply these and other local youth leagues
with equipment that players may not otherwise be able to afford, the Crew participate in
the U.S. Soccer Foundation Passback Program. Each year, the team designates a home
game at which fans may donate new or gently used soccer equipment. The collected
donations are given to a different local youth league each year, and have been used in the
past to help the two leagues the team works directly with. Along these same lines, the
team has built a new turf pitch at Crew Stadium to be used as the field for a recreational
league (beginning in 2012) specifically for youths who, based on where in Columbus
they live, might otherwise lack the opportunity to play in an organized league.

The Crew have two additional programs geared towards the youths in this particular segment of the community. The first, the ColumbusReads HOSTS Program, is a program that connects professionals from around Columbus with at-risk kindergartners to provide reading tutoring. In particular, Crew staffers work with students at Windsor Alternative Elementary School. Each tutor devotes an hour of time each week for an entire school year, allowing them to have tutoring sessions with two students. The second program is a partnership between the Crew, Easter Seals, and Dick’s Sporting Goods called “Shop with a Player.” Dick’s donates $100 shopping cards and youths that Easter Seals work with are brought to a store where they have the chance to use the cards with Crew players, the team mascot, and members of the Crewzers dance team. In addition to giving the youths a chance to meet Crew players, this program also allows some recreational spending for youths whose families are financially constricted by medical expenses.

The final two community outreach efforts that the Crew offer to this segment of the community are a partnership with Habitat for Humanity and participation in the St. Stephen’s House holiday drive. The former, a partnership spearheaded by Crew play Jason Garey after seeing the devastation in his native Louisiana following Hurricane Katrina, brings together Crew players and staffers to help build houses in Columbus. In the two years that the partnership has existed, volunteers from the Crew have helped to build four new homes for Columbus families. The latter is an annual effort during which Crew employees have collected canned food items to donate to St. Stephen’s House. St. Stephen’s House is a non-profit community center serving an area near Crew Stadium.
which, amongst its various programs, also houses a food pantry which the collected items are donated to.

“...so we do things like that, projects for the community that may not support youth directly, but certainly cleaning up the environment is something that helps everyone.”

~Robin Ungerleider, Community Relations Manager

The final set of programs, those that target the community in general, provide a diverse set of avenues through which the Crew interact with Columbus. It should be noted that, although some of these programs are intended for youths, their purpose of serving youths across the city, rather than the three groups specifically identified in the previous section, makes them appropriate for inclusion in this section. Three of these programs, GOALS for KIDS, the school assembly program, and Kicks for Kids, help to bring both the Crew and the game of soccer to public school children in and around Columbus. GOALS for KIDS is a program based around a life skills curriculum that is delivered through schools, community centers, and youth soccer programs. The curriculum is presented in a guidebook that combines team imagery with quizzes and games to promote personal wellness, community service, leadership, character building, and scholarship. The school assembly program allows Crew players and staffers to interact with school children, giving soccer demonstrations and allowing the students to practice what they have learned. The assemblies also serve as an introduction point for the GOALS for KIDS curriculum. The final of these programs, Kicks for Kids, allows individuals and companies to donate money which is used to purchase tickets that are
then distributed to local youths. The distribution points range from schools to community centers to youth soccer leagues, and the program is intended to make sure that deserving youths have the opportunity to see a live professional soccer match.

Included in this set of programs are three that have medical foci. The Crew raise funds for the Mid-Ohio chapter of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Fund (JDRF) through their annual Soccer Aid campaign, a month-long auction of autographed jerseys that has brought in $30,000 over the last six years. The Crew also partner with the Red Cross and local hospitals to help support blood and bone marrow drives. The team donates free ticket for those sponsoring the drives to give to donors as incentives to donate. The Crew also participate in monthly visits to Nationwide Children’s Hospital during the MLS season. In addition to spending time with the children in the hospital, the participating personnel bring gifts such as signed cards, soccer balls, game tickets, and t-shirts.

The final two programs are aimed at serving the city of Columbus and recognizing those who do. The Crew have an ongoing partnership with Keep Columbus Beautiful (KCB) that has led, over the last six years, to players and staffers working to clean up public recreation spaces around the city. The Columbus Crew Heroes Program is a way for the team to recognize those who make significant and lasting contributions to the Columbus community. Community members can nominate someone whom they feel has made a significant contribution to the community, thereby working to enhance the quality of life in and around Columbus.
“If you focus solely on how many people came through, how many bags of garbage picked up at a clean-up and that kind of thing, you can miss a lot, and that’s something I try to keep in mind, because you don’t want to miss the forest for the trees.”

~Robin Ungerleider, Community Relations Manager

The Crew’s conceptualization of public value, as previously noted, is derived from the section in their mission statement that addresses the organization’s desire to be respected and a leader within the community. This conceptualization is notable because, unlike the other organizations examined in this work, it is the only one which is codified in a mission statement. Additionally, as Ungerleider’s above quote indicates, the team’s conceptualization of public is intended to defy strictly quantitative measurement. In talking with Ungerleider (see Appendix C for full interview transcript), it was evident that, to the Crew, public value is something that the team understands the need for across a broad swath of the community, from patrons and non-patrons alike.

“You want to not hear bad things, and you do want to hear good things. There are measures that we use for our programming impact, but I don’t think those measures capture everything.”

~Robin Ungerleider, Community Relations Manager

In accord with the Crew’s broad approach to public value, in that they perceive its importance in the community as a whole, not just amongst patrons or policy makers, the measures that the team employs to gauge public value are diverse. As noted on the
previous page, the team keeps records that quantitatively track both the outputs (bags of garbage picked up, square feet of graffiti removed, free tickets distributed) of their outreach efforts and the outcomes (attendance bumps, redemption rates of free tickets or vouchers) of those outputs. The team also keeps track of the qualitative responses to their outreach efforts, which allow for a more immediate reflection of public value than tracking outcomes over the long-term. These qualitative responses (Ungerleider cites examples of families saying that they now feel safe taking certain routes to school and youths gaining confidence and self-esteem from receiving referee training) are collected and included in the reports that the team writes on all outreach efforts, as well as being included in materials used to promote the programs. This approach reflects the team’s commitment to not only foster a broad sense of public value, but also to measure said value in as comprehensive a fashion as possible.
Opera Columbus’ outreach program is built around educational outreach to the community. This education is intended to help make opera more understandable, relatable, and enjoyable for those who might otherwise be averse to enjoying the art form. The community outreach programs offered by Opera Columbus can be sorted into two groups: those geared solely towards youth and those aimed at the general populace.

“We come and perform at the school, there’s a question and answer about being an opera singer, about opera in general, after each performance, and that's called Opera Columbus on the Go!”

~ Peggy Kriha Dye, Director of Artistic and Educational Programming

The first of these groups, the one consisting of programs aimed solely at youths, is made up of programs that bring opera to school children and combine, in different ways, study, performance, and participation in opera. These two programs, Opera Columbus on the Go! and the Opera Residency Program, are aimed specifically at students in elementary school. Opera Columbus on the Go! is aimed at a slightly older group than Tales from the Opera and consists of a complete performance of either a children’s opera or an abridged version of a regular opera. Professional singers perform the principal roles, and a select group of students are prepared to participate as the chorus. This program also includes an hour-long workshop in the school on the day of the
performance.

“We go into a school for maybe two weeks...45 minute sessions...and we do lesson plans on opera, so we’ll talk about set design, costume, makeup, voice production, drama...and have activities that kids will do to learn these things.”

~Peggy Kriha Dye, Director of Artistic and Educational Programming

The Opera Residency Program (currently a smaller effort by the company due to decreased staff size) is a longer program, allowing students to get involved with and understand all aspects of putting on an opera performance. A group of opera professionals work with students over the course of two or three weeks and help the students with aspects of production such as performance, design, stage management, and marketing. The culmination of this program is a performance that involves both professionals and students.

“The audience gets to choose the storyline, gets to choose the characters, what they’re going to do, what props they’re going to carry, and we walk them through an outline. They make their decisions...it’s a lot of fun; it’s crazy funny, and it’s a great way to introduce people to opera.”

~Peggy Kriha Dye, Director of Artistic and Educational Programming
The second group of programs, those aimed at the general populace, also consists of two programs. The first of these programs, Improv Opera, is intended not only for older school students, but also adults (the company is pushing this program for adult educational groups and as entertainment for parties). This program gives the audience the opportunity to not only learn about the art form, but also have a hand in creating an original and unique work. This program begins with a quartet of singers explaining to the audience about the different operatic voice types and some basic opera terminology. After the audience members are given this background information, they interact with the artists through the use of fill-in-the-blank and multiple choice to create a work with unique characters and situations that the singers then perform (the words are improvised, based on the suggestions of the audience, to famous opera melodies).

“We’re doing Opera Cabaret, which is popular opera that we commission an English libretto for, so it’s current, it’s hip…it’s going to be great; you’ve got to go.”

~Peggy Kriha Dye, Director of Artistic and Educational Programming

The second program targeted towards a general audience is Opera Cabaret. This program, currently in development and planned to be introduced during the 2012-2013 season, involves the company commissioning an English libretto for famous operas that references the times while remaining true to the original score and libretto. The newly-commissioned libretto (for the program’s introductory run, the company has commissioned a translation of La Boheme) is performed by local young artists with
keyboard accompaniment and in modern dress in a series of free performances intended to attract younger audiences who might find a more traditional opera-going experience to be intimidating. For the inaugural season, Opera Columbus is co-producing the program with Shadowbox Theatre (a local theatre company), and there are plans to expand the program for the 2013-2014 season into an Ohio-wide tour.

“Audience development…to develop local talent and young talent…and also, of course, to educate Columbus.

~Peggy Kriha Dye, Director of Artistic and Educational Programming

The current slate of outreach programs offered by Opera Columbus serves a number of purposes for the organization. The primary purpose of the outreach programs is to educate Columbus about opera, thereby “demystifying” the art form and making it more approachable to the general populace. As a 501(c)3 institution, this educational bent is also a necessary part of allowing the organization to maintain its tax-exempt status. Beyond education, the outreach programs also serve as an avenue to develop local audiences and performers. The audience development component is intrinsically tied to the educational component, as it is through educating the populace and making opera more accessible that future audiences are created.

The performer development component is a relatively new one for the company (at least, with its current emphasis on developing local talent through the outreach programs). Prior to 2011, Opera Columbus had been a producing company, using
young local talent to play many of the small and chorus roles in their productions. Although the company had used young artists in outreach in the past, they were generally drawn from a national pool. Following a merger with CAPA in 2011, however, the company switched from a producing to presenting company, limiting performing opportunities for local artists. As such, the company has switched to using local talent with its outreach programs, allowing them to still provide performing experience.

“It’s not something that drives me. Let’s put it that way.”

~Peggy Kriha Dye, Director of Artistic and Educational Programming

Opera Columbus’ conceptualization and measurement of public value is one component of its outreach programming that sets the company apart from the other organizations included in this study. As noted with the other three organizations, there are some forms of measures taken, often qualitative and quantitative in nature, that allow one to see and track the public value being generated. Opera Columbus stands in contrast to the other organizations from this perspective as they currently have no set conceptualization of and no in-place means to measure public value.

In talking with Kriha Dye, it became evident that the organization operates under an assumption of inherent public valuation. Kriha Dye voiced her opinion that, as the populace of Columbus becomes aware of the organization and educated about the art form and how the company presents it, the inherent value of the company will
increase. However, despite the belief that operatic saturation of Columbus is all that is necessary to generate and maintain Opera Columbus’ public value, there is no system of measures in place to gauge any perceived increase (or existence) of value that the public feels towards the organization.
“There’s not one person in charge of outreach.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

The Columbus Museum of Art (CMA) presents a distinct challenge in discussing its community outreach programs because, in the words of director of community relations Nancy Turner, “I would say we consider everything we do to be outreach. I think, as a cultural organization, everything we do is, in some way, bringing culture to the community.” The other organizations being examined for this work all have a distinct slate of programs that are designated as “outreach,” allowing for a straightforward discussion of the content of the programs and analysis thereof. However, CMA’s approach, in which outreach is a component of the holistic mission of the organization, requires an additional measure of nuance in discussing.

“Our building and our collection is the main way that we bring culture to the community. It’s what makes us different from anyone else.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

The fact that CMA views outreach as an integral part of everything that the organization does should not be taken to also mean that they do not conduct distinct programs which may be examined in the same fashion as those presented by the other
organizations being examined. CMA presents a wide array of programs (included, as applicable, in Appendix B) that can be used as means to conduct the analysis of the organization in the next chapter. However, CMA’s approach makes it distinctly different from the organizations being examined. As such, for the purposes of presenting the available data on CMA’s outreach “programs,” the organization will be discussed in the holistic fashion in which it was presented rather than through the lens of the programs that would fail to capture the full scope of the organization’s efforts.

Similarly, whereas the programs of the other organizations are grouped and discussed based on their target audiences, the nature of CMA’s outreach prevents this sort of presentation format from proving fruitful (as noted above, there are programs for which this approach could be utilized, but they would only represent a portion, rather than the whole, of the museum’s efforts). As such, while there are some elements of CMA’s outreach that target specific age brackets or audiences, such information will not serve as the basis for grouping as it does in the discussion of the other organizations. Rather, this section will be organized by the various aspects of what the museum does as it interacts with the public.
“We had a mission statement that was probably a full page, single-spaced, and nobody could find it. [Executive director Nannette Maciejunes] decided that what we needed was a very concise mission statement that everybody could remember and, when you planned something, you had to ask ‘does this further our mission?’ The mission is: to provide great experiences with great art for everyone. It’s really easy; everybody knows it.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

The holistic approach that CMA takes to outreach, in which it is considered to be a vital component of everything that the museum does, can be seen to tie into the museum’s adherence to its mission statement. The statement, given above, is focused on the type of broad inclusiveness that making outreach a component of all organizational functions creates. Turner’s statement, that not only is the mission statement known and embraced by all personnel at the museum but also that nothing is planned without first asking whether or not it fits with and furthers the mission, speaks to the extent to which this viewpoint is ingrained in the culture of the institution. This concept, that not only is containing an element of outreach an important component of museum activities but that it also is a necessity for any program or event to be developed, strongly shapes the efforts of the museum.

“You want to do the big, flashy, blockbuster-y thing, because those help get people through the door.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations
As mentioned above, due to their intrinsic connections to the general operations of the museum, CMA’s outreach efforts are not easily categorized by target demographic, as is the case with the other organizations examined in this work. However, the activities and programs that the museum presents can be fit into three categories based on the content of the programming. The first of these categories contains the shows, programs, and activities geared towards all from a populist standpoint. This category primarily consists of the big-name exhibitions that the museum presents that draw large and diverse audiences. By capitalizing on the draw of broadly famous artists (Renoir, Monet, Degas, etc.), the museum is able to extend its reach to a substantial audience. The shows and programs in this category are those most likely to draw the casual art fan, as they rely on the works of those that the general public are most likely to recognize the name, works, and value of.

“The second type of exhibition you do is for the museum community, and you do it because of scholarship. If all you did was big flashy shows, you would stop getting loans.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

The second category of CMA’s offerings is that which focuses on works and activities with niche or academic focuses. Whereas the first category is intended to draw in a wide audience, this second category is more narrowly focused in terms of who it
will bring in. At present, for example, CMA is presenting a jointly-produced (with the Jewish Museum) exhibition of Photo League works. Such a show does not have the inherently large audience base of a Degas exhibition, but does appeal to both more devoted arts patrons and to those with intellectual curiosity pertaining to the Photo League and urban development that it chronicled.

In addition to appealing to a smaller and more intellectually focused audience than shows and programs in the first category, those in this second category serve to help the museum maintain the status necessary to secure loans from other institutions. As noted in the above quote, were the museum to present nothing but populist shows that were intended to bring in large audiences, they would likely lose some credibility as cultural institution in the eyes of other such institutions, leading to issues in procuring the loans necessary to produce shows that fall into both the first and second category. By providing programming in this second category, the museum maintains the station needed to present across the three categories.

“The third type of show we do [is] really for the community.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

The third category of programming includes shows, programs, and activities that are community-centric. Perhaps the best example of this type of programming is the museum’s long-standing relationship with Columbus artist Aminah Robinson. Robinson is a Columbus-born visual artist whose work strongly relates to both the
African-American experience and life in Columbus. The museum has shown Robinson’s work in the past and has several of her works as part of its standing collection. As part of Columbus’ bicentennial celebration, the museum will be co-presenting (with Hammond Harkins Gallery, in Bexley) an exhibition of new work by Robinson specifically created for the occasion. This programming features new work by a member of the community that is inspired by the community and is largely intended for consumption by the community. This community-centric nature is what differentiates the third category of programming from the first two. While it is possible for such a community-focused show to have broad appeal or speak to the intellectual curiosity of an audience, its primary purpose is to provide something of the community for the community.

“We have one of the largest, most loyal audiences in town, which is really great. So, I would say one of the biggest reasons we do it is audience development.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

The role of outreach as a component of a holistic management plan utilized by CMA makes it somewhat difficult to pinpoint specific purposes that these efforts serve for the organization. However, Turner was able to identify two primary benefits that the museum derived from the outreach components of its activities. The first of these benefits is audience development. As noted above, CMA perceives its audience to be substantial and wide-spread throughout the community. Although this is due in part to
the naturally-occurring audience for visual art in a city such as Columbus, Turner is quick to note that the museum specifically seeks out opportunities to reach out to segments of the community that might not otherwise be patrons of the museum.

An example of such a segment of the community is Columbus’ growing Hispanic population. In 2011, CMA operated a booth at Columbus’ annual Festival Latino, handing out free passes to those who stopped by. Although such efforts to hand out free passes usually show a low rate of return, a substantial portion of the passes handed out at the festival have been used. This has led to increased visits from Latinos to the museum, even without the free passes, and the museum plans to sit a booth at the festival again this year. This example gives a clear and quantitative example of an outreach effort leading to audience growth and development.

Another similar set of examples are the institution of annual fellowships (co-sponsored by the Great Columbus Arts Council) to local artists, a current exhibition of work by the Ohio Plein Air Society, and demonstrations at the museum offered by the Ohio Watercolor Society. Turner notes that, despite artists being seemingly low-hanging fruit as an audience, the museum has traditionally had difficulty getting them to be regular museum patrons (she cites repeated complaints from artists about a lack of their work being displayed). These programs, which offer an olive branch of sorts to local artists while still providing content that can be enjoyed by other patrons has served to increase available offerings by the museum and attract more local artists as consistent patrons.
“We are really adaptive on the fly. We turn on a dime.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

The second purpose that the outreach components of the museum’s operations serve, according to Turner, is the ability to adapt to events and changes in the city. Although the museum plans its exhibitions several years in advance, the inclusion of outreach efforts in their operations allows the institution to be responsive on a more immediate basis. For example, with the prolonged financial recession that took place several years ago, the museum was able to offer free admission during summer months so that local residents who could not afford to take vacations could still have an opportunity to take a small getaway that they might not otherwise be able to. At regular admission prices, a family with two parents and two children over the age of five would have to pay $30 to visit the museum, a sum that could be unaffordable at the height of the recession. This outreach effort reflects a response by the museum to an issue that was not included in their long-term planning that benefited both local citizens (by giving them an option for entertainment for free during the summer) and the museum (by drawing a set of patrons that they might now have otherwise had, many of whom, according to Turner, have come back since).
“We don’t consider outreach programs a separate thing from all we do because it’s so integrated in everything we do. We don’t say ‘gosh, how are we measuring this?’, because we don’t do it.”

~Nancy Turner, Director of Community Relations

CMA’s conceptualization and measurement of public value is largely split depending on the group whose perception is being considered. According to Turner, the museum’s education department does a fair amount of data collection in measuring perceptions of the museum’s public value. This data is collected through surveys and focus groups (both with an emphasis on generating quantitative data), but this information is collected from patrons who are at the museum. In accord with the aforementioned holistic approach that CMA seems to take, public value is not the primary focus of this data collection, but rather a component of the questioning that is conducted. It is not clear what impact the inclusion of public value questions as part of a broader data collection instrument (rather than as the primary focus of questioning) has on the data gathered, if it has an impact at all.

While CMA makes use of focus groups and surveys and quantitative data from these sources in measuring public value amongst active museum patrons, there is a distinct shift from quantitative to qualitative when the group whose perception is being considered is non-patrons. This is particularly true when considering the perceptions of local and state policy makers. Turner is quick to mention that any city or state legislative meeting at which the museum has a presence includes council members or legislators
letting the museum representative know that their work with and for the community is appreciated (it should be noted that all Columbus City Council members and state legislators serving Central Ohio are given free tours of the museum and information regarding museum activities). Although there seem to be many examples of this sort of qualitative data, there are not currently efforts to collect or organize it in the same fashion that museum staff collects quantitative data.

In talking with Turner, it became evident that the museum’s perceived public value is not, at least on a broad basis, a major concern of the institution. As noted above, the museum enjoys strong bi-partisan perceived value on the part of local and state policy makers. This may help to explain why Turner and the museum can offer several qualitative examples of perceived public value on the part of these individuals, but otherwise only seem to collect data from patrons already at the museum. This seems to speak to the strength of the institution, as well as the scope and depth of its audience base (if the museum is confident in collecting public value data from only active patrons, it must be comfortable in the validity of this data as representative for Columbus en masse). That being said, there is no formalized set of consistent measures that is used to collect and verify these data and perceptions.
The outreach programs offered by the Blue Jackets and Crew, although unique in each case in their scope and target audience, reveal a number of recurrent themes when examined together. The first of these themes is a willingness to look beyond the organization’s core product when developing and implementing outreach programs. With the Crew, even though Ungerleider points out that “soccer is what we do best,” there exist a number of programs that do not directly relate to soccer. Rather, they aim to improve the quality of life in the community that hosts the team (for example, park clean-ups and graffiti removal). Similarly, the Blue Jackets venture into ancillary territory with several of their programs, including their work with Junior Achievement of Central Ohio and Jackets for Jackets. As with the Crew, these programs serve to enhance the quality of life for those in the surrounding community without directly drawing on the organizations’ core products (in this case, soccer and hockey).

The second theme, and one that is related to the first, is a willingness to partner with outside groups. In doing so, the sport organizations position themselves to not always directly interact with end-users, but rather sometimes leverage their resources to help other groups deliver products and services to end-users. This theme is especially prevalent in the outreach programs conducted by the Blue Jackets, who partner with other organizations on a majority of their offerings. For example, the player-driven programs are all partnerships with outside organizations in which players will donate their time and/or tickets so that the partnering organization can use those resources to reward people...
with attendance opportunities or raise funds. The Crew’s offerings are not as consistently reliant on outside partners as are the Blue Jackets’, but they do partner with outside organizations for a number of their outreach programs. For instance, their work with Habitat for Humanity and St. Stephen’s House involve partnering organizations that make use of the team’s resources while handling the interactions with the end-users. This is a stark point of contrast when compared to the arts organizations, whose outreach programs all involve direct organizational contact with the eventual end-users.

The third apparent theme in the programming is a disproportionate skewing of the outreach programs towards youths. Due to the large number of programs offered by both the Blue Jackets and Crew that involve education, both in a general sense in a school setting and in a sport-specific context outside of a school setting, there are more programs targeted towards various ages of youth participants than there are targeted towards adults. This skew becomes even more apparent when youths are considered as a part of the target demographic for programs aimed at the general populace. This is a theme that is also seen occurring in the programming offered by the arts organizations, although the sport organizations are not necessarily as driven to include an educational component due to the requirements for tax-exemption. Interestingly, whereas the arts organizations have a substantial number of programs that are intended to be participated in by youths with their parents, the youth-targeted programs offered by the sport organizations do not necessarily include parental participation.
Summary Overview: Arts

The outreach programs offered by CMA and Opera Columbus, although somewhat unique in their scope and purposes for each organization, present as evident a few common themes. The first amongst these is the use of outreach programs as a means to educate or involve the public in the organization’s core product. In the case of Opera Columbus, Kriha Dye indicates that the outreach programs offered serve to educate and acclimate Central Ohio to opera, demystifying it as an art form. Similarly, the programs offered by CMA all center on members of the community experiencing, creating, and/or learning about visual art. In both instances, this can be seen as indicatives of mission adherence, given that both organizations are 501(c)3 institutions. This does, however, stand in contrast to the programs offered by the sport organizations, in which education about or involvement in the core product is only a component of how outreach programs are used.

Another evident theme is the targeting of programs towards the general populace, rather than specific sub-sections of the community. With both organizations, particularly within the subset of programs that are geared toward students, there is no limiting or tailoring of the programs to specific racial, ethnic, or socio-economic groups. Rather, the programs are available to any school willing and able to participate. While this may, in some instances, create participant groups that are largely comprised of a particular racial, ethnic, or socio-economic group, such focusing is not inherent in the programs. This theme is not entirely pervasive as the museum has made efforts to reach out to
Columbus’ Hispanic community through involvement with the annual Festival Latino. However, this is the only example of such a focused program between the two arts organizations.

The final common theme in the programming of the arts organizations, and one held in common with the sport organizations, is that there is a disproportionate skew towards youth as the target age bracket for the programs. Both Opera Columbus and CMA target many of their programs to school-aged children. This makes sense, given the educational component of their charitable mission that allows them to maintain tax-exempt status. However, education does not necessarily need to be limited to school-aged students. Both organizations seem to recognize this, as they do offer educational programming designed for adults. However, the bulk of their educational programming (and, as educational programming dominates their offerings, the bulk of their outreach efforts) are geared towards young students. It should be noted that several of the programs geared toward youth are designed to involve parents and/guardians, so they do apply to multiple demographics. This does not alter the fact that there is a substantial skew towards youth-centric programming.
Chapter 6: Analysis and Discussion

Structure

Utilizing the data presented in the preceding chapter, this chapter examines that information and presents the findings derived from this analysis. This analysis of the data is presented herein in four sections: individual organizations, parallel organization comparisons, field comparison, and public value comparison. The initial section, analysis of individual organizations, looks at each of the organizations being studied and breaks down, using the coding system discussed in the methodology chapter, the ages, populations, and purposes served by each of the organizations being studied. For each organization, a table and graph are provided that visualize the target age and population breakdown of the programs.

The second section of this chapter, parallel organization comparisons, draws upon the pairings of organizations discussed in the introduction to this work. This analysis, making use of the individual organization analyses from the preceding section, examines the potential for direct interactions between each of the parallel organization pairs based on the ages and populations that each currently serves and the content of their programming. Similarly, the third section, field comparison, examines each field in its entirety to look at broad patterns and then looks at how the patterns in both fields might welcome, facilitate, or impede interactions between the two.
The final section of this chapter, public value comparison, examines how each of the organizations conceptualizes and measures its public value. Through this cross-examination, similarities and differences between the various organizations and the two fields are brought to light, informing the discussion of how the two fields might conceive and measure public value at such point as they work together. This section directly influences the recommendations section included in the next chapter.

Columbus Blue Jackets

The community outreach programming offered by the Blue Jackets appears to work towards the generation of public value through a two-pronged approach: the utilization of both social marketing and youth audience development. The former, the use of social marketing, becomes evident when one examines the content of the outreach programs that the team and its foundation offer. Social marketing, as per Andreasen (1994), is the development of consumer loyalty for an organization through the indirect method of enhancing the quality of life in the community in which the organization resides. This is reflected in the team’s outreach programming by the relatively high percentage of programs that include no direct inducement to make a beneficiary of the program into a consumer of the organization’s product. Of the 22 programs (see table 3) included for consideration (this includes the consolidation of the player programs, which are constantly in flux due to player transactions, into one for analytical purposes), approximately 15 are designed to enhance the quality of life in the surrounding
community while including no direct inducement to become a consumer. This number is approximate given the few programs that, depending on the incentives awarded for participation (Book Jackets and Hockey: It’s In your Blood, for example), may or may not fall into this category. This represents approximately 68% of the outreach programming that falls into the category of social marketing, a clear majority of the programs offered.

In addition to considering the high percentage of outreach programs that qualify as social marketing by omitting inducements for beneficiaries to become consumers, a reconsideration of the programs that include such inducements but still meet the other criteria for social marketing reveals that almost all of the outreach programming provided by the team falls under this umbrella. Of the 22 programs, all but two (Street Jackets and Junior Jackets, and even these are arguable) are designed to enhance the quality of life in the surrounding community, meaning that approximately 91% of the outreach programs can be classified as social marketing.

The means by which this social marketing is manifested through the various programs are fairly diverse, including both direct interaction between the team and the end users and partnerships that allow the team to leverage its resources on behalf of another organization that then interacts with the end users. The result of these varied manifestations is an expansive presence in the community that allows the team to be actively involved in facets of Columbus as far ranging as education, blood donation, and providing season-appropriate clothing to those in need.

21 In this instance, direct inducements to become a consumer include tickets to attend a game or a fundraising effort that requires attendance at a game.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columbus Blue Jackets</th>
<th>Early Youth</th>
<th>Late Youth</th>
<th>Young Adult</th>
<th>Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Jackets at School</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Jackets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Club Good Health Challenge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Jackets Hockey Shop</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Jackets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Jackets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hats for Heroes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravery beads</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey scholarship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport safety helmet program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners in education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell scholarship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearances/Speakers bureau</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50 raffle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s in your Blood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackets for Jackets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday toy drive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family resource center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players’ programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Outreach Programs, Blue Jackets

The second component of how the Blue Jackets use their outreach programming to generate public value, youth audience development, is best demonstrated through examining the age breakdown of who is targeted by these programs (see figure 4). This
approach to generating public value, while less immediate than the aforementioned social marketing, allows the organization to expose its product to youths over the course of their childhood through a number of programs. These programs, particularly those which tie the team to academic curricula or offer team-themed rewards for achievement, provide the team with a strong image to local youth. Developing fans at a young age serves a dual purpose for the team: making use of parental purchasing power and creating future support. The former purpose, making use of parental purchasing power, allows the team to make an initial investment in providing free tickets or memorabilia to students and then reaping the benefit of parents purchasing additional tickets and/or memorabilia for their children. The latter purpose, creating future support, allows the team to create young fans who will then grow up appreciating the value of the team, rather than having to convince them of the team’s value once they have reached adulthood.

Figure 4: Age Group Distribution, Blue Jackets
In examining the targeted age groups and content of the Blue Jackets’ outreach programming, two points of interest came to light. The first of these, and one tied to the above point regarding the benefit of developing young fans, is that the organization offers no programs specifically targeted at young adults. The team’s youth programming slate is very dense, and although there are fewer adult-specific programs, there are still a decent number of them. This represents a programming gap that leaves those between the ages of 18 and 35 largely unaddressed by the team. Given the potential for future support that comes with developing youth audiences, it seems strange that the team would ignore this same group once they have graduated high school, having reached an age that would allow them to vote in support of public measures that would favor the team. There are undoubtedly reasons behind the team’s decision to maintain this gap in targeted programming, but speculation as to these reasons is the domain of future works.

The second point of interest is that, despite being arguably the largest of the four organizations studied and having one of the most expansive reaches with outreach programming, there is not a single program that the team offers that is geared specifically towards minority communities in and around Columbus. Although the nature of the programming that the team offers does not exclude minority participation as part of the general populace, they also fail to address the distinct cultural needs of these different groups. Given the underrepresentation of minorities on NHL rosters, this seems as though it would represent a lucrative opportunity for the team to reach out to and establish

---

22 Young adult, for the purposes of this breakdown, refers to programming intended for those aged 18-35, whereas adult refers both to those above the age of 35 and to instances where a program is geared towards anyone over the age of 18.
23 Although the team has the highest annual budget of the four, other metrics leave room for debate.
perceived value with communities who may not otherwise have an interest in hockey. This would allow the team broaden existing public support, but at present represents an untapped opportunity.

Columbus Crew

The community outreach programming offered by the Crew appears to work towards the generation of public value through a three-pronged approach: the utilization of social marketing, Hispanic audience development, and youth audience development. The first of these, the use of social marketing, is evident upon examination of the content of the outreach programs that the team and its foundation offer. As noted previously, social marketing is the development of consumer loyalty through the enhancement of the quality of life in the local community. Whereas this was reflected for the Blue Jackets by the team’s high percentage of programs that include no direct inducement to make a beneficiary of the program into a consumer, the count is not quite as clear for the Crew. Many of the Blue Jackets’ programs had minimal actual connection to hockey, whereas almost every one of the Crew’s programs integrates soccer in some fashion, even if there is no direct inducement to make a consumer out of the person(s) benefiting. Given the inclusion of the sport in the programming, however, it is unclear to what extent this acts (or fails to acts) as an inducement to become a consumer. In light of this, all programming that meets the criteria to be considered as social marketing will be considered, regardless of whether or not they directly attempt to turn beneficiaries into consumers. Of the 21 programs (see table) included for consideration, approximately 18
are designed to enhance the quality of life in the surrounding community, thereby qualifying as social marketing efforts. This number is approximate given the debatable nature of several of the programs and the fact that two of these programs (GOALS for KIDS and the school assembly program) function largely in conjunction with each other, and therefore one can argue for the inclusions of either one or both. This figure represents approximately 86% of the outreach programming, a clear majority of the programs offered.

The means by which this social marketing is manifested through the various programs are diverse, if somewhat less so than the means by which the Blue Jackets’ social marketing is manifested in its programming. Almost all of the Crew’s programs involve direct interaction between the team and the end users, with the exclusion of two that allow the team to leverage its resources on behalf of another organization. The result of these manifestations is a presence in the community that allows the team to be actively involved in numerous facets of Columbus, ranging from education to blood donation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Youth</th>
<th>Late Youth</th>
<th>Young Adult</th>
<th>Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Crew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copa Victoria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIFC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away game remotes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text message program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRASH Chivas USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner City/Disadvantaged/Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer field development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ColumbusReads HOSTS program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop with a Player</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner city youth soccer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passback program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephen’s House</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS for KIDS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School assembly program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Hospital visits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicks for Kids</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDRF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood/bone marrow drives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Heroes program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Outreach Programs, Columbus Crew
The second component of how the Crew use their outreach programming to generate public value, Hispanic audience development, is best demonstrated through both the inclusion of Hispanic-targeted programming (as noted on the above table), much of which is offered in either Spanish or bilingual formats, and the presence on the organization’s staff of someone whose job is to develop and strengthen ties to the local Hispanic community. This approach to generating public value differs from the other two approaches that the Crew utilize in that there is already an existing measure of perceived value held by the Hispanic community, whereas social marketing and youth audience development are intended to create a perception of value where none previously existed. The existing perception of value within the Hispanic community is derived from soccer being the most popular sport in the countries from which the community has either relocated from or that their ancestors have relocated from, making it an integral part of their culture. However, this existing value is for the sport, not necessarily the team. As such, these programs are important as ways to convert the value ascribed to the sport to value ascribed to the local organization that fields a team. With this in mind, these programs allow the team to capitalize on existing enthusiasm by providing an outlet by which it can be expressed, building allegiance to the team in the process. For instance, the Copa Victoria tournament serves as a regional championship for various Hispanic soccer leagues, and away game remotes provide social opportunities for members of the Hispanic community to interact while viewing a game they likely would have viewed anyway. By providing these team-sponsored outlets for the Hispanic community’s
enthusiasm for soccer, the Crew establish a sense of value in the minds of the fastest growing segment of Columbus’ population.

The third component of how the Crew use their outreach programming to generate public value, youth audience development, is best demonstrated through examining the age breakdown of who is targeted by these programs (see figure 5). As mentioned in relation to the Blue Jackets, this approach to generating public value is less immediate than the aforementioned social marketing, but it does allow the organization to expose its product to youths over the course of their childhood, therefore developing an appreciation and sense of value as they grow towards adulthood and voting age. These programs help to establish a team image with youth, especially in instances where the program allows the team to provide something to these youths (such as the team’s forthcoming recreational league) that they would not otherwise have access to. By developing fans at a young age, the team is able to, as in the case of the Blue Jackets, make use of parental purchasing power and create future support.
In examining the age groups and community segments targeted by the Crew’s outreach programming, two points of interest came to light. The first of these, and one that also came to light examining the programming of the Blue Jackets, is that the organization offers no programs specifically targeted at young adults. The team offers a substantial number of youth programs (roughly half of the 21 included in this study), as well as a handful that include adults specifically and a number that include both youths and adults. However, these are no programs that aim to reach out to young adults. This represents a gap that leaves those between the ages of 18 and 35 unaddressed by the team. Given the potential for future support that developing youth audiences represents, it seems strange that the team would then leave this potential unrealized when that group graduates high school and begins to vote and have disposable income, both of which can be used to the advantage of the team. As with the Blue Jackets, there are undoubtedly
reasons behind the team’s decision to maintain this gap in targeted programming, but what these reasons are remain unclear at present.

The second point of interest is that the Crew are the only one of the four that have programming developed that specifically targets disadvantaged and/or minority populations within Columbus. As noted previously, the decision on the team’s part to reach out to Columbus’ Hispanic population makes sense, as it builds on existing enthusiasm for the sport. Additionally, the location of the team’s venue and offices (in the Linden neighborhood, an economically depressed section of Columbus) has likely shaped the team’s efforts to include inner city and disadvantaged populations (as a point of comparison the other three organizations being examined are all housed in downtown Columbus). Although the team’s efforts to reach out to these populations make sense given the aforementioned factors, it is still interesting that the other organizations, which are older and/or have greater resources available to conduct their outreach efforts, have not developed programming that reaches out to these same groups.

Columbus Museum of Art

The community outreach programming offered by the Columbus Museum of Art presents a unique challenge in analyzing given that the organization views all that it does as outreach, rather than having distinct programs intended to serve as outreach. However, for the purposes of conducting this analysis, the list of programs that the

---

24 Such efforts are also bolstered by MLS initiatives to engage Hispanic fans nationwide.
museum offers has been included and is being considered as the body of outreach programming. Upon consideration of these programs, the museum appears to work towards the generation of public value through a two-pronged approach: youth audience development and family audience development.

The first of these approaches, youth audience development, is best demonstrated through examining the age breakdown of who is targeted by these programs (see table, graph). This approach to generating public value, as has been mentioned in discussing the same approach as used by both the Blue Jackets and Crew, allows the organization to expose its product to youths over the course of their childhood through a number of programs. Youth audience development programming represents a significant portion of the programs presented by the museum (seven of 15, or 47%), indicating that it is a priority to the institution. In contrast to the programs that the sport teams offer to this end, however, the museum’s youth-focused programs are centered not on the institution itself, but rather the art form that it presents. Instead of presenting programs that inundate youths with museum imagery, these programs aim to educate youths about art and its connections to various other components of their lives, building appreciation through education. Despite the use of a different approach than that embraced by the sport organizations, the potential benefits reaped by the museum are the same. That is to say, developing fans at a young age allows the museum to both make use of the parental purchasing power associated with youths and create future support.
Figure 6: Age Group Distribution, Columbus Museum of Art

The second of these approaches, family audience development, is unique amongst the four organizations being examined. As can be seen in the below table, roughly a quarter (four of 15) of the programs that the museum offers are intended to be participated in by parents/guardians and their young children (these programs seem to have a specific bent towards children too young to participate in school-based programs). This approach to generating public value seems to work in two ways. The first, as has been discussed previously with the sport organizations and with the museum itself, is by introducing youths to the organizations at a young age, and therefore cultivating future patrons. The second way is by cultivating appreciation amongst parents and guardians by providing a free local activity to participate in with their children. Whereas cultivating future audiences and support provides rewards that the museum may reap in the long-run, winning over parents and guardians provides a more immediate reward, as these people
are more likely to be of voting age. Given the current state of the economy, the availability of free activities that are family-friendly (particularly on weekends and over the summer), such as those offered by the museum, provide an opportune way to earn the appreciation of, and therefore create the perception of value from, parents and guardians in Columbus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Youth</th>
<th>Late Youth</th>
<th>Young Adult</th>
<th>Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Works</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artful Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer art workshops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artful Adventures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressing Matters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doodles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art of Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOW! Art</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Saturdays/Family Sundays</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours for people with disabilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Fun afternoon activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Outreach Programs, Columbus Museum of Art

In examining the age groups and community segments targeted by the museum’s outreach programming, two points of interest came to light. The first of these, and one
that was also apparent while examining the programming of the Blue Jackets and Crew, is that the organization offers no programs specifically targeted at young adults. However, unlike the sport organizations, the museum does offer some programming that, while open to all adults, tends to skew towards young adult audiences. One such program, Game Show, tends to function as a young professionals event, facilitating networking over drinks before the contest begins. Another such program, The Art of Analysis, skews younger because it is designed to involve OSU College of Medicine students. These programs represent an effort on the part of the museum to maintain a sense of engagement amongst patrons between the ages of 18 and 35, something that is not seen with the aforementioned sport organizations. This allows the museum to maintain a presence with this group as they obtain disposable income and develop consumer habits.

The second point of interest is that the museum is the only one of the four organizations that have programming developed that is specifically designed for family participation. As noted previously, the decision on the museum’s part to reach out to families makes sense, as it provides both short-term and long-term benefits to the institution. Additionally, given the museum’s central location in downtown Columbus, this programming is readily accessible to families that need to travel by public transit, making it a viable option for those who may currently be economically depressed. Although the museum’s efforts to reach out to this group makes sense given the aforementioned factors, it is still interesting that the other organizations have not developed programming that similarly reaches out to families.
The community outreach programming offered by Opera Columbus appears to work towards the generation of public value through a two-pronged approach: the utilization of both youth audience development and older audience education. The first of these approaches, youth audience development, is best demonstrated through examining the age breakdown of who is targeted by these programs (see table 6, figure 7). Although the sample size for analysis is small (Opera Columbus only identifies four current outreach programs), half are specifically designed for youth audiences and an additional program can be conducted with youth audiences, although it is not necessarily specifically for that age group. This approach to generating public value, as has been mentioned in discussing the same approach as used by the other three organizations, allows Opera Columbus to expose its product to youths over the course of their childhood through a number of programs. Youth audience development programming represents a significant portion of the programs presented by Opera Columbus (either two or three [see above] of four, or 50/75%), indicating that it is a priority to the institution. As is the case with the museum, Opera Columbus’ youth-focused programs stand in contrast to those offered by the sport organizations in that they are not centered on the organization itself, but rather on opera as an art form. Rather than presenting programming that is intended to make youths appreciative if Opera Columbus directly, these programs aim to educate youths about opera and its connections to various other components of their lives, building appreciation for the art form through education. Despite the use of a different
approach than that embraced by the sport organizations, the potential benefits reaped by the opera are the same. That is to say, developing fans at a young age allows the company to both make use of the parental purchasing power associated with youths and create future support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opera Columbus</th>
<th>Early Youth</th>
<th>Late Youth</th>
<th>Young Adult</th>
<th>Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera on the Go!</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera residency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improv Opera</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera cabaret</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Outreach Programs, Opera Columbus

The second of these approaches, older audience education, is unique amongst the four organizations being examined. Although the other three organizations offer programs that are intended for adult audiences, even the most closely related (those offered by the museum) appear to focus on experiencing the organization’s core product rather than providing education about it. Kriha Dye discussed this matter in her interview, indicating that opera faces a disadvantage when compared to other entertainment options in that many potential audience members have negative preconceived notions regarding the art form, therefore preemptively finding it intimidating and/or unenjoyable. This approach to generating public value seems to work in two ways. The first, as indicated by Kriha Dye, is that education about opera helps to remove many of the barriers to appreciation and perceiving value that non-patrons may currently feel. By removing these
barriers and making opera more accessible, members of the community are more likely to perceive the generation of value by the company’s presence (or so Kriha Dye asserted). The second way is offering continuous engagement for the public from early youth through adulthood. Whereas strictly cultivating future audiences and support provides rewards that the opera may reap in the long-run, providing consistent opportunities for engagement across age groups provides the company with more immediate rewards while the participating youth grow towards adulthood, creating a constant stream of appreciative and supportive patrons.

**Figure 7: Age Group Distribution, Opera Columbus**

In examining the targeted age groups and content of the Blue Jackets’ outreach programming, a point of interest came to light. This point, tied to both the development of youth audiences and the education of older audiences, is that the organization is the
only one of the four studied to offer a slate of programs intentionally designed to offer the public constant opportunities for engagement from youth through adulthood. This is not to say that the other three organizations do not offer programs for various age brackets, as they all offer programming for age ranges from youth to adult. However, there is little to no continuity in the content of the programs as participants move from age group to age group. Perhaps the closest of the other three organizations, the museum, still makes an abrupt shift from educating youths about art to experiencing art for adults. In contrast to this, Opera Columbus offers a continuous flow of programming designed to educate participants about opera in different, age-appropriate ways. With this slate of programs, it is possible for one to start learning about opera as a school student, progress to learning about performance etiquette by attending cabaret performances as a young adult, and then put their accumulated knowledge to use in shaping a performance as an older adult. This program design is not only provides constant engagement across age groups, but also allows the experiences gained from participation to be cumulative, making it unique amongst the four organizations examined.

Blue Jackets/Columbus Museum of Art

Having examined the program content, age and population targeting, and public value generation methods employed by the four organizations being studied, it is now necessary, in the interest of evaluating whether reasonable opportunities exist for these organizations to collaborate and learn from each other, to compare the two sets of parallel
organizations (leading, ultimately, to a comparison of the two fields in the next section).
The first pairing of organizations, the Blue Jackets and the Columbus Museum of Art, represents the large “cornerstone” organizations in each field. Given the content of their programs, as presented earlier in this chapter in their analyses, the two organizations do not necessarily have much in common in terms of their outreach programming. The one evident point of similarity is that both have, in numerical terms, a skew towards youth as the targeted age group in their programming. However, this lack of similarities appears to provide ample reasonable opportunity for the two organizations to share techniques and experiences with each, allowing each to refine and enhance their current offerings so as to better serve the community.

The first apparent opportunity for these two organizations to interact and share knowledge exists around programming specifically designed for young adult (ages 18-35) audiences. As noted previously in this chapter, such programming does not seem to exist within the slate of offerings of the two sport organizations. Also noted previously in this chapter is that, although the museum’s two programs that primarily serve this audience, Game Show and The Art of Analysis, are technically open to adults of any age (in the case of the latter program, so long as they are enrolled as students in the OSU College of Medicine), those who participate tend to be predominantly young adults. These two programs offered by the museum present not only exposure to the organization and the art form that it presents, but also opportunities for professional development and social/professional networking, both of which are opportunities that do not currently exist within the programming offered by the Blue Jackets. In light of this, it seems that
interaction between the two organizations would provide the museum an opportunity to share with the Blue Jackets some of their experiences and successful techniques in not only developing and presenting programs geared towards the young adult age bracket, but also in introducing professional development and networking as elements of their outreach programming.

Although the previous example involves a one-way flow of information (from the museum to the Blue Jackets), there are additional evident opportunities that would involve an equitable transfer of information between the two organizations. For example, as previously noted, the programming currently offered by the Blue Jackets is predominantly built around partnerships in which the team makes available some measure of its resources to an outside group, enhancing the capabilities of that outside group and minimizing (or eliminating) interaction between the team and the end-users benefiting from the program. In contrast to this, the programming currently offered by the museum involves, across the board, direct contact between the institution and the end-users benefitting from the programs. This appears to represent a valuable opportunity for both institutions, as the Blue Jackets could share experience on leveraging resources and forming partnerships with outside organizations while the museum could reciprocate with experience regarding utilizing institutional resources to make direct connections to those benefitting from the programming. This exchange of expertise and information holds the potential to broaden the outreach efforts and community penetration of both organizations, representing a substantive enhancement to both groups derived from interaction.
An additional opportunity for the Columbus Museum of Art and the Blue Jackets to interact and exchange knowledge for mutual benefit arises from the team’s propensity for establishing programming that utilizes social marketing and the museum’s strength in developing discipline-focused educational programming. As noted in the team’s above analysis, the Blue Jackets feature social marketing as a strong component of their outreach programming, of which it represents a majority of the outreach efforts currently offered. Whereas social marketing is a prominently featured component of the Blue Jackets’ programming, it is markedly absent from the current slate of programs that the museum offers. Similarly, the museum currently offers a substantial number of educational programs that focus specifically on educating participants (primarily youths) about the visual art that they are seeing and creating. Although the Blue Jackets do offer some measure of educational programming, it is designed to apply team imagery and content to multiple disciplines that may or may not be directly related to the team’s core product (that is to say, hockey). In both cases, the current programming by one organization could generate the expertise and insights necessary to fill a gap in the same area with the other organization. As with the potential areas for knowledge exchange above, the swapping of experience and expertise in these areas has the potential to enhance the capacities of both organizations.

Having conducted individual organization analyses of the Blue Jackets and the Columbus Museum of Art, as well as comparing the groups targeted by their programming and the content of said programming, it seems evident that there are several inherent opportunities for these two organizations to exchange experience and expertise.
Such exchanges appear to have the potential to broaden the outreach capabilities of both organizations, as well as enhancing existing capacities. Therefore, it can be said that reasonable opportunities do exist for these two organizations to interact as a means to exchange knowledge in a fashion that would prove mutually beneficial.

Columbus Crew/Opera Columbus

The second pairing of organizations, the Columbus Crew and Opera Columbus, represents smaller, more niche organizations in each field. Given the content of their programs, as presented earlier in this chapter in their analyses, these two organizations are similar to the first pairing presented in that they do not necessarily have much in common in terms of their outreach programming. Also as with the first pairing of organizations, the one evident point of similarity is that both have, in numerical terms, a skew towards youth as the targeted age group in their programming. This skewing is less pronounced in the case of Opera Columbus, given the smaller number of programs that they offer, but youth-targeted or youth-accessible programs still account for 75% of the organization’s programming. Although there is only this one evident point of conjunction between the two, this lack of similarities seems to provide a number of reasonable opportunities for the two organizations to share techniques and experiences with each, allowing each to refine and enhance their current offerings so as to better serve the community.
The first apparent opportunity for these two organizations to interact and share knowledge, as was the case with the first pairing, exists around programming specifically designed for young adult (ages 18-35) audiences. As noted in the comparison of the previous pairing, such programming does not seem to exist within the slate of offerings of the two sport organizations. Also noted previously in this chapter is that, unlike the other three organizations being examined, Opera Columbus has programming (albeit forthcoming) that is targeted towards young adult participants. This program offers not only exposure to the organization and education regarding the art form that it presents (the repertoire and audience protocol), but also opportunities for social networking, an opportunity that does not currently exist within the programming offered by the Crew. In light of this, it seems that interaction between the two organizations would provide the opera an opportunity to share with the Crew some of their experiences in not only developing and presenting programs geared towards the young adult age bracket (especially since it is a process that the company is still working on), but also in introducing networking as an element of their outreach programming.

A similar opportunity for the exchange of knowledge exists around the Crew’s Hispanic-targeted programming. The Crew are the only of the four organizations examined that offer programming specifically targeted towards a minority group (this is not to say that the others exclude minority groups, but rather that they are grouped in with the general populace). Given that Columbus is home to several sizeable minority populations, the knowledge and expertise that accompany having a well-developed slate of outreach programs geared toward such groups would likely prove fruitful to other
organizations. As such, the Crew could offer this experience and knowledge to the opera’s benefit and in an act of reciprocity to the sharing of their expertise regarding young adult programming.

Additional opportunities appear to exist that would allow for an equitable transfer of information between the two organizations. For example, the programming currently offered by the Crew is features a number of partnerships in which the team makes available some measure of its resources to an outside group, enhancing the capabilities of that outside group and limiting the direct interaction between the team and the end-users benefiting from the program. In contrast to this, the programming offered by Opera Columbus involves nothing but direct contact between the company and the end-users benefitting from the programs. This appears to represent a valuable opportunity for both organizations, as the Crew could share experience on forming partnerships with outside organizations while Opera Columbus could reciprocate with experience regarding utilizing institutional resources to make direct connections to those benefitting from the programming (although it should be noted that, unlike the Blue Jackets, the Crew do offer some programming that involves direct connections to end-users, so the transfer of knowledge from Opera Columbus to the Crew might not be as great as the knowledge transferred in the other direction). This exchange of expertise and information holds the potential to broaden the outreach efforts and community penetration of both organizations, representing a substantive enhancement to both groups derived from interaction.
An additional opportunity for Opera Columbus and the Crew to interact and exchange knowledge for mutual benefit arises from the team’s apparent knack for establishing programming that utilizes social marketing and the opera’s strength in developing discipline-focused educational programming. As noted in the team’s individual analysis, the Crew make prominent use of social marketing as a component of their outreach programming. Whereas social marketing is a prominently featured component of the Crew’s programming, it is not present in the current slate of programs that the opera offers. Similarly, the opera currently offers a slate of programs that focus specifically on educating participants about the art form that they are seeing and, in one program’s case, helping to create. Although the Crew do offer some measure of educational programming, it is applies team imagery and content to multiple disciplines that may or may not be directly related to the team’s core product (soccer). In both cases, the current programming of each organization could provide the expertise and insights that the other would find necessary to fill a gap in the same area. As with the potential opportunities for exchanging knowledge mentioned above, the swapping of experience and expertise in these areas has the potential to enhance the capacities of both organizations.

Having conducted individual organization analyses of the Crew and Opera Columbus, as well as examining and comparing the content and groups targeted by their programming, it seems evident that there are several inherent opportunities for these two organizations to exchange experience and expertise. Such exchanges have the potential to broaden the outreach capabilities and capacities of both organizations, allowing them to
better serve the community of which they are part. Therefore, it can be said that reasonable opportunities do exist for these two organizations to interact as a means to exchange knowledge in a fashion that would prove mutually beneficial.

Field Comparison

Although the above comparisons between the pairs of parallel organizations indicated that there is reasonable potential for interaction and the sharing of knowledge for mutual benefit, this does not necessarily indicate that such opportunities exist on a broader level between the two fields. To ascertain if such opportunities exist, it is necessary to consider recurrent trends in both fields, as such trends would ignore characteristics of a single organization’s programming and instead focus on characteristics that are present in the programming of a field as a whole. This approach carries the benefit of creating a measure external validity that would be lacking if only individual organizations were taken into consideration.

In examining the two sport organizations, two trends in the content of their outreach programming became evident. The first of these, and the one that provides arguably the starkest contrast to the outreach efforts of the arts organizations, is the use of social marketing as a primary component of their programming. With the Blue Jackets, social marketing is present through such programs as Hats for Heroes, the family resource center at Nationwide Children’s Hospital, and the annual holiday toy drive, amongst many others. With the Crew, social marketing is present through the inclusion of
programs such as their involvement with Habitat for Humanity, fundraising for the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, and soccer field development. In both cases, there are a substantial number of programs that are designed to enhance the quality of life in the surrounding community, even if they do not (and, in most instances, they do not) include a direct inducement to become a consumer of the organizations’ core products. That social marketing is not only present but predominant in the slate of programs offered by both sport organizations indicates that this represents a trend in the field and not a characteristic isolated to the programming of a single organization.

The second trend in the programming of the sport organizations, and one that is at least mildly related to the presence of social marketing, is the wide-spread willingness to form partnerships with outside organizations. Unlike social marketing, however, which is fairly equal in its level of predominance in both organizations, the formation of partnerships is less balanced, with the Blue Jackets making substantially greater use of the approach than the Crew. The Crew make occasional partnerships with outside organizations, but also run a fair number of their programs in-house, giving the organization a direct connection to the end-users benefitting from the programming. The Blue Jackets, on the other hand, rely almost entirely on partnerships with outside organizations. Very little of their programming is run entirely in-house, instead letting the partnering organizations have the direct contact with the programs’ end-users while making use of resources provided by the team. Even though the use of outside partnerships may not be balanced between the two teams, its presence with both indicates that it is a trend in the field and not a characteristic tied distinctly to a single organization.
In examining the two arts organizations, as with the sport organizations, two trends in the content of their outreach programming became evident. The first of these is the prominent use of discipline-focused educational programming. Although the sport organizations do make some use of educational programs (as noted in the discussion of individual organizations), these programs tend to apply team imagery and content across multiple academic disciplines that may have little or nothing to do with the organizations’ core products. In contrast to this, the educational programs offered by the arts organizations are all tightly focused on educating participants not only on a single academic discipline (the arts), but also on the specific artistic discipline that the organizations providing the programming produces. It should be noted that, although both examined sport organizations do offer some educational programming, those programs are not included as a trend (as they are with the arts organizations) because they make up a very small percentage of the total programming offered, indicating that they are not a primary concern of the organizations in determining their programming. In contrast to this, almost all of the outreach programs offered by the arts organizations are educational in nature. The high percentage of education programs and their tight focus on a specific discipline indicate that this is a trend in the programming of the arts organizations.

The second trend in the programming of the arts organizations is the inclusion of programming that is either specifically intended for or that skews towards young adult audiences. The Columbus Museum of Art currently offers two programs, Game Show and The Art of Analysis, which skew towards young adults in terms of their participating
audiences. Opera Columbus is in the final stages of developing (to be initiated during the upcoming 2012-2013 season) a program, Opera Cabaret, which is specifically intended for young adult audiences. Although neither organization offers more than two programs that are intended to this particular age group, these limited offerings still represent a greater number of programs for this demographic than are found being offered by the sport organizations. Given the small number of programs involved, this does not represent as strong a trend as that involving discipline-specific education programming, but its presence with both arts organizations and its absence in the programming of both sport organizations warrants its inclusion.

Beyond the content of the outreach programs being offered by the organizations in both fields, there are two points of comparison that warrant mention, as they may prove to be impediments to any potential future interactions. The first of these draws on the discussion of stakeholder and regime theories presented in the literature review chapter. After examining the four organizations included herein, it seems the there is a divide between the two fields in terms of the dominant applicable theoretical construct. Both fields can have their actions, both as functional business entities and as presenters of outreach programming, explained through the use of stakeholder and regime theories. However, the applications of these theories are not balanced between the two fields. Stakeholder theory, which emphasizes (if not necessarily equally) the importance of all groups and/or individuals who can affect the activities of an entity, seems to be better suited to explaining the actions of the arts organizations, as by their nature they rely on a diverse group of stakeholders to operate. In addition to board members, they are
accountable to patrons, corporate and foundational supporters, and the general public (who have control over public funding via their votes). In contrast to this, regime theory seems to better explain the actions of the sport organizations. The applicability of regime theory for sport organizations becomes particularly apparent when one considers the cooperative efforts required to bring these organizations to Columbus and, in the recent case of the Blue Jackets, keep them here. Because the sport organizations are private corporations, and because the foundations that they maintain are primarily funded by the teams themselves, they rely on a substantially smaller group of stakeholder. As such, stakeholder theory, while applicable, is less so than is regime theory. It is not clear that the differences in organizational theory would necessarily create an impediment for interaction, but the different actors to which each field/organization is accountable and their needs could prove to be an impediment.

The second point of comparison that has the potential to prove an impediment to interactions between the two fields, and one that is tied to the above difference in applicable organizational theory, is the business model embraced by each field. The two arts organizations included in this work are both non-profit organizations. As such, while they do require earned income to operate, it is not their only source of revenue. The reliance on contributed income that is associated with non-profit organizations provides an inducement for these organizations to offer outreach programming, as individual and corporate/foundational donors are, in theory, more likely to donate to organizations that provide the greatest service to the community. Therefore, their viability as organizations relies, at least in part, on providing the services that will compel these donors to
contribute funds. The two sport organizations, in rather stark contrast, are both for-profit ventures. Therefore, they rely entirely on earned income as a source of revenue. This income, earned through ticket sales, licensing, and other activities, is not as heavily dependent on providing service to the community as is the contributed income that is vital to non-profit groups. As such, there is less inherent incentive on the part of these organizations to offer outreach programming than there is for the arts organizations.

Although both sport organizations do offer such programs, these CSR initiatives, as indicated in the literature review chapter, are strictly discretionary. While beneficial, they are not entirely necessary to win support and funding (particularly since the teams themselves provide the majority of the funding to their associated non-profit foundations). This difference in necessity based on the business model embraced by each field. As is the case with organizational theory, as discussed above, it is not clear that this difference will necessarily create an impediment, but it does create the potential for it.

The trends that emerge upon examining the two fields collectively reflect those that become apparent upon examining the two pairs of parallel organizations. Given the above assertion that such content and focuses proved complementary, and therefore provided reasonable opportunities for those organizations to interact and share knowledge, the same conclusion is come to here in relation to the two fields as collective wholes. A potential benefit of coming to the same finding for both the organizational pairings and the fields as wholes is that one has the potential to foment the other. Given the presence of organizations that provide some measure of oversight for the two fields (the Greater Columbus Arts Council and the Greater Columbus Sports Commission),
there is also potential for these organizations to offer support for these interactions, theoretically reducing the commitment of resources from individual organizations and providing an inducement to interact and share knowledge.
Chapter 7: Conclusions

Summary of Findings

Before presenting a set of recommendations based on the content of the two previous chapters, it is necessary to offer a brief recapitulation of the findings from said content. Although these findings are included as part of the data, analysis, and discussion, they are spread over the course of said chapters. In light of this somewhat disjunctive approach to initially conveying the findings of this study, they are included here in a more succinct fashion. These findings, arrived at based on the available data, inform the post-study recommendations that follow.

The first finding, and one that is evident upon examining each of the participant organizations, is that the studied organizations rely on a diverse assortment of approaches to generate the perception of public value. However, these varied approaches to generating public value are often repeated across the different organizations. For example, both sport organizations make prominent use of social marketing efforts as means to generate the perception of public value. Similarly, all four organizations make use of youth audience development as a means for organically generating public value, essentially growing audiences that appreciate and value their presence and product. There are also a number of approaches to generating public value that are only embraced by
individual organizations, but the repetition of certain methods across multiple organizations (and both fields) warrants mention.

The second finding is that there is currently an almost exclusive reliance on qualitative data as a means to measure the generation of public value. In talking with the four individuals charged with overseeing the outreach programs of each organization, each cited strictly qualitative examples when asked about how their organization measured the public value that it creates. In fact, several indicated that they felt quantitative measures of public value (or, at least, of the outputs and outcomes associated with it) failed to accurately reflect the worth of the organization. Interestingly, these sentiments, and the language used to convey them, seem to tie quantitative measures to indications of the inherent value of the organization, whereas qualitative measures reflect value specifically generated by these outreach efforts.

On a related note, this reliance on qualitative measures while rejecting the use of quantitative data also seems to indicate a heavy reliance on the proxy measures for public value discussed in the literature review. Whereas a direct measure of public value for an organization (in a fashion similar to that suggested by Moore and Moore [2005]) would likely rely on the generation and compilation of quantitative data, proxy measures rely much more heavily on qualitative information. Although there are quantitative proxy measures for public value (e.g., donation levels), the majority of these proxies are based on qualitative data. This viewpoint, that there is a stronger reliance on proxy measures than on direct measurement of public value, seems to be supported when one considers the comments of several of the individual interviewed (e.g., Ungerleider in discussing
gratitude from residents in cleaned areas or Turner in discussing the sentiments of local elected officials towards the museum). Given that, on a state level in Ohio (through the Take pArt! program), these proxy measures seem to have become a, if not the, standard measure of public value, this would seemingly call into question the use of quantitative measure of public value and their validity and utility in comparison to qualitative measures.

The third finding is that, with the exception of the Crew, there is little effort on the part of these organizations to specifically target minorities in the Columbus community with these outreach programs. The Crew are the exception in this case as they have a staff member and a full slate of programs devoted to serving the local Hispanic community and engaging them as fans and consumers. Amongst the other organizations, however, the only indication of an effort specifically targeted towards a minority population is the museum having a booth at Columbus’ annual Festival Latino to hand out free passes. In light of several of these organizations indicating, either through interview or in written materials, that audience development was a primary goal of these outreach programs, it seems strange that such a substantial portion of the population would be overlooked in developing and implementing new outreach efforts. This is not to say that these groups are necessarily underserved, as they do have access to the outreach programs that are available to the public as a whole. However, the programs do not speak to the distinct cultures of these groups.

The fourth finding, and perhaps the most germane to the questions guiding this work, is that the analysis of the outreach programs and their content and scope seems to
indicate that opportunities do exist for these organizations to interact and learn from each other. Each organization maintains its own slate of programs that are primarily built on organizational core capacities and that serve the needs of the specific organization. However, as noted in the previous chapter, there are issues (one hesitates to use the word “weaknesses”) within the programs offered in each field that could be addressed through interaction and information dissemination with the other field. For instance, the outreach efforts of the arts organizations are, without exception, driven by a narrow interpretation of their missions that appears to insist on all programming being directly tied to core product (that is to say that all of Opera Columbus’ programs directly involve opera and CMA’s directly involve visual art). While this is not inherently bad, it also limits the ability of these organizations to engage in social marketing efforts that, while still relating to organizational mission, might not directly involve the core products. In contrast to the arts organizations, the sport organizations both have a number of programs that further their missions while making peripheral use of their core products. Given this, it is reasonable to think that those charged with developing and overseeing such programs for the sport organizations might be able to work with those in similar capacities at the arts organizations so that such programs might be developed there.

Similarly, the education programs offered by the sport organizations tend to be broad, multi-disciplinary programs that use team content and imagery in delivering a curriculum while increasing brand awareness and exposure. Whereas the social marketing efforts of these organizations make effective use of moving away from core products and competencies, these educational programs drift from these strengths in a
fashion that does not seem to necessarily enhance the perceived value of each
organizations, particularly in light of the fact that physical education (the academic
discipline most closely aligned with both organizations) would deliver the same audience
while allowing them to maintain a focus on what they do best. While this is an issue with
the sport organizations, the education programs offered by the arts organizations are very
discipline-specific, drawing on organizational strengths to bolster student experience in
that area rather than attempting to inject the organizations into fields not tied to what they
do. Just as sport organizations might be able to share experience with arts organizations
in developing programs that adhere to the mission while moving away from core
products, arts organizations could likely aid sport organizations in developing educations
programs that focus on one discipline while still conveying the full measure of benefit
that the organization and its core product can offer.

Recommendations Based on Findings

Having conducted an analysis of the outreach programs offered by the
organizations being studied, and having above summarized the findings derived from said
analysis, a series of recommendations has been formulated that would, if enacted, aid
these organizations in addressing the findings. These recommendations are presented
here in two sections: recommendations by field and inter-field recommendations. As the
names indicate, the first section addresses recommendations for both of the examined
fields while the second section addresses recommendations that would impact the
relationships and interactions between the two fields. It should be noted that these
recommendations are based purely on the data presented and analyzed here. They do not take into account additional constraints, contexts, or impediments to their implementation that may arise when taking additional factors into account.

**Sport Recommendations**

The recommendation for the sport organizations is to re-evaluate and refocus their educational programs so that, rather than taking a broad approach across multiple academic disciplines, they are centered on a particular discipline. In examining the educational programs offered by the sport organizations, it became apparent that, while this slate of programs may well increase the exposure of local students to the teams’ brands, the programs do not necessarily enhance the caliber of the students’ educational experience. For example, the Blue Jackets at School program offers lessons and activities that feature either current players or the team’s mascot in order to make learning more fun, but there does not appear to be any indication that the program makes the lessons more effective than a similar alternative that does not include team content and imagery. Similarly, the GOALS for KIDS program offered by the Crew uses player and mascot imagery to create a curriculum that operates across multiple disciplines and overlaps with the purpose of the school assembly program. As with the Blue Jackets, there does not appear to be indication that the program is more effective than an alternative curriculum that does not employ team content.
While these programs undoubtedly are beneficial to the teams as means to develop new audiences through exposure to team content and the use of team-related prizes as incentives, the amount of good that they do in enhancing students’ education is debatable. However, given that the core product of these organizations is sport, it seems as though the focusing of their efforts on one academic discipline, physical education, has the opportunity to yield benefits. Even in light of the scaling back of academic programs and extracurricular activities in light of recent financial hardships, schools are required by the state of Ohio to offer physical education to all students as part of the state’s core curriculum (Ohio Department of Education, 2012). The connection between the academic discipline and the organizations’ core product represents a more logical connection than would exist with other such disciplines, and the requirement that all students partake in physical education would deliver the same participant base. This approach would offer the same opportunity to the teams without representing a case of mission drift.

On a similar note, the recent scaling back of extracurricular athletics at many schools in the Columbus area due to failed levy votes seems to present an additional opportunity for the sport organizations to make a distinctly positive impact. Through equipment donation and partnerships with sport-related booster organizations, the teams could ease the burden that the pay-to-play model adopted by several local schools has placed on those who wish to participate. As with focusing educational efforts on physical education, this approach would allow the sport organizations to make a positive impact without drifting from their missions and core competencies.
Arts Recommendation

The recommendation for the arts organizations is to expand the scope of their outreach programs beyond those which directly involve the core purpose of the organization. In examining the programs offered by the arts organizations, it became apparent that, while this slate of programs is incredibly diverse and serves a substantial number of the different communities within Columbus, every one of the programs was tied to the core purpose (that is to say, the art form) of the organization presenting it. For example, all of the programs offered by Opera Columbus are directly related to opera, be it through education, performance, or exposure. Similarly, the programs offered by the Columbus Museum of Art relate to experiencing or creating visual art.

While these programs seem to serve the organizations well and contribute to their status as 501(c)(3) organizations (representing educational activities, an exempt purpose under the tax code), they also limit the ability of the organizations to impact the community beyond those who choose to or must (as students) participate (Internal Revenue Service, 2012). Given the importance of public support for these organizations (which, unlike their sport counterparts, do not have a for-profit entity to fund their efforts), it seems as though the failure to address the portions of the population that are not currently patrons could ultimately prove detrimental to public value and support. To this end, it seems as though embracing social marketing (indirectly inducing consumption through community enhancement) would best allow the arts organizations to appeal to those who choose not to be patrons (Andreasen, 1994).
The implementation of social marketing efforts, given the extent to which the arts organizations already involve themselves with the community, would likely require either partnerships with other organizations (wherein the arts organizations leverage their resources for the effort rather than providing an end-user service) or charitable acts through other organizations or programs that to not directly draw on the core purposes of the organizations. The first of these approaches, involving the arts organizations partnering with other organizations and utilizing their resources towards a communal effort, could take on several forms. One example, for instance, could be a partnership between the Columbus Museum of Art and Habitat for Humanity in which the museum either donates or sponsors the creation of art to be included in the newly built homes. The second approach, involving the arts organizations making charitable acts unrelated to the core purposes of the organizations, could also take on several forms. In an example related to the previous one, the staff of the Columbus Museum of Art could collectively volunteer with Habitat for Humanity to build a house. In both cases, the museum is involved with another organization, but the second approach in no way involves art. Both approaches allow for the arts organizations to enhance the community of which they are part beyond those who choose to consume their product, thereby potentially bolstering the public support that they enjoy.
Inter-Field Recommendations

This study has yielded two recommendations that apply to both sport and the arts. The first of these recommendations, in light of the analysis provided in the previous chapter, is to create avenues to work together as a means to share resources, be they financial, physical, or human. These interactions may be on an organization-to-organization level (as presented in the previous analysis) or on a field-to-field level, facilitated by the organizations (GCAC and GCSC) that serve to oversee both fields in Columbus. In either case, the analysis of the data shows that opportunities do exist for such interactions, and that they have the potential to allow these organizations to better serve the Columbus community while reducing the required resource commitment from each individual organization.

The second recommendation that applies to both fields, and one potentially related to the first, is to develop a firm system to measure public value. Although, as discussed in the previous chapter, each of the organizations makes use of proxy measures to determine the public value ascribed to them (or, at least, to demonstrate that such value exists), there is presently a lack of direct measures to capture the perceived value of each organization. While it is possible for each individual organization to develop their own measurement system and instrument, a measurement system and instrument that would be employed by each of the organizations would likely prove to be a more efficient approach to take. This approach would allow each organization to maintain their unique set of proxy measures while having access to a measure that would be compared directly
to the measures of other organizations. Such a uniform measure would have applications not only for the organizations themselves (in determining if their current programming is effective or needs to be reassessed), but also for the city (as a tool for guiding funding decisions or policy efforts). Additionally, given the broad application potential for such a uniform measure, the organizations could likely appeal to either the city of Columbus or the Columbus Foundation for aid in developing such a uniform set-up, thereby allowing them to reap its benefit while reducing the necessary contribution of resources for its development.

Future Works

This work has been focused on the outreach programs offered by six specific organizations located in Columbus, Ohio, their roles in the development of public value, and the feasibility of these organizations collaborating in the administration of these programs. Although completing a work with this focus has proven itself to be a substantial academic challenge, the process of conducting the study has raised a number of ideas for future works that have the potential to either continue this current strain of research or expand upon the ideas that it touches upon.

Continuations of Current Research

As noted above, this study has been conducted within a strict set of parameters (namely, a set location and a limited number of participating organizations). However,
these parameters establish a starting point for this particular strain of research, not a final destination. To that end, by altering these constraints on what is being examined, the same research and methods can be applied to other circumstances. For instance, removing the constraint on location would allow for this research to be conducted in other cities, be they elsewhere in Ohio or in other states across the country. Although most cities larger than Columbus (currently the 15th most populous city in the nation) have sport and arts set-ups that are large enough and entrenched to the point that this research would prove less fruitful than it has in the context of Columbus, many cities of similar size (Austin, Charlotte, and El Paso, for instance) lack such sizable or well-established sport and/or arts constructs, making them opportune venues for this research.

Another opportunity to continue the current research does not require changing the city being examined, but rather expanding the list of organizations being studied. As has been noted throughout this work, the four organizations involved were selected through purposive sampling and, while representative of their respective fields, do not fully represent the professional sport and arts fields in Columbus. In the case of sport, the field is continually growing, most recently with the addition of Central Ohio’s Major League Lacrosse franchise, the Ohio Machine (excluded from this study due to an inadequate body of material to examine). In the case of the arts, a cursory examination of the membership of the Columbus Arts Marketing Association (which is itself not exhaustive, but ably supports the point at hand) reveals several dozen professional arts organizations in Columbus and the immediately surrounding areas. As such, the study
could be expanded to include both fields in their entirety within Columbus and the surrounding areas.

*Expanding on Ideas*

Whereas the previous section addresses ways in which future works could be based on this research by altering the parameters established for this specific study, this section instead examines how some of the ideas that underpin this work could be further explored in new contexts. Additionally, ideas for continuing similar research in tangential directions will be briefly discussed.

The concept of community outreach programs as a means to establish and enhance civic identity was initially a part of this research project. By examining not just how outreach programs provide opportunities for sport and the arts to work together, but how the resulting interactions could impact city branding, the intent had been to explore the potential strategic use of outreach programs in establishing a cohesive and sellable local identity and culture. This approach, using sport and the arts as “pilot” fields, would have ultimately looked at outreach as a tool to bring together multiple disparate fields across the city into one united group, providing Columbus with an identity as recognizable as that of New York, Memphis, or Austin, rather than its current state in which it lacks an identity to latch onto. This train of thought was left out of this particular study due to resource constraints and it drawing focus away from the use of outreach programs to generate public value. However, it remains a viable option for future works.
Any study that involves either sport or the arts (or any number of other fields) in the context of Columbus would be remiss if it were to omit the impact of local colleges and universities (particularly Ohio State). While this study explicitly focuses on the outreach efforts of professional sport and arts organizations, the prominence and resources associated with these institutions of higher learning would almost certainly result in them making a substantial impact on any study that considered them. This is especially true when considering the Ohio State’s role in Columbus, as it is the city’s largest employer and, arguably, its primary economic engine. However, as a university, it is also bound by rules and regulations (for instance, NCAA rules on the activities of student-athletes) that do not apply to other organizations in the city.

This study, somewhat arbitrarily, focused on the outreach programs offered within the fields of sport and the arts. However, Columbus, as with most other similar cities, consists of any number of different fields that would make suitable examples for study. As such, a future work could conceivably apply the underlying concepts and research methods that inform this work to other fields as a means to examine whether or not they represent opportunities similar to those found with sport and the arts. Similarly, the existing work could be maintained and these new fields could be added onto them, allowing for a broad comparison between several fields rather than continuing to make one-on-one comparisons. This sort of broad comparison has the potential to factor into the aforementioned examination of civic identity, as it could provide the basis for such a substantial construct.
It has been noted previously in this work that all of the sport organizations being examined are run as for-profit ventures, whereas all of the arts organizations operate as non-profits. Just as these four organizations do not represent their respective fields in their entirety, so do these business models fail to represent the scope of operating models that could be examined. Although non-profit professional sport organizations are rare (in the United States’ “Big Four” leagues, only one team, the Green Bay Packers, operates as a non-profit), non-profit and community amateur leagues are abundant. Similarly, one is not hard pressed to find examples of for-profit or community arts organizations. As such, the impact of the business operating model utilized by organizations being examined could make for an interesting future work, particularly if one is able to find suitable examples of all of these business models existing in the same locale.

A final potential continuation of this line of research to consider is one that includes a temporal element. The examination included in this work is very much a snapshot of the outreach programs offered at present by these four organizations. However, as discussed in the literature review, the values that influence perceived public value, and the people that possess and shape them, are not static. Similarly, the organizations offering the programs are not static, constantly changing their offerings to reflect the values and needs of those that they are serving. This is especially true in organizations that are in states of exceptional flux, such as Opera Columbus. As such, an examination of these organizations over a prolonged amount of time (ideally, several years), in conjunction with an examination of changes in the communities that they are
serving over the same period of time, would likely prove a fruitful continuation of this current work.

These ideas, in conjunction with the potential future works discussed above, provide a robust set of opportunities to explore the use of community outreach programs in the future. There are likely additional opportunities to continue and expand this research track that have not been discussed here, but this work is written with trust that they will, as the above ideas have come from working on this current project, come while future work is being done.

Conclusion and Contribution

This work, as has been noted previously, was constructed through the use of grounded theory, eschewing existing theoretical concepts that might have created an expected result in favor of examining the cases and letting the data form as they may. As the work progressed, it became evident that, although there was not an underlying theoretical construct guiding the work, there was a functional assumption that community outreach programs served as the primary generators of public value for the organizations being studied. After thoroughly examining the four included organizations, it seems as though this assumption is incorrect. The evidence included herein seems to indicate that, while these outreach programs may serve to create public value, it is the core functions of the organizations that are the primary generators of public value. The accounts of those who oversee the outreach programs, as well as the information about the programs
themselves, all point towards people valuing the organizations for offering the product that they offer, and the outreach programs serve as an extension, rather than a replacement, for that. As such, the assumption used to form this work is invalid.

Beyond dispelling the notion that community outreach programs serve as primary generators of public value, this work does make several other contributions. First amongst these is demonstrating that there is not only the opportunity, but reasonable cause, for arts and sport organizations to interact and work with/learn from each other. The strengths of the two fields are complementary, and at a time when resources are scarce, the chance to work with each other to reduce resource consumption and better serve their audiences is invaluable. Another contribution of this work is to make a case for a unified concept of and instrument for measuring public value. One of the challenges in conducting this study was that each organization had a somewhat different interpretation of what public value meant and method for tracking it. A unified concept and measuring instrument would allow for an apples-to-apples comparison for public policy purposes and for organizational evaluation. The final contribution of this work is to further the body of literature that ties sport and the arts together. Although these fields are often put together for policy purposes (often under the moniker of “recreation”), there is still relatively little literature that addresses both fields directly. Although it remains to be seen to what extent this work will impact the existing discourse of the two fields, it still marks a contribution to their literature bases.
Final Thoughts

This study, although it is time and location specific, has served to spark an interest, in both myself and the organizations that agreed to participate in it, in continuing this work. This continuation may prove to be in the same location but with different organizations, or perhaps with the addition of a temporal element, or it may involve a new locale. However, given the current state of the economy and the constant threats to public funding that would impact these organizations, time may be of the essence in continuing this line of work. To this end, in addition to my own aforementioned intentions to continue this research, this work can serve as a guide to other researchers who would like to apply similar methods to study these questions in their own areas.

This study was undertaken with a distinct question in mind, and a set of sub-questions to deepen the answer thereto, but no firm thesis regarding what the work would show. However, looking back on the collected data and the findings derived from it, it becomes apparent that there was a pre-conceived notion that shaped the study. The notion that outreach programs serve as the primary generators of public value for these organizations seems to be inherently flawed. After talking with those charged with overseeing the development, implementation, and administration of these programs, it became evident that, though these individuals understood that there was some benefit to be gained from the programs’ existence, they were there to enhance the community rather than establish a sense of value on the part of the populace. Each organization showed an assurance in the inherent appreciation of their presence in Columbus, seemingly
indicating that, while positive, working to establish public value (particularly amongst non-patrons) was not essential. This raises serious questions about the nature and purpose of public value and its relation to reliance on public support that warrant further examination.²⁵

While I believe wholeheartedly that both fields have a strong future in Columbus, and that the outreach programs that each organization currently has in place will play important roles in developing the audiences and public support necessary to ensure this future, challenges currently facing both fields will not make achieving this success easy. In concluding this work, I can only hope that this study and those that it leads to help to pave the road to strong public value for these organizations and others in their fields.

²⁵ While each of these organizations receives some form of public support, through tax incentives or grants, they are not reliant on this support as the primary source of their funding. This provides some measure of contrast to the existing literature on public value, particularly within the arts, which places greater emphasis on entities (the NEA, SAAs) that are reliant on public support for their funding.
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Research Protocol

Objectives

The purpose of this research is two-fold: to examine how professional sport and arts organizations in Columbus utilize their outreach programs to generate public value and the feasibility of these organizations working together to better serve the community with their programs. Through an extensive literature review, I will situate these programs and the communities they serve in the context of both relevant theories and the idea of “the public.” Additionally, I seek to determine the role these organizations and programs serve in establishing community identity. This will be accomplished through comparative case studies of four organizations in Columbus conducted through interviews and document analysis.

Background and Rationale

This research seeks to bridge a gap in literature regarding the interactions of sport and arts organizations and their use of outreach programs as a means to generate public value.
Through document analysis, an analysis of the programs offered by a sample of professional sport and arts organizations in Columbus will be conducted, highlighting avenues for interaction between the two fields. Although several scholars have sought to apply the concept of public value to the individual fields, or to discuss interactions between the two fields (Anderson, 2006; Austin, 2003; Bunting, 2007; Ferrand & McCarthy, 2009; Garnham, 1996; Kennett-Hensel, Lacey, & Biggers, 2011; Seaman, 2003), none have discussed the fields in relation to each other through this particular lens.

Additionally, the research seeks to understand the complexity of the theoretical frameworks within which such an examination must take place. Both fields make use of stakeholder and regime theories to aid in understanding how such organizations and programs function within the context of a city (Andriof & Waddock, 2002; Argandoña, 1998; Christopher, Payne, & Ballantyne, 2004; Dowding, Dunleavy, King, Margetts, & Rydin, 1999; Freeman, 1984; Gregg, 2001; Harrison & Freeman, 1999; Mossberger & Stoker, 2001). Beyond just theoretical frameworks, the research seeks to understand the complex role of marketing as it is utilized by each field, how it is used to conceptualize outreach programs, and the role of public value therein (Austin, 2003; Christopher, Payne, & Ballantyne, 2004; Dawson, 1980; Enis & Mokwa, 1979; Ferrand & McCarthy, 2009; Grönroos, 2000). This research aims to create a more comprehensive approach to discussing these fields that intrinsically ties the underlying frameworks to the broader topic being discussed.
Through comparative case studies of the outreach programs offered by professional sport and arts organizations in Columbus, the research will highlight the similarities and differences between specific cases. As each organization is unique, each offers a distinct slate of outreach programs and possesses an individual conceptualization of public value. To understand the feasibility of these organizations working together, it is most effective to understand the individual circumstances surrounding each organization. Areas for exploration include ways the case study organizations develop and implement new outreach programs and how the success of outreach programs is measured.

This research seeks to build on available literature by creating a comprehensive resource, adding to and synthesizing existing knowledge. By looking at organizational and identity development as manifested by organizations within a specific locale, this research provides a distinct perspective on the issue. This multidimensional study of how these organizations utilize their outreach programs to generate public value and how they may work together will assist professionals at these organizations interested in the possibilities and impacts of collaborating with the other organizations. By highlighting the various implications, the research can serve as a discussion piece for organizational leadership as they examine their current outreach programs and work towards more unified efforts to better serve the community.
Research Design

The research will use both qualitative and quantitative (derived from the qualitative) data and methods. I will incorporate document analysis to track the slate of programs offered by each organization over the years being examined. This short history will then provide a baseline as I use comparative case studies to examine the use of outreach programs by each organization and the feasibility of them working together.

Sample

While many of my data sources are public information found via the internet or public documents published/provided by the participating institutions, I will also be conducting interviews to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how community outreach programs are used for organizational and identity development. The research participants will speak for the organizations that they work for, which will be the four case study sites: the Columbus Blue Jackets, Columbus Crew, Columbus Museum of Art, and Opera Columbus. These four organizations were chosen via purposive sampling to represent a cross-section of each field while maintaining parallels to each other. My goal is to conduct semi-structured interviews with the staff member from each organization charged with overseeing the outreach programs.
Detailed Study Procedures

I will use a data collection form for the semi-structured interviews as it provides space for remarks unique to each interview, as well as a series of scripted questions (attached).

Each interview will be conducted in person, via phone, or through email, depending on the participants’ availability. For transcription and validation purposes, each interview will be recorded and converted to MP3 format.

The data collected from each participant will be collected through a series of two interviews. These interviews will be conducted via the method of the interviewee’s choosing (in person/telephone/email), and should last a combined 60-90 minutes. The first interview, lasting approximately 30-40 minutes, will focus on collecting information pertaining to each organization’s outreach program, how they are designed and implemented, and organizational conceptions of public value. The second interview, lasting approximately 15-25 minutes, will focus on clarifying the information collected during the first interview and collecting new information regarding differences between written descriptions and the actual execution of outreach programs.
Internal Validity

The researcher seeks validity in the data collection process through triangulation of sources, including comparative case study sites and extensive literature review. By recording and transcribing the interviews, the researcher will increase the ability of the research participants to confirm the accuracy of their representation in their interview.

Data Analysis

Several modes of analysis will be used as a way to enhance internal validity. First, the establishment of a short historical baseline will provide a framework to understand changes that have been made to the programs being offered over roughly the past decade. By understanding the factors involved in adding a new or dropping an old program, one can begin to analyze the current offerings and the circumstances that lead to their creation.

Within-case analysis will also be employed as the researcher studies each organization’s written documentation and interview responses as a separate case to identify unique patterns within the data for that single organization. A detailed case study write-up will follow. The researcher will then use cross-case analysis to examine multiple cases, categorizing evident similarities and differences. As patterns emerge, certain evidence may stand out as being in conflict with the patterns. The researcher will conduct focused
follow-up interviews to verify or correct the preliminary data in order to connect the evidence to the findings and to highlight their relationship in answer to the research questions.
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Interview #1 Instrument
Case Study (organization):
Date:
Method of Conduct:
Interviewee Details:

Consent? _____ Audio recording? _____ OK to quote? _____ Thank you? _____

Description of Interview Content:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Q&amp;A</th>
<th>Notes to Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could you please briefly describe and explain your organization’s outreach programs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the considerations and processes for developing and implementing new outreach programs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a mission or philosophy that guides your organization’s outreach programs? If so, could you please explain it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why does your organization conduct these programs? What are the goals of these programs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do you see these programs impacting the community? How do you see these programs impacting the organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does your organization conceptualize its public value? How is this public value measured?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding</td>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
<td>Notes to Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Do you wish to add to, retract, or in any way amend the information you shared in our previous interview?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Are there any details regarding the administration or nature of your organization’s outreach programs that would augment the written accounts and descriptions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Are there any ways in which the actual administration of these programs differs from their stated mode of function in the written descriptions? If so, what caused this difference?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Interview Content:
Dear <POTENTIAL INTERVIEWEE>:

You are invited to participate in a research project as part of a doctoral dissertation titled *Community Outreach in Sport and Arts Organizations as a Means for Organizational and Identity Development*, conducted by Jerome Socolof from The Ohio State University’s Art Education program. The purpose of this study is to understand how sport and arts organizations utilize community outreach to generate public value and how these programs might be used to foster organizational interaction and community identity within the city of Columbus.

You were selected to participate in this study because of your experience and expertise in administering outreach programs at <ORGANIZATION>, which serves a vital role in the Columbus community. If you decide to participate in this research project, you will be asked to provide relevant organizational materials and participate in a short series of three semi-structured interviews during the spring months of 2012. Interviews will take place at your convenience, via a method of your choosing (in person/telephone/email), and lasting an estimated combined time of 60-90 minutes. If you wish, interview questions will be provided beforehand for your consideration. In addition to taking handwritten notes, with your permission, I will use an audio recorder for transcription and validation purposes. You may also be asked to provide follow-up information through phone calls or email.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (315) 868-9067 or socolo1@buckeyemail.osu.edu, or Dr. Candace J. Stout at stout.127@osu.edu. For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at (800) 678-6251.

Thank you in advance for your interest and consideration. I will contact you shortly to speak about your potential involvement in this study.

Sincerely,

Jerome Socolof
You are invited to participate in a research project as part of a doctoral dissertation titled *Community Outreach in Sport and Arts Organizations as a Means for Organizational and Identity Development*, conducted by Jerome Socolof from The Ohio State University’s Art Education program. The purpose of this study is to understand how sport and arts organizations utilize community outreach to generate public value and how these programs might be used to foster organizational interaction and community identity within the city of Columbus.

You were selected to participate in this study because of your experience and expertise in administering outreach programs at <ORGANIZATION>, which serves a vital role in the Columbus community. If you decide to participate in this research project, you will be asked to provide relevant organizational materials and participate in a short series of three semi-structured interviews during the spring months of 2012. Interviews will take place at your convenience, via a method of your choosing (in person/telephone/email), and lasting an estimated combined time of 60-90 minutes. If you wish, interview questions will be provided beforehand for your consideration. In addition to taking handwritten notes, with your permission, I will use an audio recorder for transcription and validation purposes. You may also be asked to provide follow-up information through phone calls or email. The risks to the participants of this study are minimal. The environment and circumstances of the interviews in which you will be engaged will not be extraordinary when compared with the course of your everyday professional work.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study will be carefully and securely maintained. Your consent to participate in this interview, as indicated below, demonstrates your willingness to have your name used in any resulting documents and publications. Your participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

I believe the results of this research project will be of great value to the community of sport and arts professionals. However, I cannot guarantee that you personally will receive any benefits from this research.
If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (315) 868-9067 or socolof.1@buckeyemail.osu.edu, or Dr. Candace J. Stout at stout.127@osu.edu. For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at (800) 678-6251.

Please read and initial each of the following statements to indicate your consent:

_____ I consent to the use of audio recording and note taking during my interview.
_____ I consent to my identification as a participant in this study.
_____ I consent to the potential use of quotations from the interview.
_____ I consent to the use of information I provide regarding the organizations with which I am associated.
_____ I wish to have the opportunity to review and possibly revise my comments and the information that I provide prior to those data appearing in the final revision of any publications that may result from this study.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. You have been given a copy of this letter to keep.

Print Name: ________________________________________________________________

Signature: ________________________________________________________________

Date: ______________________

Thank you for your interest and participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Jerome Socolof
Appendix B: Program Information
Columbus Crew

Hispanic Community

Copa Victoria

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Bring together teams from various Hispanic soccer leagues to increase competition, foster a sense of camaraderie, and strengthen ties to the Crew

Description: Copa Victoria, a 24-team tournament, was the first and most visible part of the Crew’s Hispanic outreach. The tournament was founded in 2003 and brings in teams from five Hispanic soccer leagues from around Central Ohio. Beginning with the 2009 tournament, a women’s bracket (4 teams) was added to the tournament. All preliminary matches are played at the Crew’s training facility and are free to the public, and the finals of the respective brackets are played on the pitch at Crew Stadium after a home game. Also beginning in 2009, a draw party was added. Previously, the draw had only been open to the coaches and captains of involved teams. The draw party is open to all members of involved teams, as well as friends and family. A complimentary dinner is served and a DJ provides music for dancing to increase the social aspect of the event.

Asociacion Internasional de Futbol Crew (AIFC)

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Create an association of Latino fans around the state with a focus on the Crew

Description: The AIFC is an association created for Latino soccer fans in Ohio that lets them keep tabs on leagues, pick-up games, try outs, Crew information, and other items of interest via the AIFC website/blog. The social atmosphere of the AIFC is augmented by membership cards (complete with photo and barcode) that entitle holders to discounts through sponsors of the AIFC, companies of particular interest to Latino customers who are advertised on both the website and on the back of the membership cards.

Away Game Radio Remotes

Target Age: General

Intent: Provide a social occasion for Hispanic fans to watch/listen to away games
Description: Rather than broadcast away games from a studio, they are now broadcast from Garcia International (a restaurant on High Street in Columbus). The restaurant subsidizes the cost of broadcasting from their location ($200 per game) and invites all Hispanic fans to come to the restaurant and watch/listen to the games. This serves a dual purpose by both creating a more authentic atmosphere than the austere nature of a studio and creating a social occasion for fans that are unable to travel to the game.

Text Message Program

Target Age: General

Intent: Create a way to keep fans aware of Crew happenings while establishing a usable database of fan contact information

Description: The Crew have partnered with TXTWire (a service that allows mass text messaging) to create a program where fans subscribe by texting the word “futbol” to a certain number and thereafter they receive updates about the team in Spanish. The fan information also provides the Crew with a usable database of contact information. Those who are registered with the text message program are also eligible for raffles held by the team at Crew home games, games of local Hispanic leagues, and other occasions of Hispanic interest.

TRASH Chivas USA

Target Age: General

Intent: Create tension leading up to matches between the Crew and Chivas USA while creating charitable donations

Description: In an effort to create tension between fans of the Crew and Chivas USA (a sister organization to the Chivas team based in Guadalajara, based in Los Angeles and with a large Hispanic following), three local Hispanic markets jointly subsidize several hundred tickets which are sold at a discount to anyone who brings any Chivas (USA or Guadalajara) item to throw in the “garbage.” All items “thrown out” are then donated to the Chivas USA foundation, which helps needy children in both Los Angeles and Mexico.

Inner City/Disadvantaged/Special Needs

Soccer Field Development

Target Age: Youth
Intent: To create fields in the community suitable for both recreational and league use

Description: As part of the Crew Soccer Foundation’s efforts to make soccer available to disadvantaged youth, this endeavor helps to make existing fields usable for both recreational and league use. This includes such acts as keeping fields sodden, mowed, and covered in proper field markings.

Referee Scholarship

Target Age: Late Youth

Intent: Assist youths in completing referee training and provide them with necessary equipment

Description: This program, created in 2008, assists youths who have the desire but not the means to obtain referee training, certification, and equipment. In addition to providing disadvantaged youths with a marketable skill and source of income, this program also helps to provide qualified referees for the youth leagues that the Crew work with.

ColumbusReads HOSTS Program

Target Age: Early Youth

Intent: Provide at-risk kindergartners with reading tutoring over the course of a school year

Description: A part of the Help One Students to Succeed (HOSTS) program, ColumbusReads connects Crew staff members with kindergartners at Windsor Alternative Elementary School. Each participating tutor volunteers one hour per week over the course of a school year, giving two 30 minute tutoring sessions to students.

Easter Seals and Dick’s Sporting Goods “Shop with a Player”

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Give youth with special needs a unique experience with players

Description: Through a partnership with both Easter Seals and Dick’s Sporting Goods, youths with special needs are given the opportunity to go shopping at a Dick’s store with Crew players, Crew Cat, and members of the Crewzer Dance Team. In addition to giving these youths the opportunity to meet Crew personnel, the donation of $100 gift cards from Dick’s allows youths whose families are financially constricted by their medical expenses to do some recreational spending.
Near East Inner-City Youth Soccer Program/Kids Inner-City Developmental Soccer Program

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Help to recruit players and coaches, as well as help supply needed equipment

Description: Since 2007, the Crew have worked in conjunction with these two youth soccer programs, helping to recruit players and qualified coaches, as well as provide equipment needed to play the game. The Crew also donate tickets through their Kicks for Kids program and donates the time of both players and Crew Cat to league games and practices.

U.S. Soccer Foundation Passback Program

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Collect donations of new and used soccer equipment to distribute to disadvantaged local youth

Description: For the past seven years, the Crew have designated a game each year at which fans can donate new or gently used youth soccer equipment. Each year, a different youth program is named the beneficiary of the program and receives all donated items.

Habitat for Humanity

Target Age: General

Intent: Provide volunteer labor to build houses for the disadvantaged in Columbus

Description: In an effort initially headed by Jason Garey, a former Crew player and native Louisianan who witnesses the destruction caused by Hurricane Katrina, both players and staff members donate their time to help build homes in the city of Columbus. In the five years that the partnership has existed, the players and staff have helped build more than a house per year.

St. Stephen’s House Holiday Drive

Target Age: General

Intent: Collect non-perishable food items to be distributed to the needy during the holiday season
Description: For the past seven years, Crew employees have collected canned food items to donate to the St. Stephen’s House annual drive. St. Stephen’s House is a non-profit center, serving the Linden neighborhood of Columbus, that includes a food pantry where all donations are given and through which they are distributed to those in need.

Youth

GOALS for KIDS

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Promote personal wellness, community service, leadership, character-building, and scholarship amongst Columbus-area youths

Description: This program, inaugurated in 2008, brings a life skills curriculum to youths in and around Columbus. The curriculum is conveyed through a guidebook given to all participants that heavily employs Crew Cat and other team imagery while encouraging youth through quizzes, games, and a bookmark design contest. The curriculum has been delivered through local schools, community centers, and youth soccer programs.

School Assembly Program

Target Age: Early Youth

Intent: Introduce both the game of soccer and the GOALS for KIDS curriculum to elementary students

Description: Started in 2006, the school assembly program has allowed Crew players and staff members to interact with over 10,000 public elementary students in the Columbus area. At each assembly, Crew players treat children to soccer demonstrations and then give them the opportunity to practice what they have learned. The assemblies also serve as an introduction point for the GOALS for KIDS curriculum, with Crew personnel emphasizing the importance of leadership, teamwork, literacy, and staying in school.

Nationwide Children’s Hospital Visits

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Bring joy to children hospitalized with severe illness or injury

Description: For the last seven years, Crew players and staff members have visited children at Nationwide Children’s Hospital every month during the Major League Soccer
season. In addition to spending time with the children, the Crew personnel also give gifts such as signed cards, soccer balls, game tickets, and t-shirts.

Kicks for Kids

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Donate tickets to a variety of children’s organizations, allowing children to experience live professional soccer

Description: Kicks for Kids is a program that allows individuals and companies to donate money, which in turn buys tickets to be distributed to Columbus area youths. The organizations that receive the ticket donations range from schools to community centers to youth soccer leagues. The program aims to make sure that deserving youths have the opportunity to experience a live professional soccer match.

General

Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation (JDRF)

Target Age: General

Intent: Help in raising funds for the JDRF

Description: The Crew have partnered with the Mid-Ohio chapter of the JDRF to help in raising research funds for juvenile diabetes. Through their annual Soccer Aid campaign, a month-long online auction of autographed jerseys, the Crew have managed to raise over $30,000 for juvenile diabetes research. Winning bidders in the auction are invited to participate in a mini-game at Crew Stadium and are recognized on-field before a home game.

Blood/Bone Marrow Drives

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Use the Crew brand as incentive to increase donations in blood and bone marrow drives

Description: Since 2007, the Crew have partnered with the American Red Cross and local hospitals to provide incentives for donors. The Crew regularly donate free tickets to the organizations hosting the drives to distribute to donors as a token of thanks.

Keep Columbus Beautiful (KCB)
Target Age: General

Intent: Partner with KCB to provide cleanup services at public parks around Columbus

Description: The Crew have partnered with KCB since 2003, with both players and staff members donating their time to clean up public recreation spaces in the city. For instance, they worked to clean Driving Park Recreation Center following a wind storm that had caused substantial damage to the facility.

Columbus Crew Heroes Program

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Recognize individuals who have made significant and lasting contributions to the community

Description: The Heroes program is a part of the Crew’s ongoing commitment to enhancing the quality of life in Central Ohio. To this end, they accept nominations of “heroes” from the community to be recognized on-field at a home game. The heroes can be anybody who has made significant contributions to the community, thereby working to enhance the quality of life in and around Columbus. In addition to being recognized on-field, selected individuals are given four tickets to the game at which they will be recognized.
Opera Columbus

Youth

Opera on the Go!

Target Age: Early Youth

Intent: Introduce young students to opera through full performances of children’s opera or abridged performances of regular operas

Description: this program brings profession singers into schools to perform either operas based on children’s fairy talks or abridged versions of operas that are suitable for children. The profession singers perform the principal roles, and a certain number of selected students get to participate by singing in the chorus. The program also includes an hour-long student workshop on the day of the performance.

Opera Residency Program

Target Age: Early Youth

Intent: Integrate young students into the opera production process over an extended period of time

Description: The Opera Residency program offers students the opportunity to work with opera professionals over several weeks to help put on a production. The students prepare a specific opera each year and work with professionals and each other in aspects of production including performing, design, stage managing, and marketing. The culmination of the program is a performance that features both professionals and students.

General

Improv Opera

Target Age: General

Intent: Introduce students to operatic voices and terminology, as well as involve them in the creation of a unique work
Description: This program brings four singers and a pianist to local school. The singers begin each session by explaining to students the different types of operatic voices and some operatic terminology. Following this introductory material, the students use fill-in-the-blank and multiple choice to create a work with unique characters and situations that the singers then perform.

Opera Cabaret

Target Age: Young Adult

Intent: Present opera, in translation, in an unintimidating context.

Description: This program, which will begin during the 2012-2013 season, is a production of a classic opera, performed in English from a translated libretto commissioned by Opera Columbus for the purpose. By presenting the production in translation and set in modern times, the program is intended to make opera accessible to a new, hip generation of arts patrons.

Columbus Blue Jackets

Youth

Blue Jackets at School

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Provide a hockey-themed resource to add a fun twist to certain components of Ohio’s Academic Content Standards.

Description: This program offers classroom ready lesson plans and activities in the areas of language, social studies, science and health/physical education. Each lesson plan and activity features a Columbus Blue Jackets player and/or Stinger the mascot intended to capture students’ imagination and help make learning more fun. This program can also be tied to appearances by having players included in certain lessons come to the students as they work on said lessons.

Book Jackets

Target Age: Youth
Intent: Use the popularity of the Blue Jackets to incentivize reading for local children in grades K-8.

Description: This program is intended to encourage students to spend more of their free time reading. Students keep track of the number of minutes that they have read throughout a four week reading period, and they are rewarded with Blue Jackets prizes based on their “score” at the program’s completion.

61 Club Good Health Challenge

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Encourage elementary and middle school students to make healthy choices and habits.

Description: This program, run in conjunction with the Columbus Dispatch’s Newspapers in Education program, allows elementary and middle school students to download a healthy habits scorecard. The students record their healthy choices for one month and then submit the scorecard to the Blue Jackets to receive two tickets to a home game, two 61 Club shirts, and a chance to have Rick Nash appear at their school.

Blue Jackets Hockey Shop in Junior Achievement BizTown

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Provide students in grade 4-6 with a day’s experience of having a job and adult responsibilities.

Description: This program, in conjunction with Junior Achiever of Central Ohio, allows students in grades 4-6 to become adults for the day by taking on various jobs in BizTown. The Blue Jackets sponsor the Blue Jackets Hockey Shop, wherein students work with the goal of producing and selling Jackets and hockey merchandise. The shop has a CEO, CFO, sales manager, and designer. The Jackets hold JA BizTown nights during the season when former Blue Jackets Hockey Shop CEOs have the opportunity to meet with the team president to discuss his role as the CEO of the club.

Blue Jackets Student Achievers

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Reward students from central Ohio schools for exemplary improvement or achievement.
Description: This program, run in conjunction with Bob Evans, allows administrators and teachers at central Ohio schools to recognize students who have excelled academically, made great improvements, recorded perfect attendance, or excelled in some other area deemed appropriate by the school. In recognition of their achievement, these students are given a certificate good for two upper level tickets to a Blue Jackets home game.

Street Jackets

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Allow children to learn the basic skills of hockey on playgrounds or in gyms of community facilities.

Description: This program, part of the NHL Street program, allows the Blue Jackets to partner with local schools and community facilities to donate equipment, training sessions, and manuals so that local youths can learn the basics of hockey by playing street hockey. This program doesn’t incur any costs on the part of the facilities, and all the youths need are sneakers. The team further supports the program by providing clinics and a championship tournament at the end of the year.

Junior Jackets

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Develop interest and participation in ice hockey throughout central Ohio.

Description: This program provides professional instructors to help introduce youths to the sport of ice hockey in a safe and positive environment. The program is comprised of six different sessions of varying length run over the course of the year, all designed to prepare participants to partake in more organized youth hockey leagues in the future.

Hats for Heroes

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Raise money for pediatric cancer research through the sale of Hats for Heroes merchandise and provide fun opportunities for children battling cancer.

Description: This program, established in 2000, combines donated funds and funds raised through the sale of Hats for Heroes merchandise to provide support for patients and families, fund research, and provide palliative care to patients. This program has become the signature philanthropic endeavor of the Blue Jackets Foundation.
Sibling Support Program

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Help the siblings of cancer patients to deal with the impacts and stresses of the disease.

Description: This program, established through a grant to Nationwide Children’s Hospital’s oncology unit, is a six-week curriculum-based program. The program has been designed to provide education, resources, and counseling to the adolescent siblings of those battling cancer.

Stinger’s Bravery Beads Program

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Allow patients the opportunity to track the journey of their care by collecting beads.

Description: This program is designed to allow patients to collect beads of various shapes and colors to correspond with various stages of their treatment. Each child receives a starting kit and, with each stage of their treatment (a blood transfusion or a chemotherapy treatment, for instance), they are given the corresponding bead so that they have a tangible record of their battle.

High School Hockey Scholarship

Target Age: Late Youth

Intent: Recognize a local high school hockey player who excels in academics and character.

Description: This scholarship, funded by the Blue Jackets Foundation, serves to encourage participation in high school hockey by recognizing a local player who excels in their academic and extracurricular activities and is of strong character. The scholarship does not take into consideration the player’s skill, but, rather, focuses on their contributions through character.

Nationwide Children’s Hospital Sport Safety Helmet Program

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Provide youths with bicycle helmets to combat head trauma.
Description: This program, a joint venture between the team and Nationwide Children’s Hospital, allows for the distribution of team-branded bicycle helmets to youths visiting the hospital as a result of head traumas. This program has lead to the distribution of over 18,000 helmets, helping to keep kids safe while promoting bike riding.

Partners in Education

Target Age: Youth

Intent: “Adopt” an inner-city school and allow for player involvement over the course of a school year.

Description: This program allows the team to “adopt” a different inner-city school in central Ohio each year. Over the course of the year, players and team staff members serve as presenters at Career Day, speak at award assemblies, and spend time working with students in their classes.

John H. McConnell Scholarship Fund

Target Age: Late youth

Intent: Honor the legacy and character of the team’s founder, John H. McConnell.

Description: This program allows for public contributions to an annual scholarship ($10,000) awarded to a local high school senior. The bases for selection are the student’s character and leadership. This scholarship is intended to recognize a student who exemplifies the characteristics that made John H. McConnell a generous and prominent part of Columbus.

General

Donations

Target Age: General

Intent: Leverage the team brand to help local non-profit organizations in their fundraising efforts.

Description: This program, encompassing ticket, monetary, and merchandise donations, is overseen both by the team (tickets and merchandise) and the Blue Jackets Foundation (monetary). Through following an application process within a set timeframe (monthly for tickets and merchandise, annually for monetary), local non-profits can receive donations from the team to be used in their fundraising efforts. Each organization is
limited to a single donation per calendar year, and the process for tracking the donations is on par with most grant-making organizations.

Appearances/Speakers Bureau

Target Age: General

Intent: Make Blue Jackets personnel (staff, players, and mascot) available for appearances in the community.

Description: This program allows organizations to request the presence of a representative from the Blue Jackets for an event without fee (except mascot appearances, in which case all fees benefit the Blue Jackets Foundation). The Speakers Bureau provides local organizations and school the opportunity to host team broadcasters and executives as they discuss the history of the team, the current organization, and organizational initiatives.

50/50 Raffle

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Make the popularity of home games into a viable fundraising opportunity for local charities.

Description: This program allows local charities to benefit from the 50/50 raffle held at each Blue Jackets home game. Charitable organizations that address one of the four pillars of the Blue Jackets Foundation may apply to partner with the Blue Jackets for a game. Each selected organization must provide 40 volunteers over the age of 18 to sell tickets before and during the early parts of the game. After the drawing is conducted and the winner and expenses are paid, the remaining money is donated to the partnering organization.

Hockey: It’s In your Blood

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Through a partnership with the American Red Cross and OhioHealth, promote the organization of blood drives in Columbus.

Description: This program, a month-long campaign held each September, promotes the organization of blood drives around Columbus. In addition to their own kick-off drive held at Nationwide, at which the Blue Jackets reward donors with tickets and gift bags,
the team donates tickets and hosts Hockey: It's In Your Blood night to provide incentive for donors throughout the month-long campaign.

Jackets for Jackets

Target Age: General

Intent: Collect winter coats to be distributed to those in need in the community.

Description: This program, a partnership between the team, 10TV, the Dispatch Media Group, and FOX Sports Ohio Blue Line stores, constitutes an annual coat drive. The coats are collected at Nationwide, Blue Line Stores, and Chiller Ice Rinks and are then donated to the Salvation Army so that those in need around Columbus can have a winter coat.

Lady Jackets Hockey Holidays Toy Drive

Target Age: General

Intent: Help increase donations to the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve’s Toys for Tots program.

Description: This program is an annual toy drive organized by Blue Jacket WAGs. For several days each December, fans are able to drop off new and unwrapped toys at Nationwide, which are then donated to the Toys for Tots program so that children in need can open a present on Christmas.

Columbus Blue Jackets Foundation Family Resource Center

Target: General

Intent: Provide a place of comfort and respite for the families of patients at Nationwide Children’s Hospital.

Description: This facility, located at Nationwide Children’s Hospital, provides a Blue Jackets-themed area of comfort to help alleviate the stresses associated with hospital visits. The facility has a dedicated Donato’s hotline, allowing families to have pizza delivered directly from the nearest store rather than relying entirely on cafeteria food. Showcases throughout the facility highlight the history and accomplishments of the team, as well as the work of the Blue Jackets Foundation. Families interested in ordering flowers have access to a special catalogue of arrangements from a partner florist at 10% off. The facility has a lounge furnished with a television, movies, books, newspapers, magazines, music, and an X Box (provided by Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of Columbus). The facility also has a kitchen which can be used to prepare a meal and...
which is stocked with an unlimited supply of Tim Hortons coffee. For the families of children with extended stays, there are laundry and shower facilities available for use. The facility also includes a library/resource center and classroom, allowing families to stay in touch with loved ones and employers, learn about their child’s specific condition, and learn the techniques necessary to provide home care.

Blue Jackets Players’ Programs

Target Age: General

Intent: Allow players to partner with outside organizations through both personal support and by bringing those associated with the outside organizations to games.

Description: These programs (Umby’s Army, Brassard’s Buddies, Tyut’s Troops, Mac’s Pack, and Marc’s Maniacs) provide individual players the chance to work with organizations that they have a personal connection to. These programs involve the players purchasing tickets so that they can host those from the outside organizations at home games, as well as lending their time and services for personal support to the organizations. Umby’s Army partners with the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and Down Syndrome Association, Brassard’s Buddies partners with Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Ohio, Tyut’s Troops partners with the Ronald McDonald House of Central Ohio, Mac’s Pack partners with Columbus City Schools, and Marc’s Maniacs partners with CCYHA Special Hockey, Arlington Park Elementary, and YMCA Future of America.
Columbus Museum of Art

Note: As indicated in the data chapter, the museum considers all of its actions and activities to be some form of outreach. As such, identifying specific outreach programs as a basis for analysis is difficult. However, the museum issued a report regarding their Center for Creativity that includes a list of programs that they offer. The programs included here, and in the analysis of the organization, are drawn from this list.

Youth

Critical Works

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Work with urban middle school students to provide an engaged arts experience.

Description: This program is a grant-funded partnership between CMA and middle schools in Columbus. Over four classroom visits, the program makes use of conversation and art making as a means for students to explore social issues relevant to their lives. Students make works of art based on issues relevant to them, and then visit the museum to see the art that they have created being displayed.

Focus

Target Age: Late Youth

Intent: Use photography as a means to foster conversation between unique groups of students.

Description: This program brings together students from two high schools who work together to capture and edit photographs about their lives. This photography, writing, and conversation creates an open forum for student discussion and understanding.

Artful Reading

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Utilize art works as the basis for helping students develop critical thinking in reading and oral communication.

Description: This program makes use of the Observe, Describe, Interpret, Prove method to help students develop skills that promote critical thinking. The students apply the method by examining works from the CMA collection.
Art Lab

Target Age: Late Youth

Intent: Allow high school students to use technology to create personally meaningful educational resources for the museum.

Description: This program is a service-learning venture in which teens experiment with technology to create educational resources for the museum. Students explore ideas driven by their personal interests, creating videos that forge connections between their lives, art, and the community.

Summer Art Workshops

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Provide engaging summer programs for children.

Description: These programs, a series of workshops for children held during the summer months, are designed to provide creative engagement for youths between school years.

Artful Adventures

Target Age: Early Youth

Intent: Highlight the importance of play, imagination, and creativity in the development of the whole child.

Description: This program allows preschool students to explore real works of art through various hand-on experiences as they travel on a safari: building foam-block mountains, camping with shadow puppets, and creating new animals.

Pressing Matters

Target Age: Youth

Intent: Provide substantive arts experiences to middle school students whose schools lack arts programs.

Description: This program allows CMA staff to bring authentic works of art to the classroom to engage students in a two-day, interdisciplinary learning experience. Students explore social issues relevant to their own lives and communicate their concerns through creative expression and experimentation. The program includes a day at the
museum where students explore artwork in the standing collection and see the art that they have created on display.

**General**

Corporate Workshops

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Utilize museum resources to help corporate employees explore creative thinking.

Description: This program provides a number of workshop options that include staff guidance and instruction. Participants are guided through activities that encourage creative thinking, innovation, and communication skills.

Doodles

Target Age: Early Youth, Adult

Intent: Allow adults and young children to experiment in creating art.

Description: This program allows adults and children (age six and up) to experiment with materials and create art together that is inspired by artwork in the museum.

Game Show

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Create a social and fun environment to interact with young professionals around art.

Description: This program brings together young professionals for drinks and conversation at the museum followed by a game show in which contestants are drawn from the audience. Contestants compete in creative challenges for the chance to win prizes.

The Art of Analysis

Target Age: Adult

Intent: Use art as a means to develop deep and attentive thinking and analysis by medical students.
Description: This program brings OSU College of Medicine student to CMA for an experience that encourages deep and attentive looking, critical thinking, and empathy, all in an effort to help develop students into better physicians. Students participate in intense group discussions that focus on critically interpreting a work of art and then move into the galleries to individually interpret questions that are answered using works of art.

WOW! Art

Target Age: Early Youth, Adult

Intent: Provide preschool students the chance to explore art-making in a family context.

Description: This program brings preschool students and their parents to the museum to explore art-making using a variety of materials as a means to spur creativity.

First Saturdays/Family Sundays

Target Age: Early Youth, Adult

Intent: Allow young children and their parents to have fun while exploring art and art-making.

Description: These programs are intended to bring parents and their young children in as a way to discover art in a fun environment. Each program features an artist, current exhibition, or theme as the focal point and includes gallery activities, art making, and a related arts performance.

Tours for People with Disabilities

Target Age: General

Intent: Allow local citizens with disabilities to enjoy the museum’s collection.

Description: Thie program provides gallery tours with specially trained docents who provide tactile and interpretive tours for museum visitors with disabilities.

Summer Fun Afternoon Activities

Target Age: Early Youth, Adult

Intent: Provide local families fun art-based activities during the summer.
Description: This program provides a different activity every afternoon during the summer. These activities, which are free to participate in, allow parents and their children to have art-based fun during the summer.
Appendix C: Interview Transcriptions
J: I have the recorder going. So, could I ask you to please state, for the record, your name and position.

R: Robin Ungerleider, development and program specialist for the Crew Soccer Foundation and the community relations manager for the Columbus Crew.

J: So, I just want to double check, on the record, that I do have your consent to record this interview and to draw quotes from the interview.

R: Yes, and I’ll review it before you submit.

J: Oh, of course, of course. I should have, hopefully I’ll have the interview transcription done within the next couple days and I’ll have the, uh, the section on The Crew based on the interview written within the next week or so, and I’ll make sure to send those along.

R: Okay.

J: Alright. So, let’s get cracking on the questions then. Um, so, first, could you please briefly explain and describe your organization’s outreach programs?

R: Yeah. Since I wear two hats here at The Crew, both on our team side, which is the Columbus Crew side (I’m the community relations manager), we have programs on that end, and I also work for our 501(c)3 public charity, which is a separate entity. Um, although, obviously, there are lots of connections, uh, connection points with The Crew, and I run programming and I fundraise for that organization. So, we have tried, as much as we possibly can, to align the goals and focus areas of each entity, and the main entity, the main area that we focus on is using soccer as a vehicle to promote education, healthy lifestyles for at-risk youth, and, uh, there’s certainly plenty of need for that, so, uh, on the team side, we’ve done a lot with, uh, visits and appearances by players and staff to bring the game to kids that otherwise wouldn’t be able to hear about it, learn about it, know about it, and, uh, understand the benefits that soccer brings to, uh, I guess…it promotes ideas like teamwork, uh, leadership, healthy lifestyles, fitness, um, and even character building, because, you know, you have to be a good sport on the field. So, there’s programs like that. We do a lot of school assemblies, where we talk about those concepts, um, where we demonstrate some soccer skills for the kids, to give them a taste of it. We do a summer reading program, where we promote the idea of the importance of literacy.
through libraries, mainly, and we offer crew tickets as incentives to get the kids to read a
certain amount. Usually, it’s read 90 minutes a week for four weeks, and, if you do so,
you’ll get some kind of Crew prize. And, in addition, like I was saying, we try to align
the focus areas as much as possible, but, you know, there’s always these sorts of
offshoots, like, on the team side, we focus on things like the environment. That’s a big
concern for everyone now, so we do community cleanups and graffiti takeovers, so we do
things like that, projects for the community that may not support youth directly, but
certainly cleaning up the environment is something that helps everyone. And then, on the
foundation side, our mission, and you probably say it on the website, basically, it entails,
using soccer as a vehicle to promote a couple key areas, and one is education, so we’ve
developed some programming along with some recreational soccer leagues and clinics
that we offer for free to kids, particularly in the Linden neighborhood, which is where
we’re located, and surrounding areas of Columbus that are economically depressed. Um,
and uh, as it turns out, we’ve also built a field, a turf mini-field here at the stadium that’s
going to be designed to be, again, to bring soccer on a quality surface, on a quality, bring
a quality experience to kids that normally wouldn’t be able to utilize such a nice pitch.
Uh, and then, we also focus on injury prevention and health awareness, disease
prevention, in terms of heart health, getting messages out there about keeping healthy,
keeping fit, eating nutritiously, and concussion awareness. Concussion injury awareness,
we have a video and we’ve put out some education pieces about that. So, those are kind
of our main areas on the foundation side: field development, health and disease
awareness and prevention, injury prevention, and education.

J: Okay. And, I’ve seen on the website where there are some program specifics, so I
think, between that really awesome rundown you just gave me and some of the specifics
from the website, that more than answers that first question wonderfully. Out of curiosity,
because I know that The Crew have a really well-developed Hispanic relations set-up,
I’m just wondering if there, to what extent there are interactions between the community
relations department for the team and the Soccer Foundation and the Hispanic relations
set-up for the team.

R: Yeah, we, kind of, as a whole organization, focus on that community, not necessarily
just community relations or the foundation, but we do have (actually, he just left the
company, but we’ll be getting someone else) a Hispanic development coordinator, a
Hispanic community development coordinator. Actually, strike that, he’s called, his real
title was director of multicultural business development. But it’s not just about business
development, it’s about community development, and so, his role is to bring soccer to
that community, to encourage them to, um, you know, be part of the Crew experience,
whether it’s bringing clinics to folks of Hispanic origin or organizing…what we have is
Copa Victoria, which is a tournament that many teams participate in, but it’s geared
towards the Hispanic community, and of course all of our outreach programs, you know,
serve the entire community, but many of the outreach programs that I’ve mentioned in
the answer to your first question, of course, reach into the Hispanic communities. So, yes,
it’s a very key demographic for us, obviously, on the team side, because it’s a
soccer…generally, there’s a lot of love of soccer in that community, and also because there’s a lot of outreach that we feel can be beneficial.

J: Alright, good to know. Next question: what are the consideration and processes for developing new outreach programs?

R: It goes back to, again, our focus areas and our mission. You know, the Crew mission statement is somewhat lengthy, but the part that deals with community relations is to be a respected and valued influential community leader and to enhancing quality of life in Columbus, Ohio. So, you can see that is a focus area for the team, and you can get the full mission statement for the foundation on the website, but those two areas are aligned, and everything stems from those missions. What are the areas of need? How can we best help? But, again, we have to focus on what we do best, and that’s soccer. We can’t try to be all things to all people; no organization can. And, I think, the most effective way, the most visible way that we can help folks is through soccer, so, spreading the game, both to promote the game and to promote all the things that the game brings to the community, which is healthy recreational outlets, um, a way to promote education, a way to promote healthy lifestyles, and nutrition, fitness, and injury prevention, and all the programs that I mentioned do that. So, everything goes back to that, and if there’s a new program we may want to develop (for example, I was mentioning something related to the environment), it might just be something that, um, we may just do a one-time program for it because we see an acute need, or sometimes, unfortunately, when there are disasters out in the country or in the world, we might respond because it’s an acute need that happens in the community or in the world, and it’s something that we want to respond to. So, there’s both long-term thematic considerations and then there’s…sometimes, things happen that you feel it’s important, as a good community citizen, to respond to.

J: Alright. Well, you not only managed to answer that question, you managed to pretty much answer the next two questions as well.

R: Good! I’m moving right along. *laughter* These questions have a lot of overlap, so, you know, I guess I can kill off two birds with one stone.

J: That’s the spirit. So, let’s move down to…oh, okay. How do you see these programs impacting the community, and how do you see these programs impacting the organization?

R: Well, my philosophy is that corporate social responsibility has undergone a pretty dramatic, I think, a pretty dramatic shift in the last 10 or 15 years, where companies were, and there’s a good article on this from the Harvard Business Review, and, if you give me a second, I can at least Google it, because it’s something you should definitely take a look at. It’s not related directly to sports, but it’s very relevant to this conversation. Just give me a second…yeah, it’s by M.E. Porter and M.R. Kramer. I’m going to send you the link, so let me just send that to you right now. Okay, I just sent you the link, but basically the
gist of it is that, um, companies were doing what they call “corporate social responsibility programs” as a way to kind of make themselves look good, or just for show or just to get the media out of it, or just as a one-off type of thing. The understanding now is that those types of programs don’t help anyone. They don’t bring real benefit to the community because you’re kind of just sprinkling yourself here and there and not really having a deep impact. Also, it doesn’t really provide real positive branding or recognition for a corporate organization because, you know, you’re not really putting yourself out there, you’re not really staking a claim to anything. So, the more new concept is that the priorities of corporation and the priorities of the community can be aligned, and it can be a win-win for everyone. If the community…uh, if education is promoted in the community, and you have more educated people, that’s only going to promote job creation and overall standard of living increases and, you know, that’s going to provide community benefits and it’s also going to provide corporate benefits, because obviously corporations have to make money to succeed. That’s a fact of life, and, if they don’t, they can’t really do any community programming. If they don’t make any money, they go out of business and they’re not really going to be able to help anybody, so the idea is to align yourself with a particular focus area that makes sense and that has more impacts so that, rather than trying to be all things to all people, you focus on one theme and not necessarily build all your programming around that, but gear most of it. So, you know, that’s what we try to do here. Soccer is what we do best. We can try to…you know, there are other organizations. The American Heart Association does heart education and research funding best. That’s not to say that we wouldn’t promote heart health, but we wouldn’t try to duplicate the efforts of the American Heart Association, and they do it well. You know, there are other organizations that focus on cancer research and other disease prevention, homelessness, so we can have impact on those areas, but really, what we do best is soccer, and soccer is…if we didn’t believe in the sport of soccer, then none of us would be here. Believing in the benefits, not just in the fun benefits of it, that it’s entertaining, that it’s, you know, a wonderful sport. They call it the “beautiful game,” and it’s almost artistic to watch great players play soccer. But, also, it brings a lot of benefit as a sport that, I think, more than any other, promotes fitness and health. I mean, you’re running, a player is running up to 8 miles per game, so you have to stay healthy, you have to stay fit to play this game. It’s a teamwork-type game, it’s not you and you alone that you’re focusing on. It’s a team effort. It doesn’t matter who scores the goal as long as you score the goal and as long as you win. If you’ve ever watched a soccer game, you know that, even if you don’t have the ball, you’re having an impact on the rest of the team. You know, you’re setting up the next play or you’re defending against someone on the other team that might score a goal, so there is so much possible activity that has to happen. I always say that a sport that has the word “assist” in it, you probably can’t find a better example of teamwork than that. You get credit for assists, and those are important. It’s not just who scored the goal, but it’s who assisted the goal that gets announced. So, given that, given the benefits of the sport, bringing it to the community, encouraging people to become Crew fans, to play the game, maybe even to become a Crew player themselves one day, through the youth development program, it only brings benefit to folks to promote that, the health, fitness, and wellness component that is so important.
Childhood obesity is such a terrible problem now that the First Lady has developed many important programs around it, so, it probably is classified as a societal crisis. So, bringing that game to the community is, I think, a benefit to everyone, and we can use it in creative ways, as I was saying before, we can also use it impact education. We give away free tickets to kids that read, we’re both getting them here to Crew Stadium to have a wonderful experience, and we’re also promoting reading. So, there’s not a reason why your corporate priorities and the community priorities can’t align, and that’s the most effective way for organizations to think about it.

J: That actually, I think, started to touch a bit on the next question, which is: how does your organization conceptualize its public value, and how is this public value measured?

R: I struggled with this question a little when I saw it, in terms of what you’re looking for with that. Can you give me an example of what another organization said, or try to give me a little more detail about what you’re looking for or what you mean by that?

J: Sure. With the organizational conceptualization, I’ve found that, while we on the academic side tend to very much see that public value is just this kind of broad amorphous concept that, oh, public value is just proof that the public does value an organization or entity. Most organizations have kind of a specific idea of what it means to them, whether it’s a certain size fan base or whether it’s public funding or whether it’s their ability to impact a local community agenda or something to that end. Similarly, with the measure of the public value, how does the organization track or show that. If, say, you were to tell me that The Crew conceptualizes its public value through, say, attendance, which is, I know, at best a component of it, then how is public value measured? That might be measured via paid attendance at the games. So, I’m just kind of wondering, from that point of view, how does The Crew, what is The Crew’s notion of its public value? How does it see the value that it experiences amongst Columbus and how does it measure that public value?

R: Yeah, I’m probably not the most qualified person to answer that question if it’s related to anything like attendance or anything on the Crew side in terms of the business side because that’s just not my area. I can speak, of course, to our community efforts and how we would approach that and, I mean, public value in terms of the community is a somewhat difficult concept to measure. I mean, you can do surveys, you can get feedback from community leaders and government officials, but, again, those things are a little bit difficult to measure because we’re not a grant-making organization or a foundation at a place where we can be a grant-making organization, so we can’t necessarily give out money and then ask an organization how they spent the money and what was the impact of that. Because of that, we can’t necessarily come up with a hard measure of some of those things. We can come up with measures of our own programming on the community side, such as how many kids did we get to play in our free recreational league, how many kids were we able to get through our referee scholarship program? We can, you know, get testimonials for things like that. How many kids were we able to give free tickets to?
There’s definitely numbers that you can throw out there, but I think public value is one of those phrases that means different things to different people. If I got to a meeting…yesterday, I had a meeting with a non-profit here in town, and we were talking about different ways to partner and, you know, they were saying to me “we’ve heard such good things about The Crew and all the things you do in the community,” and, to me, that’s a definite example of public value. But, you know, could I necessarily write a research report about it? Probably not, but you want to not hear bad things, and you do want to hear good things. So, yeah, there are measures that we use for our programming, but I don’t think those measures capture everything. We went on a community clean-up, and we picked up…I don’t remember what it was, 90-100 bags of garbage. We cleaned up graffiti…over 1,000 square of graffitied-over property, we took pictures before and after and got lots of positive feedback on that. We had probably 30, 40 volunteers, both Crew staff and players and community members. So, that sounds good, and we can be proud of ourselves for that and let people know about it, but, to me, the main value of that, the public value of that, is a kid and a parent telling me that they can walk through that alley on the way to and from school and not see a bunch of garbage and beer bottles strewn about, and that change in their acts, that change in their environment, how they think about their community and safety in their community, to me is the main idea that came out of that project.

J: Alright. That’s actually a really helpful answer. It’s interesting because you’re the first person I’ve talked to that kind of touched on, in discussing public value, the importance of almost informal measures, the whole word of mouth and people coming up to you and saying, like you just said, “we can now walk down this alley on the way to school and feel safe and it’s not garbage-strewn,” so, I think that’s really an interesting point, and I’m glad you brought it up.

R: Thanks. Obviously, we’ve attended schools and we have business cycles, but, to me, the focus of what I do, and probably the focus of your paper is measuring the value of what you do off the field. And, to that affect, what I was saying before: is that a win-win? Can that help create new Crew fans to come to our stadium? Sure, we hope so. We can’t help anyone if we’re not in business anymore, and no organization could. Like I said, it’s not that you shouldn’t measure community impact. It’s just that, if you keep strictly to how many people came through, how many bags of garbage did you pick up, you can miss a lot, and that’s something I try to keep in mind because you don’t want to miss the forest for the trees.

J: Yeah, no, I definitely understand. I very much appreciate the whole idea of being able to account not just for the quantitative, but also very much the qualitative side of things.

R: Right. I write a report about every single community project and endeavor that we do, but to me, that’s only part of the story.
J: Just two more quick questions, then. Let’s see. In regards to some of the written descriptions on the website, it seems like most of the standing programs you guys have are pretty well-detailed on there. Are there are any details regarding the administration or nature of those programs that you’d like to give some details or insights on that might augment the written descriptions? Any additional on those, or are the ones on the website good to use?

R: I’d have to think about it because I can’t quite remember everything that was written. Yeah, I think we’re progressing a lot, and…I apologize, I think I’d probably have to go back to the website. Can I put that question on hold? I should probably go back to the website and, sort of, see what’s on there, and then I can…why don’t we do the last question, and then I can come back to that.

J: Okay. Um, the last one, it’s kind of related, again, to the written description of the programs. Is there any way the actual administration of the programs differs from the stated mode of function in the written description and, if so, what caused the difference?

R: Gosh, I’m trying to…sorry, I’m kind of blanking on this. I mean, the descriptions on the website are obviously very brief, so, in terms of…they’re not necessarily administered any differently, but we don’t necessarily talk about administration. We talk about the program and the benefits and how you can get involved, so administration of them is a little bit different. Let me just go to the website here. It might help me if you could give me a specific program that you saw that I can talk about that you had an interest in or you had additional questions on. That might help me.

J: Uh, well, let me call up the website.

R: Sometimes I’m a lot better off with a specific example.

J: Oh, gosh, I’m exactly the same way. I totally understand. Um, well, let’s talk about the referee scholarship. I mean, it’s a brief, little-over-two-line mention, um, says that it assists youngster aged 14-18 who have the desire but no means to obtain referee training, certification, and a uniform. So, I guess to that end, what are some additional details that might help me understand the program, because when it comes to the way it’s administered and the mode of function, it seems pretty straightforward, but I’m just wondering if there are any additional details on the program that might help me understand it a little better.

R: Yeah. I actually wrote something up about that. We just did a video testimonial from one of the kids who is kind of our star. He started in the program in ’08, and, you know, we not only help kids to get certified, but we help them to get recertified, if they’re interested in getting recertified every few years, we’ll pay for that as well. The main…the program is a four session program. We have it every winter, and we do four Saturdays in a row and the kids do a total of 15 hours of training. We have two wonderful instructors
who have years of ref experience, and they go over the finer points of the game, the rules, obviously how to know a run is offsides, all the rules, and then they also go over strategies that are a little more intangible, like how do you handle a difficult parent, or how do you break up a fight on the field or things like that. They really go into more of the esoteric aspects of being a ref, you know, what are some of the pressure points that a ref might feel and not just, you know, here’s how you call a foul or here’s how you issue a red card, but what to do if someone’s screaming at you and you’re a 14 year old kid. Someone shouldn’t be doing that, but they do, and that will provide character building. So, what the kid was saying, the kid that we interviewed the other day, and we asked him for a testimonial, what he said was, what his mom said was it really built his confidence, you know, to know that he could basically be the general in charge of a soccer game. You’re the arbiter of what happens in terms of adhering to the rules of play and controlling the temper of the match to keep it from getting ugly or if there are injuries taking place, and things like that. The ref’s job is to make sure that there’s not excessive fouls (as we call it, persistent infringement) that can create more injuries than might otherwise be happening in the normal course of the game. So, by being the general, you gain a lot of experience, you gain confidence, you gain leadership skills, and other things you can translate into your life. Those are skills we all need to succeed, and that’s what he was talking about. So, some of the intangible aspects of what you gain from the course, and the mentoring that our instructors provide is another key element, though certainly not listed on the website, but it’s one of the key elements of what we’re doing. I’m going to try to find something I have written up on the ref scholarship, talking about the benefits of it, and I can’t quite find it right now. If you want, I can call you back and I can kind of go over, if I can find it. I know I did something, but, yeah, so, and then, in terms of growth that is not on the website, Crew Soccer Foundation Field is a new program that we’re, we just started. It’s a new project that’s just been completed. We’re starting a recreational league, so certainly on there, we haven’t done the league yet, it’s starting this summer, so that’s a “stay tuned” situation where we’re really excited to see what happens with it and what the reaction of the kids is going to be and see how much impact we can have, because the program is going to have elements of…it’s not just going to be “here’s a ball, play soccer.” We’re going to start each session with skill development and then a lesson, a healthy lifestyle lesson, that’s incorporated into each practice and each session, so we think that we’ll see, when we do surveys at the end, what the impact was, which of the kids keep playing soccer, whether they come back for the following year. So, that’s a little bit of a “stay tuned” moment for us, and we’re excited about it.

J: Understandably. That sounds like a pretty cool program to be starting.

R: Yeah, yeah it is. It’s been several years in the making. You know, we are very excited. It’s the first real endeavor that we’ve undertaken, it’s the first field we’ve ever built, it’s the first recreational soccer league that we’ve ever put forth and created, so we’re excited to see how it all comes together.
J: Awesome. Well, that pretty much does it for the questions I have.

R: Great. I can’t find that thing I wrote up, but, I mean, I think I gave you a pretty good idea, and if you want to fill in anything, when you send me a copy of it, if I see anything I can kind of fill in, I’ll definitely do that.

J: That definitely sounds like a solid plan. I’ll just give you one last opportunity before I turn off the recorder, if there’s any additional thing that I might not have covered with one of the questions that you’d like to add.

R: I can’t think of anything, other than, I know you told me this, but I kind of…I know I have this on me. “Community Outreach in Sport and Arts Organizations as a Means for Organizational Development.” Um, in terms of organizational development, what is your thesis, in terms of some of the research you’ve got and these interviews into how outreach in sports does develop an organization? I’m just curious about that, because I did a thesis myself.

J: Um, well, what I’ve found so far is, interestingly, these outreach programs are really kind of the prime drivers of public value for a particular organization, which struck me as kind of interesting, especially when you have organizations as relatively high-profile as The Crew and the Blue Jackets, because, as much as they are, you know, strong presences in the community and they are economic engines for the community, there is inevitably people who don’t necessarily see the inherent value in having a sport organization in town, or who maybe, whether they’re just not a fan of the sport in particular or maybe they’re just sort of grumpy in general, or what have you. But, what I’m seeing is, with these outreach programs, because they tend to go above and beyond just what is directly related to getting people to show up to the games, I mean, some of the things you talked about, from community cleanups to helping youths develop life skills and healthy habits, stuff like that, that kind of goes above and beyond just necessarily getting people to show up to a soccer game, it seems like a solid example of developing social and relationship marketing. And so, what I’m seeing to that end is that these programs help the organizations develop by means of basically creating public value and appreciation where there might not have inherently been some.

R: Mmhmm. Yeah, that makes sense, and while I was talking to you about it, and I don’t know if it would help, but an article that was on our website, I’m going to send you a link for that. It talks about how the Crew side did do a study, and, again, I wasn’t involved with this because that’s not my area, but the focus was on, they had a group do a study and it showed that the Columbus Crew and Crew Stadium generated more than $384 million in direct spending, both within and outside the stadium, helping to create hundreds of area jobs and produce millions in tax revenue. So, if you wanted to talk about that question about public value and, you know, I know there’s a lot of debate about the economic benefits of sports, you know, do sports teams really benefit their community in a tangible way, a tangible, positive way? Not just “hey, we’ve got a lot of fans,” but “do you create jobs? Do you significantly impact the community?” This is a good example of
how we do, and, again, area jobs are very important, and millions in tax revenue, of course, and no social service or community development programs can be run without that. So, I guess there’s lots of ways that you can attribute, and it’s a merging of the two worlds, that you can do a community program and you see the direct benefit (for example, we do a community clean-up), but also, on the team side, you can also see indirectly by creating tax revenue, jobs. You can also see an impact on community standard of living and just the quality of the experience in the community and the perception of Columbus in a national discourse, so there’s a lot of benefit that can be created there, too. So, you might want to take a look at that. I just sent you the link.

J: Um…let’s see. Yeah, that’s…yeah, there’s the email.

R: I sent you two emails. Hopefully you got them both.

J: Yup, got them both. Awesome. That’s pretty much all I have on my end.

R: Okay.

J: I really, really appreciate you having taken the time to talk to me.

R: My pleasure.

J: It’s been extremely helpful. I actually look forward to transcribing this this afternoon and looking back over some of the things, because there’s a lot of good stuff here that I’m definitely going to be able to make great use out of.

R: Good! Glad to hear that.

J: Glad to be able to say it. So, I will try my best to have the transcription and the write-up on The Crew and the data about The Crew to you in the next week or so.

R: Okay, that sounds great.

J: Wonderful.

R: I look forward to that.

J: So, once again, thank you very much for your help, Robin. I sincerely appreciate it. And, yeah, I’m glad that you and The Crew have agreed to be part of the project, and to help me out.

R: Yeah, likewise. So, good luck with it, and I’ll look forward to hearing back from you.

J: Alright.
R: My pleasure.

J: Thanks.

R: Bye bye.

*END*
J: Alright, if, uh, you, uh, would be so kind as to state your name and your position with Opera Columbus.

P: Ok. My name is Peggy Kriha Dye. I’m director of artistic and educational programming for Opera Columbus.

J: And, uh, I just want to double check that I do have your consent, uh, to record the interview and to draw quotes from the interview.

P: Yes.

J: Wonderful. Ok. Uh, the first question: could you please briefly describe and explain, uh, Opera Columbus’ outreach programs?

P: Yes. We have different facets to our program, uh, educational program. I’ll start there. We have, uh, one program called Opera on the Go!, which is a children’s opera performed by four singers and accompanied by keyboard. We go into the public schools and private schools, for that matter, and the music director at that school can choose to have their students be the children’s chorus in the production or not. So, we come and perform at the school, there’s a question and answer about being an opera singer, about opera in general, after each performance, and that’s called Opera on the Go! This year we did the story of Three Billy Goats Gruff, arranged by John Davies. Next year we’ll be doing that show; it’s about bullying, as well, so we’re trying to address issues in the schools as well as introduce them to opera. Next year we’ll be adding a production to that, uh, Opera on the Go!, and that will be Jack and the Beanstalk. We’re looking at that. So, uh, Reynoldsburg high school creates our sets, uh, builds them; their drama department, sets and costumes. That program runs January through May, and goes through elementary schools and some junior high, Opera on the Go! Another program is called Improv Opera, which is four singers, keyboard, and there’s a rough storyline, and we take it to a school. This is great for high schools; we also do it for adults, for parties, it can be adapted to any age group and setting, and the audience gets to choose the storyline, gets to choose the characters, what they’re going to do, what props they’re going to carry, and we walk them through an outline. They make their decisions, and the singers make up their words according to their decisions to operatic repertoire. Yeah, it’s a lot of fun, it’s crazy funny, and it’s a great way to introduce opera to people. There, again, we talk about voice types, we talk about the structure of opera, and we have a
question and answer series. Uh, another program we do, which is getting smaller just because of our staff size, uh, is a residency program. We go into a school for maybe two weeks for an hour and a half, 45 minute sessions, depending on the needs of the school, and we do lesson plans on opera, so we’ll talk about set design, costume, makeup, uh, voice production, drama, voice types, you know, uh, et cetera, and have activities that the kids will do to learn these things, and then we do the children’s opera with the children’s chorus as part of the residency program. So, that is…those are the educational programs. We have another outreach program that is beginning in our next season. It was just announced. We’re doing Opera Cabaret, which is popular opera that we commission an English libretto for, so it’s current, it’s hip, it’s…references the times, but it’s true to the score as well. These are performed by local young artists, with keyboard, modern dress, and next season will be a co-production, La Boheme, with Shadowbox Theater. Yeah, it’s going to be great; you gotta go. These will be free performances, uh, and, oh, there’s Steve Guyer right there. He’s our director. *laughter* Anyway, uh, the following season, ’13-’14, that we are going to do again, but we’re going to expand, a tour, as well. So, we’re going to do a tour through Ohio. We’re trying to reach a younger audience, and audience that might not buy a ticket to an opera, but this is a great way for them to taste it without the intimidation of buying a ticket and going to the opera house.

J: Makes sense.

P: That’s it.

J: Okay. Wonderful. Uh, let’s see. This, actually, I think, is really relevant, considering that Opera Cabaret is kind of a forthcoming project. Uh, what are the considerations and processes for developing and implementing new outreach programs?

P: Uh, I think it’s audience development, is one of the considerations. Cost. *laughter* And I think, for us, Opera Columbus, uh, part of our mission is to develop local talent and young talent, so all of our outreach programs accommodate that mission.

J: Okay. Um, that actually largely answers the next question: is there a mission or philosophy that guides your organization’s outreach programs?

P: Yeah, there you go. And also, of course, to educate Columbus, the children and…the population. Provide…and simply to provide entertainment, as well. But the outreach programs are an educational focus.

J: Uh, okay, you are, like, perpetually one question ahead of me, because the next one is why does your organization conduct these programs, and what are the goals of the programs? So, gosh, you are making my life easy.

P: Good. *laughter*
J: How do you see these programs impacting the community? How do you see these programs impacting the organization?

P: Okay. As far as impacting the community, my goal is to educate Columbus children and parents and citizens in this genre, uh, to create a less intimidating environment, to where people in Columbus can feel a part of what we do, and comfortable with what we do, being at these events. Um, what was the question again?

J: How do you see these programs impacting the community…

P: Yes. So, I…I think it’s going to enrich and sophisticate our society.

J: Okay.

P: Now, as far as the organization, I’m hoping that as we build our audience and our subscription base, we are able to offer more productions at a higher quality consistently.

J: Okay. Um, the last one on this sheet: how does your organization conceptualize its public value, and how does it measure its public value?

P: That’s a good question. I’m not…it’s not something that drives me, let’s put it that way. Um, I think as, as people that live in Columbus become aware and educated and interested, we will become valuable. So, it’s not…it’s just a matter of time in my mind. I just think we haven’t saturated Columbus the way we should be, and I’m confident that once we do, we will be valued.

J: Are there any details regarding the administration or nature of the organization’s outreach programs, uh, that you’d like, uh, to expand upon? On top of what you’ve already shared? Or do you think the encapsulation so far is pretty solid?

P: I think so.

J: Um, that makes this one irrelevant. Well then, that was much less of a hassle than I originally kind of intended for this to be. That makes my life easier.

P: I’m not much of a talker.

*END*
Nancy Turner
Director of Community Relations
Columbus Museum of Art

J: Okay. Uh, could you please state your name and your position?

N: Nancy Turner, director of community relations.

J: Okay. And I just want to double check that I do have your consent to record this interview, as well as to draw quotes from the transcription thereof.

N: You do.

J: Wonderful. So, let’s run through the questions, then. The first one: could you please briefly describe and explain your organization’s outreach programs?

N: I would say we consider everything we do to be outreach. I think, as a cultural organization, everything we do is, in some way, bringing culture to the community, but very many different communities. So, that’s kind of interesting, and of course we use lots of media, but, also, our building and our collection is the main way that we bring culture to the community. And we use it, so we use the building and our collection in the programming. It’s what makes us different from anyone else. No one else in Columbus, I think there’s, like, the Rickenbacker museum, but other than that, there’s no other collecting museum in Columbus, so we are it.

J: Okay. Um, well, that should actually make the answer to this next one kind of interesting. What are the considerations and processes for developing and implementing new outreach programs?

N: We…so, we try to have a balance of programs, if you look at our exhibitions in particular. There are several reasons you do exhibitions. One is you want to do the big, flashy, blockbuster-y thing, because those help get people through the door, and then…that’s number one. You do your Renoir shows, your Monet shows, your Degas shows, and they get you lots of visibility, they bring lots of people in who go shop, they eat here, and the people in town, it makes the people in town aware of you and love you. So, that’s number one. And then, those are popular exhibitions, so the second type of exhibition you do is for the museum community, and you do it because of scholarship. If all you did was big flashy shows, you would stop getting loans. People would say “Columbus Museum of Art’s not serious. Why would we…we’re not going to loan them work. They’re just doing this to get money.” So you have to, for the museum community, and probably the academic community. Like, if you do some things that involve scholarship and serious subjects and things like that. And then the third type of show we do, really for the community, is something like Aminah Robinson. Are you aware of Aminah’s work?
J: Yeah, definitely.

N: So, we’re doing this. She called us earlier this year and said “I have this new body of work that I created for the bicentennial. I’d love to have it at the museum.” Well, we make up our schedule years in advance and we have everything budgeted, and now we’re past budget time, but it’s Aminah, and you’re not going to say no to Aminah. She did this for the bicentennial, so we worked with Hammond Harkins Gallery (they did the first part, and they’re opening it), and we’ll be doing the second part in the late summer/early fall. So, you do it because, politically, you sort of have to do it.

J: Okay, interesting. Um, is there a mission or philosophy that guides your organization’s outreach programs and, if so, could you please explain it?

N: Yes! When Nanette became the executive director in, I think, 2003, we had a mission statement that was probably a full page, single-spaced, and nobody could find it. And so she and Louise Green, who was director of strategic planning, decided that what we needed was a very concise mission statement that everybody could remember and, when you planned something, you had to ask “does this further our mission?” So, the mission is: to provide great experiences with great art for everyone. It’s really easy, everybody knows it. We say it so often, we weave it into letters, we weave it into press releases, and we’ve been doing it for a long time. It’s just what we believe in, that we try to create great experiences with great art for everyone. And, actually, the very first part of the strategic plan…this is an addendum…okay, so the mission page isn’t here. But, anyway, yeah, so everything, all the goals (there are four goals), and they all go back to the great experience, which is probably in there somewhere. The machine was eating pages.

J: Okay, so, just to clarify for my purposes, then, the mission statement is kind of pervasive through the organization, as opposed to it being just kind of a general management mission statement, and outreach might have a different one, it’s a pervasive organizational mission statement.

N: Right. Because, really, there’s not one person in charge of outreach. Education does lots of outreach, to families, to children, to teachers. We do special programming for teachers to talk about how to use creativity in the classroom. So, education does a lot of outreach that way. They also do a lot of lectures. Then you’ve got the curatorial department that creates the exhibitions. That’s probably our main outreach. So, I try to work with community groups, try to find ways that we can create synergy. For example, we’re doing an exhibition with Rothko next year, and CATCO is doing the play “Red,” which is about Rothko, so we’re trying to figure out ways. Can we bring audiences, give the audiences tickets that they can bring here and get two-for-one or something? Can we have our curators do a talk before the play, where people come early and listen to the talk? Can we have people who go to the play then come here after for a tour? Are there ways that we can cross-promote and advertise and things like that? So, we do lots of
things with other cultural institutions. Another thing that I’ve been trying to do is, gosh, we’re looking at audiences and, again, we find that we have many different audiences, but one of the audiences that has to be low-hanging fruit is artists. We find that artists are kind of ticked off with us because we don’t show their work. We’re very small. We’re tiny, and we just don’t have a lot of room to be showing work. So, one of the things that we’ve done is we’ve gone with GCAC, and we have an art award that they give, they give away four $5,000 fellowships, and we set that up and we do the jurying, and then we do a show with the fellowship recipients’ work, and we have a panel discussion with the recipients, and that’s one way we can work with the community. Another thing is, we have a show up right now with work from the Ohio Plein Air Society, it’s their 10th anniversary. So, for very special reasons, we can do shows like that. It’s a very tiny little show, it’s up for a couple of months, but it brings them in and makes them feel good about us. We’re doing watercolor demonstrations with the Ohio Watercolor Society, and with the Central Ohio Watercolor Society, so we bring in their members to do demos. They’re very thrilled to be here. We’re going to do a workshop, we have a workshop coming up with a member of COWS, and then we have another one coming up with someone from OWS, so trying to make them feel good, that we care about them, make them come in. I mean, really, they’re an obvious audience. How is it that, you know…seriously? I used to belong to…I paint, and I used to belong to the watercolor society up in Gahanna, and it’s like “oh, let’s go down to the museum,” and they’re like “oh, we don’t go there.” You know, it’s a long drive, it’s hard, you can’t bike your way around. So, if we can try to find ways to get artists in, it just makes so much sense.

J: Yeah, definitely. It makes me think of the art museum back home. It has, actually, a community arts set-up attached to it, so I think it’s interesting, because I’d never really considered that it’s almost a rarity to have an art museum that goes out of its way to speak directly to artists in that way. When I think of CMA or some other reasonably-sized city’s art museums, it seems they kind of say “we’re here, we have the art that we’d like to have, and it would be nice if artists came,” but it doesn’t seem like there’s much direct outreach to them.

N: Well, we also try to relate, we try to react to what’s going on in the community, too. So, right now, what’s the fastest growing demographic in Columbus? Latinos. So, last year, we sat a booth at the Latino Festival, and we’ll do it again this year, and what we did was he handed out free passes. And there was a tremendous number…when you hand away free passes, people almost never bring them back, but a tremendous number of passes came back from this Latino Festival, so we’re going to do it again. We try to do a broad range of shows, different ethnic shows, woven in with our whole idea of “you’ve got to do splashy shows and serious shows.” Then, we also try to weave in different ethnic shows, too.

J: The perpetual challenge of trying to balance your product with your audiences.
N: Another thing is that there’s a huge underserved audience out there, and I was really, really proud of this, during the depth of the recession, for three summers in a row, we did free July and August. And we were doing programming for the people when they came, because people couldn’t afford to take vacations, so we were saying “come and take a vacation at the Columbus Museum of Art.” And so we had, we brought in a show about animals. We brought in the zoo to bring some animals so that kids could do some petting and then go in and see the animals show. And now we’re doing free Sundays, but it’s just, for me, I think that’s a huge part of our public value, that we’re reaching out to audiences. And when I go to city council or county commissioners, that’s the first things they say, “oh! It’s so great what you’re doing for people, letting them come for free.” It’s really appreciated.

J: Wonderful. Okay, let’s see. I think you’ve kind of touched a bit on this one, but why does CMA conduct these programs and what are the goals of these programs?

N: So, audience development is one of the huge goals, and we’ve just begun studying our audience and looking at it. We want to know what our three top audiences, who comes here. A huge crossover with other audiences, and I think there’s a whole section in here on audiences that we have. We have one of the largest, most loyal audiences in town, which is really great. So, I would say one of the biggest reasons we do it is audience development.

J: Okay. Actually, I think you’ve kind of touched the rest of the questions on this sheet. So, how do you see these programs impacting the community, and how do you see these programs impacting the organization?

N: So, if you look at the cities…Columbus is in a study, does a study of matching, I think there’s about 16 matching cities (I can’t remember the exact numbers), but it compares their cost of housing, all kinds of comparisons. But one of the comparisons is money spent on the arts, and we’re way, way, way at the bottom compared to other cities our size, comparable cities. So…but, one of the things you look at is when you look at the cities that are really thriving on this list, they tend to be cities with thriving arts sectors. So, it’s interesting that our arts sector sort of thrives in spite of itself. We cooperate really well, like I was telling you how we cross-promote and work together. If we’re doing a puppet show, for example, in 2013, and CAPA is bringing in “War Horse”…

J: Ooo.

N: Yeah, I know. I just saw it last weekend in New York. It’s a wonderful show. So, there’s puppets in both, really, really different puppets. We’ve worked on things to share costs, and media buys. Some of the other organizations are using other people’s back-of-house finance departments and that sort of thing. So, we have the most well-organized art group working together anywhere, the Columbus Cultural Leadership Consortium, and I think that’s one of the things that makes us very successful. In terms of dollars per capita,
we’re way, way at the bottom of the list. Now, why was I telling you that? Oh! The community! So, cities, thriving cities of our size, even larger cities, tend to have very thriving arts sectors. And, we think that we help in an economic development way by making the art museum better. We could...back in 2005, we had a choice. We said we could either...we had about $1,000,000 that we couldn’t cover every year. You really had to hustle to fundraise that $1,000,000, and so we had two choices. One was you could go smaller, do less programming, be a small regional museum and not try to do national shows, and the second was you could grow, add on to the museum, add space for exhibitions, and be a real leader nationally, and that’s what we decided to do. For example, our *Radical Camera* show...

J: Which I have been hearing rave early reviews about.

N: We did with the Jewish Museum in New York. And, actually, we had the first...what’s it called...Photo League! We had the first Photo League collection anywhere, anyhow. We bought it from a guy in Chicago, so we were the first museum to have a Photo League collection, and then, after we got it, Photo Leaguers found out that we are the place, and so they started giving us their stuff because they wanted to be included in it. And then the Jewish Museum heard we had it, and there were lots of Jewish members when they were young. Photo League was late teens, early twenties when it starts, and it started so that they had a place they could share dark rooms and supplies, like a co-op for photographers. And they would have shows, they had a little magazine and stuff. Anyway, so when the Jewish Museum found out we had it, they came to see ours, and then they started collecting as well. Then it just seemed smart to collaborate on a show. It opened in New York to huge acclaim. It was in the New York Times four, five times, it was in Time Magazine, Huffington Post, Art News, we got an art review, it was in, I don’t know, Wall Street Journal. It was huge, because we opened it in New York, and that’s where the media is. But it’s here, and it’ll be interesting to see how it plays here. It’s one of those things you do for scholarly reasons. That’s the one where our curator was co-curator on that, and she also wrote for the book.

J: Okay. I’m looking forward to having the opportunity to come down and scope it out. I’m excited for this one, I really am.

N: And are you from Columbus always?

J: No, I’m actually from New York, the upstate part, but I spent a fair amount of time, because my dad’s side of the family is all from the city, so I’m extremely interested, both as a fan of the CMA and the Photo League. And the Jewish Museum, for that matter. So, I’m kind of interested in seeing how it all comes together.

N: Yeah. It’s a great show, and you’re going to want to come more than once, because you can only take in so much before you need to go rest and come back.
J: Awesome. Okay. How does your organization conceptualize its public value, and how is this public value measured?

N: Our education department actually does measure. They’re the best measurers of the whole CMA. They do surveys at the door, they do surveys in the galleries, they do focus groups, so they measure all the time. But, like I said, we don’t have…we don’t consider, um, public outreach, outreach programs a separate thing from all we do because it’s so integrated in everything we do. We don’t say “gosh, how are we measuring this?” because we don’t do it.

J: Okay. So, the whole thing conceptualizing public value and measuring seems like it’s very much in accord with the seemingly kind of very holistic approach with CMA as a whole. I’m noticing that there’s that, there’s the fact that the mission statement is pervasive throughout the organization, and the fact that you all don’t even tend to think of the outreach programs as separate programs, but rather everything you do is a component of outreach and vice versa. So, that’s actually really kind of interesting.

N: And outreach to many different audiences.

J: Yeah. Okay. Neat. I’m loving the fact that every organization is giving me a fairly different answer to the, especially the public value question.

N: So, is that other, when you say other, is that other museums?

J: Um, the organizations that I’m talking to for this study, all in Columbus, so far I have done interviews with…I’m doing the one with you now, I’ve spoken to the Columbus Crew, I’ve spoken to the folks over at the Blue Jackets, I’ve spoken to Opera Columbus, and I’m still, and increasingly frustratedly, trying to track down the folks from the Jazz Arts Group and the Clippers.

N: The Jazz Arts Group just changed directors, so they have an interim director.

J: I know things over there are going to be in a little bit of tumult.

N: They did an audience study that we’re all…

J: Oh, I’m in awe of the audience study.

N: We’re using some of their data as the starting point. And we’re also, CCLC is looking at bring in Jess Luke, um, to do that. Jess Luke is like the guru of museum experiences, and we’re bringing her in for the whole CCLC to talk about audience. So, that’s pretty exciting.
J: Okay. I'm trying to get a fairly diverse look at both fields in Columbus, and I tried...well, it's a lot easier with the sports side because there's not a whole lot of options. With the arts, I tried to get a fairly representative sample that managed to represent a pretty wide array of artistic audiences and such. I'm loving the fact, like I said, that so far everyone I've talked to has given me a fairly different answer regarding conceptualization of public value. That means I'm going to get some interesting stuff out of this.

N: So, whenever I go to talk (I do government relations), whenever I go to talk to city council, for example, they'll just say “oh, we love what you’re doing.” You know, it’s so important, because they love that we have these free days that anybody can come and experience art. And they’re taking art out of the schools. Here’s another thing we do. We have an outreach program down to, and I don't know that you’ll read about any of this in the materials, but we go down to the Ohio River, to the southeast part of Ohio, and we work with a junior high, I think it is, and we take works from our collection that are works of social justice, and they’re prints. We go down there and we work with the classrooms. We do things like pretend one person is a newspaper and another person is the artist and they talk about, they do an interview about the art. So, they talk about it that way, and they talk about social issues. They talk about what’s an important social issue in your life? And it’s their parents don’t have any money for gas, so they can’t go anywhere, they’re stuck at home. One year it was cigarettes, and people were upset about their parents smoking. I suppose it’s whatever they studied last. And then, the kids make art, they make prints, and so they learn some print making, and then the prints come up here and we hang them in a little show, and then they come up and they meet their representative. We bring their representative from the statehouse in to meet with them. We bring them all up in a bus, we play for the bus to get them here. They meet their representative, have a little reception, and they talk about whatever social issue is on their mind with their state representative. So, that’s something that I don’t think anyone ever hears about it; it’s just something that we do.

J: Yeah. Well, I think that also kind of speaks to the fact that you said, when you go and talk to city council members, the fact that you have their state representatives willing to take the time to meet with them, that kind of speaks to a fairly strong perception of value on their part, which I think kind of folds in nicely with that whole public value thing.

N: We bring all our state reps from Central Ohio in for tours, and city council all come for tours, and the mayor. The mayor loves us, he comes all the time. We love him, too. We’re building our garden over here, too. Did you see that when you were coming in?

J: I saw that as I was coming in. It looks wonderful.

N: It’s like a city park. It is, well, we’re going under construction, and this entrance will close, so this is our handicap entrance. We needed a school tour entrance, rather than letting kids off on Broad St., which is really dangerous. This will be a place where busses
can pull up, kids can go up the ramp, it’s got this enclosed space so that once they’re off the bus, they’re in this enclosed space. And it’s also handicap accessible, so it will be out handicap entrance while we’re under construction, as well as the school tour entrance. We just made...I mean, talk about accessibility. We just made the whole 1931 building accessible, which it was not. We put in skip-stop elevators at all the different levels. It used to be that you had to go down stairs to get to the bathroom, but now there’s an elevator that can take you there. We put in a nursing mother room, we put in family restrooms so that, if a dad comes with a little girl, he can take her to the restroom and not have to take her to the men’s room. Men would talk to women on staff and say “would you mind taking my daughter to the restroom?” So, you know, we’re really also trying to be much more accessible in terms of a disabled audience, too.

J: Okay, wonderful. Just two more quick questions. These kind of touch on some of the stuff, some of the different programs that you all do that you’ve touched on, some of the stuff in here. The first is, are there any details regarding the administration or nature of the programs that would augment the written accounts or descriptions? Basically, is there anything regarding any of the programs that you talked about or that are written in here, any additional details that might help me as I’m writing this up, or is it pretty much as is?

N: So, I sent you the magazines, and that should be a big help. This has, I think, descriptions of all the programs in here. And I think, as you look through the strategic plan, you won’t find anywhere where we say “we’re going to develop a community outreach program.” Now, we did just hire a deputy director for institutional advancement, and in her job description is to keep the museum...to create buzz out there, to create relationships and things, which is also what I do. So, maybe we will, you know, separate this out. But, at this moment, I would just say that it isn’t separated out.

J: Okay. The last one is basically the same thing, so I have a feeling that it’s going to have a very similar answer. Is there way the actual administration of the programs differs from the written descriptions? You gave me the rundown on a bunch of stuff, and there’s a whole lot of stuff written down fairly well in here. I’m just wondering if there are any differences between the way that those are carried out and the way that they’re written down, or is everything fairly by the book?

N: So, we’re starting to look at things, and we use to just add more, add more, add more, as you can see by the list; we just did tons of stuff. And so, I would say we’re doing a better job (in fact, in the back of this, there are forms that our education department uses, they designed, they are just so good). You know, I just do this in my head. When I say, should we do something with the watercolor society, I do it in my head. What is the audience? I know in my head what the audience is, but I write a little sheet down about it, why would we do it and so on. But they really, I mean, they have to write it up, they take it to the department meeting and the whole department analyzes whether they’re going to do it or not, and then they’ll give it a few tries. For example, we had this thing called Game Show, which I think you can see on YouTube if you want to see it. It brings in a
young, hip, creative audience, which is one of our target audiences because our traditional audience is women like me. You see a lot of white women with gray hair, 60s, 60 year old women interested in art, and we’ve got them, we know we’ve got them. We don’t want to forget them, but we’ve got to start getting some younger people and some families in or we’re going to die on the vine, right? So, they have this thing for young professionals called Game Show, and it’s like The Price is Right type of game show. I mean, it’s not The Price is Right, but it’s a game show. And it’s fun and people compete and it’s about art and creativity. The first time they did it they had about ten people, and then it went to 25, and now they’re getting tons of people. They found that if they work with another outside group, that group will bring people, so they’ve learned now about marketing it much better. So, they gave it a chance and it grew. Then you have this thing called Craftacular Spectacular, which cost tons of money to put it on and, like, three people came. Then they put it on a second time and I don’t know if it got any better, so you’ll drop that. So, even if it’s on our list of things we say we do, we may not do it anymore.

J: Okay. So, it seems like you all are fairly adaptive on the fly, then.

N: We are really adaptive on the fly. We turn on a dime. And I think, you know what? I think that’s one of the good things about the museum, is that we’re small enough that we can turn on a dime. You have somebody like a big museum, Cincinnati or Cleveland, for them, a recession comes and they can live off their endowment for a while. But then, the endowment starts going down, and how do you turn a big organization like that fast? You don’t. Whereas we have very little endowment, although I will say that we have the largest endowment of any arts organization in town. It’s dwarfed by our sister museums. In fact, our space, our footprint is dwarfed by…we’re smaller than Dayton, even after our expansion we’re smaller than Dayton. We’re smaller than Canton. I mean, so we can turn on a dime, you bet, and we do. We come up with new ideas, we study old ones and we can say “gosh, this isn’t working for us,” and we can drop it. And we’re used to raising our money, too. We’re not used to living on our endowment. As I was telling you, Toledo lives on their endowment. They have a huge endowment, but when their endowment is going down because the whole economy is going, then you have trouble. It’s like we had a little trouble, too, but we’re used to raising our money.

J: Oh, gosh.

N: So, yes, you have to show me these quotes before you use them.

J: Yeah, um, once I have the transcription done, which will be…I’m hoping to have all my transcribing done over the weekend…

N: Wow.
J: Yeah, that is probably against my better judgment putting off writing original content until I get my transcription done because I know otherwise I'll keep putting it off and that'll be a disaster. So, once I have the transcription done, I’ll send it over for you to review. That way, we can make sure there’s nothing in there…

N: Nothing goofy.

J: It’s a dissertation in the arts. Goofy is endearing.

N: Oh, I see.

J: Alrighty then. That’s pretty much all I have, so I will kill the recording.

*END*
Kellie Yoskovich
Manager of Community Development
Columbus Blue Jackets

1.) Could you please briefly describe and explain your organization’s outreach programs?

2.) What are the considerations and processes for developing and implementing new outreach programs?
   a. The Columbus Blue Jackets has two departments who implement and manage outreach programs. The Community Relations department is committed to a variety of grassroots outreach programs designed to have a positive impact in central Ohio and beyond. The team’s players, coaches, broadcasters and mascot Stinger support this community engagement with appearances and participation at various events throughout the year. The Blue Jackets Foundation, the charitable arm of the hockey club, is a vehicle through which the franchise’s athletes, coaches and staff contribute time and financial resources to organizations supporting the Foundation’s four pillars of giving: the fight against pediatric cancer; education; children’s health & safety and the development of youth & amateur hockey.

These two departments have a shared staff and a completely new staff as of the start of the 2011-12 season so we stuck with the programs that were already in place as we didn’t have time to plan and execute new programs and initiatives. In this off-season the Blue Jackets Foundation will look at budgets to create revenue goals and determine if there needs to be any new fundraising events added. The Community Development focuses on educational programs and various community initiatives such as coat drives and blood drives as well as giving out autographed merchandise to use as a fundraising tool for non-profits in Ohio. We work closely with our Fan Development department and corporate partners to determine what programs can be leveraged by corporate partners’ involvement.
We also work closely with other NHL teams to learn their best practices and to get new ideas to keep programs fresh and relevant.

3.) Is there a mission or philosophy that guides your organization’s outreach programs? If so, could you please explain it?
   a. The Blue Jackets Foundation has four main pillars of giving: the fight against pediatric cancer, youth & amateur hockey development, education and children’s health & safety. The Foundation primarily works with local non-profit organizations who focus in one or more of those areas.

4.) Why does your organization conduct these programs? What are the goals of these programs?
   a. The goals of our programs are to be good citizens in the Columbus community and create excitement and a love of hockey in the Columbus community.

5.) How do you see these programs impacting the community? How do you see these programs impacting the organization?
   a. I think the best example of how our programs impact the community is in the growth of youth hockey. In 1991 there were two (2) sheets of ice in the Columbus area: The Ohio State University Rink and the Expo Center.

There are now thirteen (13) sheets of ice in the Columbus area:
- Nationwide Arena
- OhioHealth Ice Haus
- Schottenstein Center/Value City Arena (Ohio State)
- Ohio State Ice Rink
- Newark Ice Rink
- Ohio State Expo Center
- Chiller Ice Works, built in 2001 (one regulation sheet)
- Chiller Dublin, built in 1993 (two regulation NHL sheets)
- Chiller Easton, built in 1997 (two sheets, one Olympic size and one regulation NHL)
- Chiller North, built in 2004 (two regulation NHL sheets)

In 1994 there were three (3) hockey organizations, at any level, playing hockey in the Columbus area:
- Ohio State Men’s hockey
Upper Arlington High School Hockey
Capital Amateur Hockey Association (CAHA)

Currently there are:
- five (5) youth organizations
  - Capital Amateur Hockey Association (CAHA)
  - Columbus Chill Youth Hockey Association (CCYHA)
  - Easton Youth Hockey Association (EYHA)
  - Columbus Ice Hockey Club (CIHC)
  - Newark Ice Hockey Association (NIHA)
- seventeen (17) high school hockey programs (making 31 teams)
  - Upper Arlington Varsity/JV
  - Thomas Worthington Varsity
  - Worthington Kilbourne Varsity
  - Bishop Watterson Varsity
  - St. Charles Varsity Varsity/JV
  - Dublin Scioto
  - Dublin Coffman (three Dublin Schools combine to form 2 JV teams)
  - Dublin Jerome
  - Gahanna Varsity/JV
  - DeSales Varsity
  - Olentangy Liberty Varsity/JV
  - Olentangy Orange Varsity/JV
  - Olentangy Braves Varsity/JV
  - Westerville Club/JV
  - Pickerington Club/JV
  - Hilliard Club/JV
  - Northeast Club/JV
  - Newark Club/JV

Ohio State Men’s hockey and Ohio State Women’s Hockey
Chiller Adult Hockey League with over 100 teams compared to 25 teams in 1999
One (1) all womens hockey program (CCYHA Blue Jackets Girls Hockey)
Junior Jackets learn to play hockey program

Youth Participation:
- In 1995 there were 150 youth players registered in the Columbus area

Currently there are over 4500 players registered in the Columbus area:
• 2500+ in the Junior Jackets learn to play program
• 450+ in CAHA
• 850+ in CCYHA
• 350+ in EYHA
• 150+ in Columbus Travel Hockey
• 200+ in NIHA

6.) How does your organization conceptualize its public value? How is this public value measured?
   a. The mission of the Columbus Blue Jackets is to provide world class, major league sports entertainment for our fans and corporate partners that delivers a high level of value worthy of their support and investment in us. With a very disappointing 2011-12 season we had a group of fans who held a rally in front of the arena to encourage owners to look at replacing upper level management, thinking that these changes would yield a more competitive team. We had a meeting with the president of the team who said that this rally was actually a good sign of our public value as it showed how much passion our fan base has and how much they care. It was a really interesting way to look at the situation. I’m not certain that you can really measure public value. We could look at our ticket sales numbers, the sales of merchandise in our stores, the amount of money spent by corporate partners, the number of donation requests we receive, the amount of money the Foundation gives out every year and the number of youth who are playing hockey but I don’t think that we can actually measure our public value.

7.) Are there any details regarding the administration or nature of your organization’s outreach programs that would augment the written accounts and descriptions?
   a. N/A

8.) Are there any ways in which the actual administration of these programs differs from their stated mode of function in the written descriptions? If so, what caused this difference?
   a. N/A