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ABSTRACT

This thesis looks at the geographic distribution of antipoverty nonprofit organizations in the 52 neighborhoods that makeup Cincinnati, Ohio in 1990 and 2000. This is done to determine if a disparity in antipoverty nonprofit service provision exists within these communities. In addition, this thesis examined the effects of population decline, demographic changes and redevelopment efforts on the antipoverty nonprofit organizations located in the Over the Rhine community as they relate to service utilization and location reliance. Over the Rhine has the highest concentration of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in the city. Furthermore, historically the community has suffered from a variety of socioeconomic problems as well as continual population declines. In addition, Over the Rhine is currently experiencing aggressive redevelopment efforts, making it a suitable, if not a prime location to focus this study.

There are four major findings (1) There is an equitable social service distribution in place in Cincinnati, however there was minor improvement in this distribution from 1990 to 2000. (2) Cincinnati communities are both underserved and overburdened by this unbalanced distribution. (3) Location reliance in Over the Rhine is related to factors of accessibility, demand and community commitment. (4) The development and demographic changes are related to a rise in nonresident service utilization. The thesis concludes with a discussion of the findings and recommendations for further research.
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I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Concept

This study has two primary objectives. First it will determine the geographic distribution of antipoverty nonprofit organizations in the 52 neighborhoods that makeup Cincinnati, Ohio in 1990 and 2000. The purpose of this objective is to determine if a disparity in antipoverty nonprofit service provision exists within these communities. Essentially, this section of the thesis investigates the overall effectiveness of the antipoverty nonprofit system as it pertains to service availability.

The second objective is to develop an understanding of the effects of population decline, demographic changes and redevelopment efforts on the antipoverty nonprofit organizations located in the Over the Rhine community as it relates to service utilization and location reliance. In other words, this section will explore the ability of antipoverty nonprofits to maintain adequate levels of low-income clientele and to distribute their services effectively (based on their own goals); and whether or not being located in Over the Rhine is essential to doing the both of these.

So, the first section of the thesis will provide a landscape view of the overall effectiveness of the antipoverty nonprofit system in Cincinnati. The findings of this section are subsequently linked to the antipoverty nonprofits in Over the Rhine. As we will discuss more in depth later, Over the Rhine has the highest concentration of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations

---

1 Antipoverty Nonprofit is used interchangeably with social service providers/organizations throughout the study ; The term is more thoroughly defined in the Literature Review chapter
in the city. Furthermore, historically the community has suffered from a variety of socioeconomic problems as well as continual population declines. In addition, Over the Rhine is currently experiencing aggressive redevelopment efforts, making it a suitable, if not a prime location to focus this study.

The research questions posed to accomplish the objectives stated above are: (1) Is there an equitable distribution of antipoverty nonprofit services in the communities of Cincinnati? (2) How have demographic and developmental changes (past, present and future) in Over the Rhine affected the antipoverty nonprofits in the community?

1.2 Problem Statement

In late 2008, nonprofit organizational leaders in Over the Rhine filed a federal lawsuit against the city of Cincinnati in response to proposed zoning changes that would restrict social service agencies from concentrating in a single neighborhood (Prendergast J., 2009). Prior to the proposed zoning changes, the City lost a two year court battle against CityLink, an organization planning to develop a social services mall in the community of West End² (May, 2008). In 2002, the City enacted a new set of anti-panhandling laws and formed a unit of 15 police officers to enforce the laws in downtown Cincinnati. Subsequently, nonprofit leaders in the area challenged these laws as well (Fischer, 2003).

In October 2008, city officials enacted an emergency ordinance directing the Cincinnati/Hamilton County Continuum of Care for the Homeless to establish a comprehensive plan for the adequate provision of homelessness services. The plan was introduced to the public in late April 2009. More recently several city council members, along with Mayor Mark Mallory,

---

² The community of West End is adjacent to Over the Rhine
signed on to restore financial support to over 50 human services programs that had previously suffered funding cuts (Business Courier, 2009).

These stories and others like them, reveal the complex nature of the relationship that is maintained between antipoverty nonprofit organizational leaders and Cincinnati city officials. It is a relationship that requires a delicate balance of support, coordination and continual assessment between both parties in order to remain mutually beneficial. But as evident in the above anecdotes, maintaining this balance has been problematic, especially in the case of Over the Rhine. The reoccurring debate in Over the Rhine seems to stem from the widely held perception that the community is over inundated with social service providers. This is evident by the fact that Over the Rhine is often dubbed the “ unofficial social services hub of Cincinnati ” (Over the Rhine Foundation, 2008).

Of course there was a time when social service providers were welcomed with open arms into the Over the Rhine community. In fact, many of them were given significant funding to locate in Over the Rhine in an effort to confront the many socioeconomic problems that plagued the community. So, why has this relationship changed? One possibility is that the strategies employed to reinvent Over the Rhine in years passed, specifically included nonprofit organizations that would reach out to the overwhelming number of impoverished residents in the community. Thus, as problems presented themselves in the neighborhood, such as soaring crime, dropout and unemployment rates, an organization would arrive to combat the issue. Eventually, this responsive behavior led to an Over the Rhine characterized by an extensive network of social service providers that chose the location based on its apparent needs (Miller, 1998).
And while the needs of Over the Rhine did not change, the population did and so did the city’s strategy to reinvent it. Staggering population declines in the neighborhood and a corresponding increase in vacant buildings offered the city a unique opportunity to revitalize the area without toiling with what to do with a large population of poor residents. In effect, the strategy for revitalization in Over the Rhine had transitioned from one which depended on the services provided by antipoverty nonprofits, to one that sought to gentrify and therefore attract an entirely different economic sector into the area – a sector that did not depend on the services provided by the abundance of agencies in the community (Ambrosino, 2007).

Suddenly, Over the Rhine’s social service sector began to take on the reputation of muckrakers and opponents, rather than advocates for positive neighborhood change. Media outlets, city officials and even some nonprofit leaders are now quick to proclaim that Over the Rhine is excessively saturated with social service providers, however, there has yet to be a study conducted to verify these claims and to compare the community’s antipoverty nonprofit sector with others in Cincinnati (May b, 2008). This thesis proposes to do just that and to understand what affect demographic changes and redevelopment efforts in Over the Rhine are having on antipoverty nonprofits in the community.

What this study aims to understand is what happens to antipoverty nonprofit organizations when the neighborhood they were created to serve no longer requires the same level of assistance? Do they become obsolete? Do they reconfigure their mission? Do they follow the demand? Through conversations with representatives of five antipoverty nonprofit organizations in Over the Rhine this study will shed light on these and other pertinent questions.
1.3 Historical Demographics Shifts in Over the Rhine

In order to gain insight on the perspective outlined above and demonstrate why Over the Rhine is an important community to focus on for this study, we must first understand the complex and troubled history of the community. The 360 acres that makeup Over the Rhine is located adjacent north of Cincinnati’s central business district. The neighborhood is often the subject of research and news headlines due to its unique mix of assets and detriments including, an abundant supply of 19th century Italianate architecture, a prime location amidst several corporations in the CBD and south of the University-Medical complex in the Uptown of Cincinnati, as well as a much more popular history of economic decline, urban blight and racial tension (Addie, 2006).

Following the departure of a large population of German immigrants, who inhabited Over the Rhine until the early 1900’s, Appalachians, expectedly from eastern Kentucky, began to heavily migrate into the community. By the 1960’s the Appalachian population dominated the area. In response to a variety of socioeconomic issues that affected the group, a multitude of nonprofit, social service providers soon followed. This period was also marked by a population decrease in the community, going from approximately 44,475 residents in 1900 to 27,577 in 1960 (Over the Rhine Foundation, 2005).

The following decade was characterized by an influx of African-Americans as well as another population decrease. From 1960 to 1970, the population of Over the Rhine dropped to approximately, 15,025, a nearly 50 percent reduction, while the African American population more than doubled from 2,720 in 1960 to 5,830 in 1970. Many of the African Americans were expected to have arrived in Over the Rhine due to the demolition of low-income housing in the
West End (Over the Rhine Foundation, 2005). The entry of this new demographic introduced yet another set of social problems to the community and not surprisingly, social services agencies responded in like fashion.

![Population/Demographic Timeline OTR 1900 - 2007](image)

Following the 1970’s the population in Over the Rhine continued to decrease. In 1990 the community had approximately 9,572 residents and decreased even more in 2000 to 7,638 and again to 4,970 in 2007 (based on Shop 52 projections) - quite a long way from the 44,475 residents that occupied the area a century before. While many of the residents that remain in the community are poor and undereducated, 2007 median household income projections show an increase from 2000 estimates (Over the Rhine Foundation, 2005). From this evidence we can conclude that Over the Rhine has begun a new transition, one which focuses less on “to the rescue” service agencies, and more on an independent population base. It is a transition that creates realistic uncertainties for social service agencies in the community.
1.4 Rationale for the Study

Nonprofit organizations are major conduits of social change in local communities. They often represent a constituency that is consistently underrepresented in both governmental policy and funding decisions. This underrepresentation has manifested itself in a surplus of socioeconomic issues such as, homelessness, poverty, unemployment and health and educational disparities. While government intervention does exist, top-down, government initiated programs have proved inadequate in alleviating these issues, making onsite nonprofit organizations a fundamental necessity in achieving positive local change.

It is therefore important to understand how these organizations can fit seamlessly into a community and exist as drivers of success rather than antagonists. It is of course naïve to believe that a neighborhood, such as Over the Rhine, on the brink of a dramatic transition, will continue to require the exact same resources in the same capacity. However, it is unfair to make assumptions about the appropriate share of antipoverty nonprofit services in OTR without probing the public’s interest. It is also irresponsible to move forward in any direction without the proper research to aid us in understanding what a “high” concentration of social services is and how it actually impacts the community. In other words, public consensus and supporting research under the guidance of equitable distribution, is of utmost importance as we begin to analyze the OTR social service network.

However, it is important to note that this will not automatically lead to one particular solution. There will inevitably be a variety of ways in which to address the issue once the information gathering process concludes. Therefore it becomes exceedingly important for organizational leaders and city officials to work together in keeping abreast of the ever-changing
needs of Over the Rhine, otherwise they risk making adverse decisions that negatively impact the very community they wish to uplift. Moreover, the effects of the shifting geography of low-income populations and the corresponding need to reevaluate the distribution of social services are not neatly contained within OTR and thus have significant regional impacts.

But more importantly, is the ability of antipoverty nonprofits to effectively serve their targeted clientele. Location plays a major role in this. Whether Over the Rhine is the right location and to what extent is an issue that requires serious consideration. But it is important to understand that this is not a one sided conversation, nor is it an overnight fix. In other words, if after careful analysis of Over the Rhine the overall conclusion is that a high concentration of nonprofits is no longer beneficial to the community, the next step is to figure out where these organizations need to be and what kind of resources are required to help them transition.

On the other hand, if it is determined that the current social service network in OTR is necessary and desired, city officials and organizational leaders must work together to ensure the community is being efficiently served while proactively avoiding potential drawbacks. It is therefore pertinent that it is the result of strategic consideration and collective action. The hope is that this study will serve as a foundation for that action.

1.5 Outline of Thesis

The remainder of this study is comprised of four major chapters: (1) review of the pertinent literature, (2) data and methods, (3) findings and (4) conclusion. The review of the literature section in chapter 2 begins with an operational definition of antipoverty nonprofit organizations, which serves as a basis for understanding and evaluating the organizations mentioned throughout the study. Following this, the literature review assumes its traditional role
as it addresses previous research in the four fundamental areas relating to this study. These areas include: nonprofit location decisions, the relationship between nonprofits and low-income areas, service proximity, utilization and effectiveness, nonprofit concentration and community effects and the shifting location of the poor.

Chapter 3 discusses the data sources and methods of analysis used to gather and evaluate the information included in this study. Next, chapter 4 presents the findings of the study and organizes them as they relate to the previously stated research questions. Finally, chapter 5 summarizes the findings, linking them to broader implications and concludes with recommendations for further research.
II. REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

As previously stated, the first objective of this study was to analyze the geographical relationship of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations and impoverished communities within Cincinnati, OH. The purpose of this objective was to determine whether or not anti-poverty nonprofit organizations are located within the communities that demonstrate the greatest demand for their services. Secondly, the study sought to understand the effects of population decline and demographic changes on the antipoverty nonprofit organizations located in the Over the Rhine community. This study is unique to other similar studies because it focuses on neighborhood – level analysis and complements analytical conclusions with qualitative information gained through semi-structured interviews.

Prior research that is relevant to this study falls into five broad categories: (1) nonprofit location decisions, (2) the relationship between the location of nonprofits and impoverished communities, (3) nonprofit service proximity, utilization and effectiveness, (4) nonprofit concentration and community affects (5) the changing geography of the poor. This literature review will focus on research conducted in these four primary areas.

2.1 Defining Anti-Poverty Nonprofit

Before we address these five topics, some explanation on what exactly defines an anti-poverty nonprofit organization is needed. The United States nonprofit sector is widely encompassing. Studies that have nonprofit institutions as their primary focus sometimes neglect to extract precise subsectors and instead attempt to explain nonprofit behavior as a much too simplified amalgamated tale (Salamon, 1992). This practice can be both remissive and misleading, thus it was important for this study to focus only on one segment of the larger
nonprofit sector in an attempt to isolate unique behavioral patterns. With that said, this process is not without its own flaws as it is sometimes difficult to determine which nonprofit subsector a particular organization belongs to. Still, the benefits of disaggregating the nonprofit sector for research far outweigh the drawbacks and it is a process that enables us to explain more than its cumulative counterpart.

Thus, while defining the nonprofit sector and its various subsectors is a complex and imperfect process, it is also a valuable and important practice in order to effectively study the sector and draw meaningful comparisons over time and space. Classification helps us to understand the distributional variations of nonprofits across different communities and allows us to come up with solid justifications for these variations. In addition, it allows us to better understand how the sector has changed over time and why (Morris, 2000).

The National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) classifies the nonprofit sector into 26 major categories. Table 2.1 presents the NTEE core codes. These codes represent the major nonprofit activity categories and are further broken down into subcategories similar to the structure of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). For example, the A category is Arts, Cultures and Humanities, while A20 is Arts and Culture and A23 is Cultural and Ethnic activities. This system is used by the Internal Revenue Service as well as the United States Census.

The problem we face when we are specifically discussing organizations that specialize in poverty alleviation is that they exist within multiple NTEE categories. For example, many of the organizations that specifically target and serve the low-income and no-income populations are in category P – Human Services. This includes services such as financial/transportation counseling and assistance. However, they also fall into category J – Education, in areas such as job training,
as well as category L – Housing and Shelter in nearly all of its subcategories (National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Arts, Culture &amp; Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Animal-Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mental Health &amp; Crisis Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Diseases, Disorders &amp; Medical Disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Medical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Legal-Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Food, Agriculture &amp; Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Public Safety, Disaster Preparedness &amp; Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Youth Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>International, Foreign Affairs &amp; National Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Civil Rights, Social Action &amp; Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Community Improvement &amp; Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Philanthropy, Voluntarism &amp; Grantmaking Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Public &amp; Societal Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Religion-Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Membership Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 NTEE Core Codes

Alternatively, when a nonprofit organization applies for its tax exempt status with the IRS they are asked to specify the top three activities they will engage in within the community. These activities fall into the following major categories, which correspond with NTEE codes and makeup the IRS nonprofit classification system. Not only does the IRS classification system provide an inadequate level of description when compared to the NTEE, but it also relies heavily on the NTEE for its clarification requirements. Therefore, while this classification system does exist, it is limited in explanatory value and is unsupportive to the level of detail required for this study.

The purpose of focusing on antipoverty nonprofit organizations is to attempt to systematically exclude those organizations whose locational behavior cannot be similarly explained, such as hospitals, churches, foundations and museums. While these types of organizations are certainly included in the nonprofit sector, they serve a much broader audience
and therefore behave differently than those that specially serve the poor. This study also focuses on antipoverty nonprofits in an effort to be consistent with Peck and Allard’s studies in Arizona and California (2008, 2004). With this said, the study will focus on organizations which fall into the same major categories used by Peck (2008) in order to provide a consistent set of results that will better help us understand the general phenomenon. However, this report will narrow its findings to only include specific subsectors within each major category.

Something should be said about Community Development Corporations (CDCs) as they do deliver anti-poverty services but will not be included in this study. This is due to the fact that CDCs have unique locational behaviors. A CDC is attached to the community rather than the inhabitants of that community. They exist in order to better their surroundings regardless of the existing demographics. Therefore, population shifts do not have consequential effects on CDCs, specifically their locational preferences. In the case of CDC’s, the community is the primary client thus their location remains static.

Opportunely, Peck’s 2008 study on the location of antipoverty nonprofit organizations in Phoenix, AZ did a thorough job of describing the antipoverty nonprofit sector. Drawing from her study, an anti-poverty nonprofit organization is one whose primary focus is to provide poverty relief to poor populations in the following areas: “education, health, mental health, justice, food banks/soup kitchens, shelters, legal services, community development, housing, youth development, residential services, foster care and adoption, and homeless services” (Peck, 2008).

I provide this description with the understanding that it is not very precise, but it does attempt to be as inclusive as possible. Essentially, the primary criterion for being defined as an antipoverty nonprofit, would be a strategic effort to specifically target poor populations. Once
this condition is met, we will look at organizations that specifically provide poverty related services, such as the ones provided by Peck. These services correspond to the 2005 Core Codes: B, E, F, I, J, K, L, O and P as provided by the National Taxonomy of Tax Exempt Entities (Bielefeld, 2000). In addition, this report will only analyze those organizations in the subsectors included in Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Category</th>
<th>Subsectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B01, B80, B82, B90, B92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E01, E21, E32, E50, E60, E70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F01, F20, F21, F22, F30, F32, F42, F50, F52, F54, F60, F99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I01, I21, I31, I43, I44, I71, I72, I73, I99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>J01, J20, J21, J22, J30, J33, J99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>K30, K31, K34, K35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L20, L21, L22, L24, L25, L30, L40, L41, L80, L81, L82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O01, O20, O21, O22, O23, O50, O51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P01, P19, P20, P22, P24, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P33, P40, P42, P43, P45, P50, P52, P60, P62, P70, P71, P73, P75, P80, P83, P84, P85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 NTEE Codes Included in Study

Accordingly, the definition of an anti-poverty nonprofit organization for this report is a tax exempt entity that provides poverty alleviation services to some subset of the poor, within the NTEE categories listed in Table 2.2. If this definition seems both simplistic and broad it is because there is no clearly efficient way of defining this sector with more detail. In fact, attempting to narrow the definition may exclude additional organizations that provide poverty relief services (Gronbjerg K., 1994). Therefore, the definition given above provides us with tactical approach to studying this issue.
2.2 Nonprofit Location Decisions

There is a fair amount of literature that addresses the location decisions of nonprofit organizations (Bielefeld and Murdoch, 2004; Gronbjerg and Paarlberg, 2001; Bielefeld, et. al, 1997; Milligan and Fyfe, 2004; Fofak, 2000). These studies typically attempt to explain nonprofit location decisions in two different ways: organizations that locate in a community for supply reasons (access to human resources, social networks, etc.) and those that locate in a community because there is a high level of demand (need for their services) present. It should be fairly obvious that neither supply nor demand theories provide an all-inclusive explanation that could serve to justify the location decision of every nonprofit organization in the country. However, the available research does explain the vast majority of locational decisions made by many nonprofit organizational leaders.

For example, Bielefeld and Murdoch’s 2004 study on six different metropolitan regions across the U.S. examined the degree to which nonprofit locations were determined by the location of other nonprofits as well as for-profits. They found that nonprofits that conducted similar activities were seldom clustered in one area. This could likely be due to a targeted effort to avoid service duplication within one community (this is often cited as a problem in Over the Rhine). In addition Bielefeld and Murdoch (2004) found that nonprofit clustering could be better explained by the needs and resources model (supply and demand), although location patterns varied by region.

The location of a nonprofit will not only have substantive consequences on the organization, but the encompassing community as well. Location influences an organization’s access to employees, materials, volunteers and clientele. It can also determine their level of success in carrying out their mission. Hence an organization’s continued existence significantly
depends on the location decision (Bielefeld and Murdoch, 2004). In the case of the antipoverty nonprofits we shall discuss in this thesis, they are often community-based and locally operated, making location not only important but one of the core aspects of their overall mission. In other words, antipoverty nonprofits are often tied to the communities they serve (Gronbjerg and Paarlberg, 2001).

The supply side of the equation demonstrates how nonprofit institutions mimic their for-profit counterparts when deciding where to locate. In this case, organizations are established according to “powerful institutional actors in their environment”, perceived amount of donor participation and other considerations for shared infrastructure, communication, taxes and supply costs. Simply stated, some nonprofits gravitate to areas where they can better mobilize resources (Bielefeld and Murdoch, 2004). Research has found that both the level of donated funds and volunteer support in a community correlates positively to nonprofit activity. Middle income, heterogeneous neighborhoods are more likely to have more volunteer and donor support (Bielefeld, et. al, 1997).

A 2001 report by Gronbjerg and Paarlberg looked at how supply, demand and social structure theories predict overall nonprofit concentration within local communities in an Indiana county. Their findings on nonprofit location patterns support the supply and social structure theories, while the demand theory is not explanatory. One of the reasons demand side explanations were not indicative of nonprofit location patterns in this particular study is because the authors examined nonprofit concentration on a per capita basis, therefore communities with extremely high levels of demand exhibited fewer nonprofits per 10,000 residents. Particularly supportive supply side factors were related to human capital. Specifically, communities with better educated and older residents (between 45 and 64) were more likely to have a high
prevalence of nonprofits (Gronbjerg and Paarlberg, 2001). These findings are intriguing when juxtaposed to the Over the Rhine community, which has a steadily declining population and a growing antipoverty nonprofit sector.

On the other hand, many nonprofit organizations determine the best location by first establishing which community demonstrates the greatest need for their services. In other words, the nonprofit organization will determine its location by seeking out a community with particular demographic characteristics or socioeconomic problems. Primarily, nonprofits that provide social services to low-income or disadvantaged populations (antipoverty nonprofits) fall into this category (Bielefeld, et. al, 1997).

In 1997 Bielefeld, Murdoch and Waddell examined the relationship between nonprofit location patterns and socioeconomic characteristics in Dallas County, Texas. Their study was supportive of demand side explanations. The authors found that income, age and minority composition positively influenced the location of nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit activity and the aforementioned demographics correlated the strongest within the center of the city, getting progressively weaker the further they moved away from the city’s core (Bielefeld, et. al, 1997). This finding is interesting because the authors do not assert that the level of demand decreases outside of the city’s core. Instead the relationship between demand and nonprofit activity weakens. This could result in inadequate service provision for low-income populations residing outside of the urban core – a possibility which is one of the primary concerns of this report.

Furthermore, in some cases the demand for services in a community can be both the reason for the location decision as well as for the establishment of the organization itself. In other words, sometimes organizations are created to serve a particular need in a specific place.
After determining where the pockets of poverty exist, place is a possible criterion to determine eligibility for poverty reduction programs in geographic targeting efforts (Fofack, 2000).

Milligan and Fyfe’s 2004 study of Glasgow explored the ways in which geographical analysis could provide further explanation as to the inequitable distribution of voluntary organizations across space. They found that the uneven development of the voluntary sector in Glasgow was due to a variety of social, political and institutional factors that excessively encouraged third sector development in some areas while (blatantly and circuitously) discouraging it in others. The authors go on to site local and national policy, governmental programs and specialized funding as some of the underlying causes of nonprofit agglomeration (Milligan and Fyfe, 2004). This finding is of utmost importance to this study because much of the circulating debate in Over the Rhine pertains to the inequitable concentration of social service providers in the area. Thus, Milligan and Fyfe’s study sheds some light on how the community of Over the Rhine became the unofficial social services hub of Cincinnati.

Again, it is important to note that locational decisions are unique to the specific type of nonprofit organization. Studies that show no evidence of demand-side location behavior, often neglect to view the nonprofit sector as several individual subsectors with extremely different goals as well as behaviors. When viewed aggregately the true locational behavior of these different subsectors is skewed. This is obvious when you consider that a nonprofit institution such as a museum would behave drastically different than a homeless shelter. In order to gain a full understanding of nonprofit location decisions, one must endeavor to study each subsector individually, consequently this study only attempts to explain the locational behavior of antipoverty nonprofit organizations.
2.3 The Relationship between the Location of Nonprofits and Impoverished Communities

Next, we look at the relatively small amount of research that has been conducted on nonprofit locations and its relationship to impoverished communities and/or regions. Four major studies include particularly useful models in studying this relationship. In a 2003 Los Angeles County study, Wolch and Joassart-Marcelli found that the distribution of antipoverty organizations was not even across the region and there were more organizations and allocated expenditures occurring in the central city where most of the county’s poor population resided. But when viewed proportionately, there were less antipoverty nonprofits providing services to large populations in poor areas, whereas wealthier, suburban locations, with smaller poor populations had more organizations proportionate to their size (Wolch & Joassart-Marcelli, 2003).

Furthermore, they found that although services in suburban locations are not limited to suburban residents, there is a “distance-decay pattern” of utilization, which is conducive to a strong relationship between the location of antipoverty nonprofits and client usage. Therefore, people in “service poor” communities do not have adequate access to nonprofit services (Wolch & Joassart-Marcelli, 2003). Finally they found that the average number of poor people served by nonprofit organizations in an impoverished community is significantly higher than in suburban locations, which suggests a lower level of effective service (Wolch & Joassart-Marcelli, 2003).

Focusing on the welfare population as a unique subset of the poor, Allard’s three-city study exploring the geography of poverty – nonprofit service relationship, revealed a similar trend. His findings suggest that center-city poor have greater access to poverty alleviation services than poor individuals located in the suburbs, but that proportionately, the level of demand in the center city far outweighs the demand in the suburbs. His findings also reveal that
demographic changes in a community do not necessarily correlate with the location of service provision (Allard, 2004). In other words, as the poor move out of impoverished areas, the nonprofit service providers do not follow.

This phenomenon is central to the investigation of this thesis. In his study, Allard suggested that nonprofit organizational leaders and policy makers should take a proactive stance in remedying the pending spatial mismatch of social service providers and poor populations (Allard, 2004). This thesis aims at investigating whether or not nonprofit leaders are aware of this problem and what they are prepared to do as a result.

Peck’s 2008 study of the Phoenix, Arizona found that there was a greater density of antipoverty nonprofit organizations in the central part of the metropolitan area. Peck’s study used an accessibility measure to demonstrate that community members could easily access services in adjacent neighborhoods. This measure served well to point out that when competition for services is taken into account, organizations that provide poverty relief services are not ideally positioned (Peck, 2008).

Bielefeld, Murdoch and Waddell (1997) also studied the geography of intrametropolitan nonprofits. Specifically, they looked at the effects of demographic characteristics on the location of social, health and educational services in Dallas County. They found that more nonprofits located in communities characterized by higher incomes and greater access to resources as well as higher minority populations with greater needs. They also found that nonprofits were more likely to locate in racially heterogeneous neighborhoods. More importantly however, was their conclusion of the importance of community-based needs as well as resources to support nonprofit activity (Bielefeld, Murdoch, & Waddell, 1997).
Although conducted on different scales, the findings of these studies are very similar but they each neglect to include the integral and unique voice of nonprofit organizational leaders. If what Allard suggests is true and there is currently a major shift in the geography of the poor (welfare population) it seems as though we should next seek to understand how nonprofit leaders are responding to this change, if they are responding at all. The inclusion of actual organizational leaders’ feedback is likely the chief advantage of this study.

2.4 Service Proximity and Utilization

Vital to this study is a discussion of service proximity, utilization and effectiveness; we are after all making a huge fuss over the location of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations in relation to the segment of the population that most require their services. The question then is: why do we even care if antipoverty nonprofits are located in the most impoverished communities? Why isn’t it just as efficient if the organizations are located elsewhere within the city? The literature on service proximity and utilization can help us understand the importance of inter-community location versus the less effective cross-town counterpart.

Naturally included in a discussion of community are issues such as neighborhood effects and social capital. On their own, these two concepts have large body of corresponding research, however, here we do not intend to discuss them in depth but instead focus on them as they relate to the importance of service proximity.

Perhaps the most telling argument as to the importance of organizational proximity is the one on service utilization. Several studies point to the seemingly obvious fact that low-income populations are better able and more likely to utilize nonprofit services if located in an easily accessible location (Allard, 2003; Benin & Keith, 1995;Ihlanfeldt, 1998). Inadequate linkages
between antipoverty nonprofit social service providers in different program areas, ineffective administration, lack of cultural competency and low-level outreach efforts have all been identified as factors shaping social service utilization rates among low-income populations (Benin & Keith, 1995). In addition, longer distance correlates to lengthy commutes, especially for welfare recipients who may not have adequate transportation. Given these difficult commutes to work, child care, welfare programs offices, and other obligatory locations, increased distance to antipoverty nonprofit service providers will make accessibility even more difficult (Small, 2004). Thus access to the services provided by nonprofit organizations is positively correlated to service utilization.

As suggested above, language, racial and cultural barriers between clients and service providers play a fundamental role in discouraging service utilization among poor individuals (Small, 2004). This hindrance is more likely to be curbed if the organization is located within the client’s community. Furthermore, welfare recipients that live farther from antipoverty nonprofit organizations would likely have less information about the organization and would therefore be less likely to utilize that service (Allard, 2003).

Aside from increased accessibility, nonprofit organizations serve yet another important role in urban communities. The mere presence of these institutions is suggestive of a serious effort to restore disenfranchised communities and mobilize the poor who inhabitant them (Ellen, 2003). Communities that lack social infrastructure play a large role in perpetuating poverty and dependence. In other words, place has a significant effect on the outcomes of an individual living in the place, a condition often termed as neighborhood effects (Furstenburg & Hughes, 1995). Nonprofit organizations instill needed social connections that help deter negative neighborhood
effects, making their presence in the community even more vital. Therefore, access to service providers also grants access to social capital (Small, 2004).

This social support is not only necessary to build self-esteem and self-reliance; it also connects poor populations to additional opportunities, information and expands their social networks (Benin & Keith, 1995). It can then be concluded that if not located within the community, antipoverty nonprofit organizations have little to no effect on poor populations. If service providers are located in inaccessible areas, they miss the opportunity to build supportive communities that are more conducive of upwardly mobile inhabitants.

2.5 The Effects of Nonprofit Concentration on Communities

Although we have explored demand side explanations for nonprofit location decisions as well as discussed the importance of service proximity in relation to utilization rates among low-income populations, the discussion presented here would be irresponsibly incomplete without examining the effects of nonprofit concentration on their encompassing communities. So far we know that antipoverty nonprofit organizations are often inclined to locate in socioeconomically disadvantaged communities because of their inherent need. We also know that this is beneficial to the low-income persons living in these communities because it provides greater accessibility to services.

However, demand side locational patterns can become problematic if not managed. As described earlier in the case of Over the Rhine, as problems increase in a community, so does the existence of antipoverty nonprofit organizations. This increase in services corresponds to an increase in the number of disadvantaged persons who travel to the community in search of assistance, thus creating a seemingly never-ending cycle. It is a complex issue that exists in cities
across the country and one that is often ignored until it creates a direct barrier for new
development and “economic growth”.

Take LA County’s infamous Skid Row for example. For decades, the area has been home
to a multitude of emergency shelters for the homeless, drug addiction support centers and mental
institutions among other things. It had become the “dumping” ground for LA’s most destitute. In
recent years, however, the area immediately surrounding Skid Row, once characterized by
vacant and dilapidated buildings, is now on an aggressive rebound. The vacant buildings are now
half million dollar lofts and the new residents along with city officials can suddenly take no more
of the conditions maintained on Skid Row (Dimassa and Winton, 2005).

Sacramento, California, is also taking action to alleviate some of the issues associated
with a heavy concentration of social services in a single community. Homeless men and women
who do not gain access to shelter facilities due to capacity issues, often setup illegal campsites
nearby. Organizations such as the American River Parkway Preservation Society complain that
the campsites encourage criminal activity and are bad for the environment. In January 2009,
Sacramento city officials proposed the creation of several legal campsites throughout the city in
an effort to promote a more equitable distribution of the city’s homeless (sharing the burden).

Another example of this issue takes us to our neighboring country, Canada in the city of
Ottawa. Again, antipoverty nonprofits are primarily concentrated in downtown Ottawa and they
are cited as the culprits behind exasperating the problems that exist in the area. In response, the
Community and Social Services Minister, Madeleine Meileur plans to disperse the organizations
to various parts of the region (Adam, 2008).
Of course this problem is not one-dimensional. As mentioned earlier the inequitable
distribution on social service providers is the result of a variety of institutional factors, stemming
from governmental policy, funding and programs. In addition, nonprofit organizational leaders
would quickly reject the idea of the city’s problems being a result of their existence – after all,
they were established to help the problem, not to make it worse.

2.6 The Changing Geography of the Poor

Of the other central themes of this paper, the dialogue on the changing spatial trends of
the poor is conceivably the most difficult to grasp. This is partly due to the fact that much of the
analysis on the subject is speculative at best, meaning that new geographic shifts are in their
initial stages and cannot be adequately quantified. But with strong redevelopment and
deconcentration efforts occurring in the inner city that are primarily aimed at attracting higher
income individuals to the area, it is hardly easy to dismiss the notion that the poor are on the
move. As we learned earlier, this fact is extremely evident in the case of the community of Over
the Rhine.

Local redevelopment plans, specifically in the center of the city are increasingly focused
on creating mixed-income communities that are better able to support the desired montage of
commercial development. Downtowns that have suffered from high crime rates and high levels
of poverty seek to reverse this trend and promote safe, walkable urban centers that cater to
diverse populations, primarily young professionals and empty nesters. This redevelopment focus
inherently means that property values will rise and many of the poor residents that live in
downtowns will have to relocate in order to find more affordable housing (Sofmer, 1999). Left
behind will be the abundance of anti-poverty nonprofit organizations that located in downtowns in order to serve the poor population that once lived there.

There is an entire body of literature devoted to the discussion of gentrification and its seemingly inherent displacement component. Gentrification is a phenomenon characterized by the positive transformation of socioeconomically injured urban communities through the entrance of middle and upper class residents (often called the gentry). This transformation takes place in both residential and social contexts, shifting previously disinvested communities with a deteriorating housing stock, into places characterized by plentiful commercial activity, strong social connections and a renovated housing supply (Zukin, 1987).

Gentrification is often viewed as an economic development tool; a way to rehabilitate old inner city neighborhoods that suffer from blight and disinvestment by encouraging upper income groups to move into the area. This in turn attracts a variety of new retail and commercial service providers upon the assumption that their businesses can be better sustained by the gentrifiers. The process undoubtedly is shown to result in a redistribution of income concentrations within the community, which is both viewed as the benefit of gentrification as well as the drawback. Thus, gentrification is championed by some and opposed by others. Opponents of the process primarily criticize it because it either directly or indirectly pushes the poor out of the community, a debate that is currently surrounding the proposed and completed development in the Over the Rhine. However, Over the Rhine is not unique in this way. The redevelopment of dilapidated downtowns with high concentrations of poverty in nearly every region of the country is linked to gentrification and therefore displacement (Zukin, 1987).

In Cincinnati’s Over the Rhine, The Center City Development Corporation (3CDC) is leading a similar mission to transform the area. Central to 3CDC’s mission is the attraction of
higher income groups to the community and since 2003 3CDC has taken multiple strides in attempting to re-create Over the Rhine as an attractive, trendy, mid to upper-income community. These efforts have put the development group at odds with the various community organizations and service providers in Over the Rhine. This head butting is primarily due to the fact that 3CDC’s existing residential developments are not affordable and therefore decrease the need and desire for antipoverty nonprofit activity in the community (La Botz, 2008). In addition many of the nonprofits in the area play the role of low-income advocate and do not like the idea of their clientele being directly or indirectly pushed out of the neighborhood.

Vine Street, a main corridor that connects the CBD, Over the Rhine and the Uptown is currently undergoing major redevelopment with the guidance of 3CDC. Since 2003 the development organization has utilized approximately $13 million in private funding to buy 152 buildings and 165 vacant lots. Their first major project in Over the Rhine was the Gateway Corridor, a group of trendy, upscale condos with boutique type shops underneath. The prices of these condo units were well beyond the means of any low-income resident. However, their next phase of development along Vine Street is promised to have a more mixed-income focus, with majority of the units being market rate but a small portion of them set aside for low-income homeowners.

To ease these tensions, 3CDC has recently partnered with Over the Rhine Community Housing in planning to construct 12 single family, low-income units on Pleasant Street in a project called City Home, as well as a 25 - unit building for the chronically homeless, on Oedon Street called the Jimmy Heath House. While this partnership is unquestionably beneficial to the community, it is also likely that The Jimmy Heath House is hoped to be a replacement for the Drop Inn Center, another homeless shelter located in the heart of Over the Rhine. The Drop Inn
Center’s location has been problematic for 3CDC as they’ve begun to plan for the redevelopment of the adjacent Washington Park and Music Hall. While this is speculation, it is not unfounded. In fact, the City has recently proposed new zoning regulations that would place certain restrictions on social service providers in the area. For example, the Drop Inn Center would have to limit the amount of residents they could house as well as eliminate dormitory style housing; a feature that makes the program economically feasible. In addition, if social service providers were forced to cluster together in order to be financially sustainable; the new zoning would prevent them from doing so (Osborne, 2008).

But even with the promise of a few low-income units and a new homeless shelter, low-income residents of Over the Rhine are still fearful that they will not be able to stay in the neighborhood. They are further concerned that the new shops and amenities are not at a price range that they can afford (Bernard-Kuhn, 2009). This concern is not likely one shared by City officials, as they desire to depart from a center city that is defined by blight, poverty and crime. And who could blame them? The detrimental effects of concentrated poverty are obvious. Nevertheless, Over the Rhine has the highest concentration of social service providers than anywhere else in the city and the leaders of these organizations should be concerned about their futures (Bernard-Kuhn, 2009).

An additional opposition to consider is the new, higher income persons who are moving into Over the Rhine with the hopes of it one day becoming a safe, walkable and trendy community. It is a fair possibility that this new group will develop the “not in my backyard syndrome” (NIMBYS), an emotional reaction that is not likely to be ignored by city officials. NIMBYism occurs when residents believe that certain developments, organizations or people hurt the character or value of their community and therefore they become very vocal in their
opposition to these organizations. This is likely to happen with the social service sector in Over the Rhine (Zakalunzny, 2007).

But strategic redevelopment initiatives led by development organizations are not the only factors to consider in the shifting geography of the poor. In addition, poverty deconcentration efforts play a major role in the location of need. Federal programs such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) and Housing Choice Voucher aim at promoting mobility of low-income families by giving them the opportunity to move into communities with less concentrated poverty. Whether these programs promote income mixing or low-income clustering in suburbs is still debated, but the fact remains that they do work to shift the geography of the poor. In fact, an analysis of the LIHTC indicated that increasingly, clusters of low-income voucher holders were forming in suburban locations north of the center of Cincinnati (Varady, 2006). This finding should be particularly alarming for center city nonprofits. For example, in a recent town hall forum held in Springfield Township, a suburban community, located approximately 20 minutes north of downtown Cincinnati, residents complained to the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA) about the growing concentration of section 8 voucher holders in the area. Currently Springfield Township has 720 voucher holders living in the community (Korte, 2009).

In Cincinnati, the 886-unit Lincoln Court, a housing project in the center of the city, was demolished to make way for 75 homes subsidized by the Low Income Housing Tax Credit, 50 homeownership units, and 250 public housing units. While this did result in a mixed-income environment, more than 600 low-income residents were displaced and given Section 8 vouchers in order to obtain housing elsewhere (Pitcoff, 1999). Where these 600 residents dispersed to is hard to determine, but the fact that they have otherwise relocated and are possibly no longer near
social service providers is case in point. Studies indicate that LIHTC are gaining in popularity with private developers meaning that more cities will experience a shift in their low-income population as developers build more LIHTC housing units (Varady, 2006).

Summary

This section has attempted to explain the various important components of this thesis through a review of the pertinent literature. Specifically we’ve determined that nonprofit organizations have unique locational behavior depending on the type of service provided. The anti-poverty subsector normally adheres to demand explanations of location decisions, thus the institutions that we focus on in this study will display this locational behavior.

Several studies have found that while more anti-poverty nonprofits are located in the urban core of cities, there is also a greater demand for their services. In addition we learned that service proximity is a significant factor in service utilization among low-income groups. Understanding this is core to this thesis as we aim to determine the spatial relationship between antipoverty nonprofits and poor communities in Cincinnati, OH.

Next, we discussed the effects of concentrated social service provision on the surrounding community. Finally, redevelopment trends and poverty deconcentration efforts across the country and in the center of Cincinnati is encouraging a shift in the geography of the poor, making us question the service ability of nonprofit organizations.
III. DATA AND METHODS

3.1 Spatial Analysis of Antipoverty Nonprofits

As previously mentioned, this study has two components. The first portion of this study seeks to determine the spatial distribution of antipoverty nonprofit service providers in the 52 communities that comprise Cincinnati, Ohio in the years 1990 and 2000. It seeks to answer the research question: *Is there an equitable distribution of antipoverty nonprofit services in the communities of Cincinnati?*

The spatial representation of data that is presented here is used to further illustrate distributional patterns of antipoverty nonprofit organizations between the two study years. This type of examination allows us to determine the spatial relationship between the two groups, as space and location is vital to the overall argument of this study (Coppock and Rhind, 1991).

The data used in this section of the thesis is gathered from three primary sources: (1) the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS), (2) the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) and (3) the United States Census Bureau.

The NCCS is an online database containing an abundant amount of information on the U.S. nonprofit sector. The information it provides is based upon IRS 990 form filings for exempt entities that have $25,000 or more in annual expenditures. Similar to Peck’s 2008 study, NCCS core files from 1988, 1989, 1990, 1997, 1998 and 1999 are used to gather nonprofit organizational addresses, which are then linked to census tracts.

Next, the NTEE is an online classification system used by government entities as well as scholarly researchers to enable more precise study of the nonprofit sector. The NTEE in this
study is used to appropriately categorize nonprofit organizations into sub-sub sectors that fall into the operational definition of an “anti-poverty nonprofit organization” as thoroughly explained in the Literature Review Section. For this study that includes the following sectors: education, health, mental health, justice, food banks/soup kitchens, shelters, legal services, community development, housing, youth development, residential services, foster care and adoption, and homeless services; corresponding to the following NTEE core codes: B, E, F, I, J, K, L, O and P. Thus, this study will limit its focus to nonprofit organizations that fall into the aforementioned categories and therefore meet the established criteria of an antipoverty nonprofit as described in chapter three (please see Table 2.2).

Tract level demographic data from the 52 neighborhoods in Cincinnati for 1990 and 2000 is derived from the United States Census Bureau. This includes the total population and poverty rate for individuals. This data will be linked to the information obtained through the NCCS to determine the relationship between poverty populations the presence of antipoverty nonprofit organizations in each neighborhood. As in Peck’s (2008) study, NCCS core files for 1988, 1989 and 1990 are linked to US Census Data for 1990 and core files for 1997, 1998 and 1999 correspond to US Census Data for 2000.

A service to poverty population ratio is used to analyze the effectiveness of social service delivery in each community. The number of people in poverty in each community represents the poverty population. This number is divided by the number of antipoverty nonprofit organizations in each community, revealing the proportion of services to poverty population. For example, if community X has a poverty population of 7,000 and has 4 antipoverty nonprofit organizations, I divide 7,000 by 4 to get 1,750. Therefore, for every one antipoverty nonprofit organization in community X, it serves 1,750 people.
While this is a simplistic and clear way of looking at the level of service provision within a community, there is no exact measure provided in this thesis to determine what level of service is indeed adequate or inadequate. Taking the example above, community X has a ratio of 1:1,750; however, there is no data to determine whether that system is ineffective or not. Thus, the numbers must stand alone and the communities must serve as comparative measures for each other.

Finally, this information will be displayed visually with the GIS database. GIS will present the information in map form, vividly displaying the spatial distribution of antipoverty nonprofit organizations as it compares to poverty populations.

3.2 How Do Community Changes Affect Antipoverty Nonprofits?

The second segment of this research seeks to find a more in-depth meaning of the results obtained in the first portion of the study. Specifically, it links the locational findings to actual community level affects. To be more specific, the first section of the study looks at overall antipoverty nonprofit effectiveness as it relates to service availability. If the findings suggest that there is inadequate social service system in place in Cincinnati, this not only impinges on the effectiveness of the antipoverty nonprofits in Over the Rhine as they are today, but will likely affect them in the future if the problem is to be addressed by city officials. Thus, this section of the study includes a multiple, explanatory case method, utilizing semi-structured interviews. The research question to be answered here is: How have demographic and developmental changes (past, present and future) in Over the Rhine affected the antipoverty nonprofits in the community?
“A case study refers to the collection and presentation of detailed information about a particular participant or small group, frequently including the accounts of subjects themselves. A form of qualitative descriptive research, the case study looks intensely at an individual or small participant pool, drawing conclusions about that participant or group and only in that specific context (Yin, 2009).”

Robert Yin suggests that a case study is utilized when the following conditions are met:

1. The study requires no control of behavioral events

2. The events to be described are contemporary

3. The research question(s) to be asked are why or how?

This study meets all of these conditions. The ever changing nature of Over the Rhine and its community organizations is vital to the significance of this study, thus behavioral events do not require control. Furthermore, one of the most noteworthy things about this thesis is its timeliness. While the issues being addressed in this thesis do not present a new problem that is occurring in Over the Rhine, they are issues that are currently under a significant level of scrutiny from city officials and community leaders. Finally, the third condition is clearly met through the research question stated above.

Again this study seeks to understand the effects of population decline and demographic changes on the antipoverty nonprofit organizations located in the Over the Rhine community as it relates to service utilization, service effectiveness and location reliance. We can only come to conclusions about this through a ground level discussion with organizational leaders. Thus, semi-structured interviews are utilized to effectively gather this data.
Five semi-structured interviews are used as the primary data gathering method in the second half of this study. The semi-structured interview is designed in a way that the researcher is in charge of the pace and breadth of the situation while still allowing for a certain level of flexibility, comfortability and open conversation. This allows the interviewee to fully express their opinion on a given subject while not discussing irrelevant issues. Foundational interview questions were created prior to the interviews, but the actual interview was open to unanticipated questions and feedback (McLellan, 2003). This process was not designed in a frigid manner, but instead it was designed to be the most conducive to an open exchange of thought and opinion.

The semi-structured interview process allows for vital and unforeseen information to emerge during the research. It is different from a structured process in which all the interview questions are preconceived and each interviewee is asked the same set of questions. While this method allows for rapid evaluation and comparison, the semi-structured process provides the opportunity for in-depth probing and interviewee revelations – two elements which are important to this study (Foddy, 1993). Therefore, this discussion will likely contribute greatly to our knowledge of this particular issue and point to realistic solutions for it. In this way, the case study method allows us to have a comprehensive view of the groups and people affected by the changing geography of the urban poor.

3.3 Interviews

For this study five representatives from Over the Rhine organizations, meeting the definition of an antipoverty nonprofit were interviewed. The organizations in Over the Rhine vary greatly in their size, scope and service provision, so it was important to select organizations that varied in these ways so that the discussion would be multi-dimensional and the information
gained would be from different perspectives. In addition, only those organizations that were at least 10 years old and had been located in Over the Rhine for at least 10 years were considered for the study for the following reasons:

1. **Aware of population changes**: knowledge of the changes in population and the emergence of the gentrifiers

2. **Embedded in the culture of the community**: knowledge of the unique social constructs that exists within the community

3. **Concrete knowledge of successes and failures**: knowledge of the level of success achieved in their current location as well as perceived and realistic impediments

Next, it was important to speak to the appropriate organizational representatives to gain a full and accurate understanding of the organization, its goals and objectives and its concerns (or lack thereof) with the changes occurring in the community. This process is inherently faulty because often those with the most information are not available to participate in thesis research and you are often forced to speak with whoever’s available. This situation is exasperated in the case of antipoverty nonprofits that have very small staffs that are often already over extended within their daily work load. With this noted, appropriate steps were taken to ensure that representatives were knowledgeable and understood what this study attempted to capture.

Two of five interviews were conducted in person. In one of the in-person interviews, a tape recorder was used to capture the data; however, there was no recording device in the second interview. Instead copious notes were taken in order to document the interview. This was done at the request of the interviewee. Two of five interviews were conducted primarily via email, although one of them included an informal in-person discussion, which was conducted at the interviewee’s organizational site. Although the email questions were sequentially ordered, the
initial responses were not answered in a complementary fashion. Instead there was a general explanation provided by the participant, which referred to some of the questions directly and left others out completely. In this case follow-up questions were sent to the participant via email for clarification and additional information as needed. The final interview was conducted via telephone and was documented by manual note taking. With the exception of the email interview, the interviews lasted approximately an hour each. Follow-up questions were handled via telephone.

3.3.1 Analyzing Interviews

Once the interview data was gathered, three themes were developed in order to standardize the way in which information was chosen to be included in the study. The themes were created based on the focus of the second thesis objective and the conversations that took place during the interview process. It was thus determined that all pertinent interview data (the information important to the study) would be related to the three themes. These themes also provided the format for discussing the interview data within the Findings chapter. The three themes are as follows:

1. Importance of being located in Over the Rhine to overall organizational mission
2. Effects of community changes on organizational mission
3. Servicing nonresidents

3.3.2 Organizational Information

Again the antipoverty nonprofits interviewed for this study varied in their scope of activities as well as their organizational structures. This section will briefly describe the activities of each organization. Names and professional titles are not used in this report. This is done to protect the privacy of the individuals who were interviewed and to adhere to the principles of confidentiality.
The five organizations included in this study are (in no particular order):

1. **The Drop Inn Center**: a homeless shelter that provides emergency accommodations, addiction support and transitional housing coordination for the homeless community

2. **The Emmanuel Community Center**: a community center focused on child care, arts and recreation and social bonding within the community

3. **The Contact Center**: a community organizing agency focused on poverty alleviation and empowerment among low-income populations

4. **Tender Mercies**: an organization providing permanent housing and related services for homeless persons with histories of mental or emotional disabilities

5. **Mary Magdalene House**: an organization providing a safe and convenient place for the homeless to take care of their personal hygiene, wash clothes and utilize a telephone and messaging system

### 3.4 Focusing on Over the Rhine

Again, this study examines the spatial distribution of antipoverty nonprofit organizations in Cincinnati, OH in order to gain perspective on the relationship between organization location and poverty. However, special attention is paid to the community of Over the Rhine and its institutions. The following provides explanation as to why this study narrows it focus to Over the Rhine as well as a discussion of criteria used to select the nonprofit organizations that participate in this study.

As we discussed more thoroughly in the background section of this paper, Over the Rhine is characterized by a plethora of distinguishable traits that make it an optimum location for this study. For one, Over the Rhine has historically been plagued with a variety of socioeconomic
issues. These issues are inextricably linked to the poor/minority populations that have dwelled in the community since the 1930’s. Consequently, the area emerged as a natural place for social service providers to locate and thus has the highest concentration of antipoverty organizations in the city. In addition, in the past three decades, the community has suffered from dramatic population decline. Finally, there have been a multitude of redevelopment efforts employed throughout the years to reinvent the community.

Hence, this study focused on antipoverty nonprofits in Over the Rhine for the following reasons: (1) the high concentration of social service providers in the community, (2) high level of social tension and socioeconomic problems in the area, (3) a severe decline in population in the past three decades and (4) a rich history of different types of redevelopment employed to revitalize the community.

3.5 Study Limitations

Limitations to the first section of this study have two foundations. First, while the system used to classify antipoverty nonprofit organizations (NTEE) is continually updated and is the best tool for this type of classification, it is not without flaws. Classifying the nonprofit sector is a massive task in itself, as each organizational sector seems to be somewhat tied to activities in other organizational sectors. This is a problem when the research is trying to pinpoint a specific locational trend or explain an explicit behavioral trait. However, defining the sectors that will be researched in advance, gives the study a strategic course of action that can be easily duplicated by other researchers.

Second, as other researchers have pointed out, there are some drawbacks of utilizing the NCCS database. One of the major problems cited is that the NCCS does not provide information
on nonprofit organizations with annual expenditures falling below $25,000. This is due to the fact that these organizations are not required to file the IRS 990 form. While there has been no real solution to this problem, others have suggested that the inclusion of these organizations would not add any distinguishably different results to the study and therefore are negligible (Peck, 2008; Allard, 2004).

The second half of this thesis also has some limitations. First, the overall direction of the second portion of the study is directly tied to the results of the first half of the study. Thus, the interview questions were prepared with the assumption that there was an inequitable distribution of antipoverty nonprofit service across Cincinnati’s communities. Furthermore, much of the second half of the thesis discusses emerging trends rather than well documented, historical changes, making a significant part of the discussion a speculative one. However, the feelings, attitudes and thoughts of the nonprofit organizational leaders that were interviewed are extremely consequential regardless of the future tense of the conversation.

With that said, the interviews are very organizational specific, thus the results may or may not mimic those of other, similar organizations in the area. However, this study does not pretend to be all inclusive in its findings, nor does it attempt to provide a bundled explanation of the thoughts and beliefs of each individual antipoverty nonprofit in Over the Rhine. Instead, this study seeks to understand major reoccurring themes, issues and opinions of those interviewed in order to set in motion the broader discussion of how demographic changes in Over the Rhine will impact the nonprofit community.
IV. FINDINGS

Before the findings are discussed, there are a few important caveats to understand. First, as outlined in the Literature Review chapter, the antipoverty nonprofits that were included in this study were determined based on their NTEE codes. This report limited its results to nine of the 26 major NTEE codes. It further restricted the results to specific subcategories within the nine selected core codes. While this provided a desired level of functionality and preciseness to the report, it also lessened the number of antipoverty nonprofits represented in each community. In addition, as discussed in the Data and Methods chapter, organizations with less than $25,000 in annual expenditures were also excluded from the results. This is important to keep in mind while reviewing the findings, as many of the communities have a larger nonprofit sector that the results may imply. This includes nonprofits that provide poverty alleviation services but were not included in the nine NTEE core codes.

Secondly, in April 2001, “riots” erupted in Over the Rhine after the fatal shooting of a young African American male by the Cincinnati Police. This resulted in an increase in funding for social services, specifically within the Over the Rhine community (MacDonald 2002). This is important to know for this study because after 2001 the number of nonprofit organizations in Over the Rhine increased. This increase can likely be attributed to solutions posed to prevent future ruinous events such as the riots. While this report does not include data beyond the year 2000, this brief, anecdotal description of what occurred in Over the Rhine after the riots, shows that locational patterns for nonprofits continue to be explained by demand, rather than supply theories.
Finally, while Cincinnati is an agglomerate of geographically distinct neighborhoods, the Greater Cincinnati Region includes an extensive network of townships, villages and small cities, each with their own governmental structure. The locations of these areas, while not included in this report, are significant to the overall antipoverty nonprofit system and poor populations (especially considering the fact that the majority of neighborhoods in Cincinnati had declining populations from 1990 to 2000). For example, Springfield Township, a community previously mentioned in the Literature Review section, has a growing low-income population, however it is technically not within the jurisdictional boundaries of the city of Cincinnati. This study does not offer explanation as to the level of antipoverty nonprofit service provision available to low-income populations in these communities. Further research to document this situation is recommended in Chapter 5.

4.1 Is there an equitable distribution of antipoverty nonprofit services in the communities of Cincinnati?

The first objective of this thesis was to determine the overall efficiency of the antipoverty nonprofit system within the communities of Cincinnati. To do this, the number of people in poverty (poverty population) in each neighborhood was compared to the number of antipoverty nonprofits serving that neighborhood. Again, the idea is to come away with some understanding of the disparities that exist in the distribution of services. Table 4.1 (see Appendix A) provides a snapshot of the ratio of services to poverty population in each community in 1990. The last column of the table is to be interpreted as: there is one antipoverty nonprofit for every so many people. So, using Avondale as an example, we would conclude that there is one antipoverty nonprofit for every 582 people living in that community.
In 1990, there were 15 neighborhoods with no service. This means that the poverty population in those communities was not being served. There are two major problems with this: first, the poverty population of a neighborhood without any service availability will likely utilize the services in another community. The result of which is an overtaxed system within the community that does provide services. On the hand, as discussed in the second chapter, this could also result in a decreased utilization of pertinent services by the residents of the underserved community. The larger the poverty population, the more exasperated these two issues become. The neighborhoods of West Price Hill, Evanston and Hartwell all have poverty populations above 1,000, but have no corresponding social services.

However, communities with high service to population ratios are in a similar position. There are 18 neighborhoods that fit this description. The communities of Winton Hills, Westwood, North Fairmount and University Heights provide exemplary illustrations of this situation. In Westwood for example, there is one antipoverty nonprofit organization serving a poverty population of 4,579 and in Winton Hills, there is one antipoverty nonprofit serving a population of 4,690. The single organization in each of these places is likely to be overburdened.

Over the Rhine has a ratio of 1:445, meaning every one antipoverty nonprofit serves 445 people. Again, I do not pretend to have a method of measurement which would determine if this is an adequate level of service. However, it is clear that Over the Rhine has neither the best nor worst service to population ratio. When looked at this way, it is difficult to brand the area as having an “over concentration of services.”
Figure 4.1 (see Appendix B) displays the ratio spatially. The darker green colors represent higher ratios and therefore lower levels of service\(^3\). The lighter colors correspond to lower ratios. From this illustration, an inequitable distribution of services across the communities is evident. However, when comparing Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2, this disparity appears to have improved somewhat. This is due to increased service provision as well as overall population decreases and decreases in poverty populations. Figure 4.2 (see Appendix B) is the spatial representation of service to people ratios in 2000. The color correspondence is intentionally repeated here so that the difference between the decades is apparent.

From 1990 to 2000, the number of neighborhoods with no service decreased from 15 to 11. Furthermore, the neighborhoods with no service generally had a decreased poverty population. In 2000, there were 9 communities with high ratios of 1:500 or more, compared to 18 in 1990. Although the communities of Winton Hills, Westwood, North Fairmount and University Heights still have excessively high ratios (as compared to other communities), their ratios have lowered when compared to 1990.

Over the Rhine improved its ratio from 1990 to 2000. In 2000, the community’s ratio was 1:135. In other words, there was one antipoverty nonprofit for every 135 people. Again, it is not the best ratio across the board, but it is certainly better than many of the other neighborhoods. Table 4.2 (see Appendix A) provides a snapshot of the ratio of services to poverty population in each community in 2000.

These findings clearly suggest an inequitable distribution of services across the Cincinnati area, although there has been a slight improvement from 1990 to 2000. This is an

\(^{3}\) Lower level of service means that too many people rely on the service – it has no meaning for the organization itself.
issue that is problematic in two ways. First, service utilization among poverty populations will likely be lower in neighborhoods that have inadequate service provision or no service at all. Secondly, the absence of antipoverty nonprofits in some communities, impose a significant burden on those that do maintain a high concentration of services. This is a duality that renders the entire antipoverty nonprofit system ineffective.

4.2 How have demographic and developmental changes (past, present and future) in Over the Rhine affected the antipoverty nonprofits in the community?

This section will provide a discussion of the findings obtained from interviews with five antipoverty nonprofit organizations in Over the Rhine. It examines the concepts of service utilization and location reliance as discussed earlier in this thesis. The interview responses presented here and the corresponding dialogue are grouped into three major discussion points: (1) the importance of the Over the Rhine location to organizational mission, (2) the level of service provided to those who live outside of Over the Rhine and (3) the effects of demographic changes and redevelopment on organizational mission. Again, organizational representatives from the Drop Inn Center, Emmanuel Community Center, Tender Mercies, the Contact Center and Mary Magdalene House are included in this study.

4.2.1 The Importance of the Over the Rhine Location to Organizational Mission

In general, it was found that the antipoverty nonprofit organizations interviewed felt that being located in Over the Rhine was essential to their overall mission. This sentiment was expressed in three different ways. First, some organizations expressed a strong feeling of commitment to and investment in the community. According to a representative from the
Emmanuel Community Center, “Emanuel Community Center was founded in 1871, and has always been a central part of the Over-the-Rhine Community. Emanuel remains an integral part of this neighborhood, and is committed to its current and new residents.” This statement reveals the level of commitment to serving the community of Over the Rhine. While the residents of Over the Rhine may change, organizations like the Emanuel Center remain dedicated to the continual improvement of the community itself. In addition, four of the five organizations were adamant about their historical presence in the community. In other words, permanence seems to be a strong factor in location reliance.

Second, location reliance was also strongly related to an accessibility factor. Three of the organizational representatives saw Over the Rhine as a preferable location due to its ease of accessibility for low and no-income populations. To paraphrase a Drop Inn Center representative - when visiting other cities in search of homeless shelter best practices, it was discovered that every city had a large emergency shelter facility in their downtown. A large emergency shelter is important in a downtown because it must be accessible to those who need it. If homeless people have to travel too far to find a facility they are likely to give up and sleep on the street instead. This anecdote not only shows the importance of accessibility but it also reveals the realistic relationship between accessibility and utilization. A Contact Center representative expressed similar feelings: “It is very important to be in this location because many of our members live in Over-the-Rhine and the surrounding area and it is on the bus line.” Although this quote refers to the importance of accessibility it also has an added dimension that seems to reveal demand locational patterns. This leads us to our final point.

The final aspect of location reliance is related to the demand for services within the Over the Rhine community. This is an issue that is hotly debated among city officials and
organizational leaders. One side of the argument would say that a high concentration of social
service providers makes a community more desirable to those who require the services. The
other side of the argument would suggest that service providers are attracted to the community
because there is an existing need. A Tender Mercies representative would agree with the latter.
“We are in Over the Rhine because that is where most of the homeless people are. Social
services will exist where there is a need for their services. Some people seem to think social
service agencies are attracting poor people to Over the Rhine. It’s the other way around.
Agencies are here because the need is here.”

A Mary Magdalene House representative mimics this sentiment.

“...we serve the homeless, many of which are in Over the Rhine so it easier for them to access
our services on a regular basis and when they need it.”

The verdict on this debate is still unclear on broad basis. As we found out earlier, demand
does not automatically predict antipoverty nonprofit location. However, Over the Rhine seems to
adhere to a special set of circumstances and while there is absolutely no evidence that the
problems (or number of people) in Over the Rhine have increased with the entrance of additional
service providers, there is evidence that these organizations emerged in order to remedy an
existing set of problems.

4.2.2 The Level of Service Provided To Nonresidents

The problem we run into when discussing accessibility to antipoverty nonprofits as well
as over concentration is much of the same one that occurs when discussing environmental
problems– these issues simply don’t adhere to defined geographical boundaries. Two adjacent
communities may have conflicting levels of service (one has a high concentration and the other
has little to no service), but the activities that occur in those two communities are likely to be interchangeable. In other words, a resident of a neighborhood with a lack of service could very easily receive the required service in the adjacent neighborhood. Of course, as discussed before this is problematic.

Organizations such as Tender Mercies, Mary Magdalene House and Drop Inn Center, serve a wandering population. Homeless people that originate from various parts of the region and beyond, utilize their services. On the other hand, even though this population is very transient, many of them spend the bulk of their time in Over the Rhine. As put by a Mary Magdalene House representative, “We provide services to homeless people. I imagine many of them spend the majority of their time in Over the Rhine, but they come from all over the place.”

Second, establishments such as Emmanuel Community Center and the Contact Center serve a broad geographical base, although a significant portion of their clientele still maintain a residence in Over the Rhine. Interestingly, it almost seems as if this client locational diversity makes these organizations more immune to changes occurring in the community. For example, according to a Contact Center representative, only 40 percent of their members live in Over the Rhine. This means that more than half of their client base resides in other communities. According to an Emmanuel Community Center representative, “About 75% of our customers that send their children to our Early Childhood Learning Center are from Over-the-Rhine, but also from other Cincinnati communities, as well (Price Hill, Avondale, and Colerain). However, this is changing as the community changes.”

Hence this discussion provides evidence that changes in Over the Rhine are likely to have less of a negative impact on those organizations that serve large groups of outsiders. This may be due to a visibility factor. In the case of the Drop Inn Center, their constituency is very a visible
one. Therefore, such organizations may be perceived as an impediment to development, whereas a provider such as the Contact Center has a large number of discernable members who return to their home community after utilizing the service and is thus perceived as less of a barrier to progress. But it is important to note that action based on pure perception is foolish and detrimental.

4.2.3 The Effects of Demographic Changes and Redevelopment on Organizational Mission

All five organizations included in this study, had positive views on the developmental changes taking place in Over the Rhine. They generally offered a high level of support and were encouraged by the opportunity to be a part of a future Over the Rhine characterized by socioeconomic and racial diversity, investment and overall vibrancy.

An Emmanuel Community Center representative expressed this sentiment perfectly:

“It (development efforts) is an enhancement as our Mission has recently changed to adapt to the changes that are happening. Emanuel Community Center is ‘The Community Connector.’ Change is good, not everyone will agree, but to grow – change has to take place. But it has to be a change that welcomes and supports diversity. Bottom line – everyone deserves a beautiful park, everyone deserves nice surroundings, everyone deserves decent housing (both affordable and market). When a positive environment is created – it can have a positive impact on everyone.”

A Contact Center echoed this tone of support:

“We welcome them (development changes) with open arms. The changes that are happening today have been coming for a while. We welcome the change for the better. A mixed income community is the best for all. We need to keep our neighborhood school, we fight for the rights of low-income housing - it’s the best of both worlds. We all are working for the same thing, a safe and loving community for all.”

Furthermore, none of the organizations seemed to view either development or demographic changes as impediments to effective service provision. However, a few of the interviewees expressed concerns of displacement and clientele reduction. As a Tender Mercies representative put it, “Gentrification is complicated. Tender Mercies has a good working relationship with several of the organizations trying to rehabilitate OTR properties. Rehabbing
abandoned buildings serves the community. We are pleased with many of the changes; at the same time we do not like to see low-income people displaced.”

A Mary Magdalene representative also said, “We support the positive things occurring in Over the Rhine. We want to see a revival of the community; however this shouldn’t be at the expense of one certain group.”

The interviewee at the Drop Inn Center gave a similar response. To paraphrase, the Drop Inn Center is a supporter of the new school and other development, but not at the expense of the homeless. The city should redirect more funding toward human services because its current funding is inadequate. Furthermore, 3CDC does not specialize in human services. They are concerned about the negative effects of having an organization like the Drop Inn Center in the community. But the overall hope is that we will be able to have a healthy mix all income types, including the homeless.

Although it is clear that the organizations are supportive of development in Over the Rhine, many of them have had to make modifications to their services or practices in order to progress along with the community. For example, the Drop Inn Center has increasingly taken a proactive role in city and community interactions. In addition, they have established more stringent behavioral standards for their residents. The Emmanuel Community Center has also adapted to community changes.

“Emanuel Community Center has always been known to change as the community and over the last 5 years we have worked hard to make Emanuel a true community center – a place where people can connect for meetings, come to workshops, take part in book clubs, and listen to some great jazz sets, just to name a few. There has been over 80 million dollars invested in brick and mortar in this historical neighborhood, but all of that means nothing when you are unable to connect neighbors through shared experiences, no matter what their socio-economic status, background or ethnicity. At the end of the day it is about building social capital – this is what makes a neighborhood strong, vibrant, diverse, economically sound and healthy. For us, it is not
about low income or high income – it is about the people who live and work in the community and bridging the gap of these two divergent populations. We cannot save the world – but this particular mission of ours, does align itself with making the world a better place. A New Strategic Plan was adopted in September 2007 in anticipation of the changing community. Our new mission and vision reflect these changes.”

Surprisingly none of the organizations seemed to be concerned with the inevitable transformation that accompanies a dramatic shift in the character, culture and opinion of a community, especially one like Over the Rhine with such a long standing history of socio-economic ills. In the case of the Emmanuel Community Center and even the Contact Center to some extent, they have the ability to adapt to a variety of different demographics. But the organizations that serve the homeless do not have this flexibility. Also, none of the organizations expressed concern about effective service provision. They all seemed to be fairly positive that they could serve in the same capacity regardless of the makeup of Over the Rhine. However this does not seem very realistic because as Over the Rhine develops a new dominant voice, there will undoubtedly be antipoverty nonprofits that are forced out either by policy, lack of funding or public interest.

In summary, this chapter has made the following discoveries: (1) There is an equitable social service distribution in place in Cincinnati, however there was minor improvement in this distribution from 1990 to 2000. (2) Cincinnati communities are both underserved and overburdened by this unbalanced distribution. (3) Location reliance in Over the Rhine is related to factors of accessibility, demand and community commitment. (4) Antipoverty nonprofits in Over the Rhine that provide a significant amount of service to non-residents are more able to adapt to community changes. (5) The development and demographic changes occurring in Over the Rhine are not a perceived impediment to service provision. These activities and
corresponding changes are supported by organizational leaders. However, antipoverty nonprofits must make service and policy modifications in order to fully embrace these changes.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will provide a comprehensive discussion of the findings in an attempt to link them broader implications. It will conclude with recommendations for future research. There is no attempt to make any direct recommendations to city officials or community organizers as this thesis was primarily intended to promote straightforward discussion on this topic as well as provide a basis for future in-depth research.

5.1 Conclusions

There are five major conclusions derived from this study. First, to answer the first research question, there is an inequitable distribution of antipoverty nonprofits across the neighborhoods of Cincinnati is problematic for a two reasons. For one, it is usually a symptom of a larger problem, meaning a disparity in one area, usually means another area is overstrained. This is evident in Cincinnati, where there are a number of communities with considerably high service to poverty population ratios. Additionally, there are communities in Cincinnati with significant poverty populations that do not have services at all. It becomes clear then that the problem that exists in Over the Rhine is not as much an issue of over concentration of services, than it is a lack of services elsewhere. In fact, Over the Rhine appears to have healthy service to poverty population ratio when compared to other communities.

Of course when an inequitable distribution of antipoverty nonprofits exists, the community with the extensive service network will take on the burdens of the entire region. Furthermore, from a utilization perspective, this also means that poor people in low service neighborhoods are extremely underserved. So, when one neighborhood is overtaxed and the others underserved this
ultimately leads to an entirely ineffective system where no one obtains the correct level of service.

This is interesting when we reflect on the earlier discussion of service utilization and proximity. On the one hand, research says that utilization decreases as distance increases. However, as we found in the case of the Contact Center and the Emmanuel Community Center in Over the Rhine, a significant portion of their clientele were from areas outside of the community. This, along with the issue of overburdened social services systems, suggests that poverty populations do utilize services in other communities to some extent. This is not to dispute the fact that utilization declines as distance increases, but only to add that accessibility to services does not necessarily decline as distance increases.

Of course this depends on location and corresponding public transportation routes, because if the services are located in a community that is unreachable by public transportation, then accessibility is obviously affected. However, this at least serves as an explanation for the overburdened antipoverty nonprofit sector in Over the Rhine. In fact, recalling the discussion with antipoverty nonprofit leaders in Over the Rhine, accessibility was one of the primary explanations for location reliance.

According to the interview participants, demographic and development changes in Over the Rhine represents a growing number of nonresidents who utilize the services in the community. However, this has oddly not resulted in location detachment, as all of the participants were reliant on their location in Over the Rhine for reasons of accessibility; demand for services a general feeling of responsibility to the community. This provides explanation for our second research question.
Next, there is some evidence that suggests that the distributional issue will naturally fix itself as neighborhoods become more heterogeneous. As we previously learned, from 1990 to 2000, Cincinnati experienced a slight improvement in the distribution of antipoverty nonprofits across its various communities. What is not clear however, is how the growth of heterogeneous communities will affect existing service providers. After all, from 1990 to 2000 there were no communities that reduced the number of antipoverty nonprofits. But regardless of whether or not mixed-income communities will guide equitable service provision, city officials and organizational leaders need to approach the situation in a proactive manner. In other words, social service provision needs to be included in the planning process.

This brings us to our fourth conclusion. Planning for social services is not practiced in Cincinnati at all. If anything, antipoverty nonprofits are only briefly mentioned in community plans. But now that we see the effects of non-planning (an inefficient social service system), communities need to treat this sector as a priority and plan accordingly. And it is pertinent that this planning is done collaboratively and on regional level because as we know, the effects socioeconomic problems do not adhere to imposed neighborhood boundaries. This is a shared problem that requires a collective solution (Bollens, Scott 1996).

Furthermore, antipoverty nonprofit organizational leaders have a duty to engage in city processes and to be a part of the planning process. This is likely the only way their missions will not be glossed over or neglected. Furthermore, it is important that they are flexible enough to adapt to the changes occurring in their communities. This makes their presence more seamless and therefore more beneficial.

---

4 If a community did close a particular organization it was replaced by another and this study does not provide enough detail for organizational specific trends
The fifth conclusion is an important one. Before we can determine if a community has an “over concentration” of social services, we must first define what that means. This thesis suggests that determining appropriate service levels within each community is a good starting point. With this additional information we can use the service to poverty population ratio and have a more clear understanding of which neighborhoods need to make adjustments.

5.2 Recommendations for Future Research

Admittedly the comprehensiveness of this thesis could have been enhanced in a variety of ways, some of which were addressed in both Chapters 3 and 4. However, this section suggests three areas of further research, including other jurisdictions, capturing the city and residents viewpoints and utilizing current data sets. First, as mentioned in the Findings chapter, the Greater Cincinnati Region is made up of a number of townships, villages and small cities. It would be interesting and perhaps more telling, albeit complicated, to conduct additional research on this topic, utilizing data from the entire region. Next, this study revealed the viewpoint of antipoverty nonprofit organizational leaders in Over the Rhine, however further research could include the views of city officials as well as residents. Finally, 2010 census data would provide a more accurate reflection of the locational patterns of antipoverty nonprofits, as there has been extensive activity within this sector since 2000.
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## APPENDIX A

### Table 4.1 Service to Poverty Population Ratio and Neighborhood Information, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Poverty Population</th>
<th>No. of Organizations</th>
<th>Services: Poverty Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avondale</td>
<td>18,706</td>
<td>7,568</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1:582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Hill</td>
<td>10,822</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Washington</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-Riverfront</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1:67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Hill</td>
<td>31,759</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corryville</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Tusculum</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Price Hill</td>
<td>19,492</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Walnut Hills</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Clifton Heights</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Apartments</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwell</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>13,901</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Heights</td>
<td>6,449</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Price Hill</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madisonville</td>
<td>22,953</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1:268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Adams</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Airy</td>
<td>8,774</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Auburn</td>
<td>7,615</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Lookout</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Washington</td>
<td>20,402</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Avondale/Paddock Hills</td>
<td>6,461</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fairmount/English Woods</td>
<td>5,442</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:3,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>10,527</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td>12,366</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-The-Rhine</td>
<td>9,509</td>
<td>7,113</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1:445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge</td>
<td>9,870</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensgate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselawn</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1:283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayler Park</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedamsville</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cumminssville/Millvale</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fairmount</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Heights</td>
<td>9,807</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Hills</td>
<td>8,873</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1:249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>11,352</td>
<td>7,041</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1:1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Price Hill</td>
<td>32,178</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>46,676</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:4,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Hills</td>
<td>6,846</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:4,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Place</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>Poverty Population</td>
<td>No. of Organizations</td>
<td>Services: Poverty Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale</td>
<td>16,192</td>
<td>6,538</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1:327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Hill</td>
<td>9,682</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1:249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Washington</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-Riverfront</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>8,579</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Hill</td>
<td>30,469</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1:399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corryville</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1:133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Tusculum</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Price Hill</td>
<td>18,154</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1:781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Walnut Hills</td>
<td>3,704</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1:94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>9,852</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/Clifton Heights</td>
<td>7,261</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Apartments</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwell</td>
<td>9,935</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>13,620</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Heights</td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Price Hill</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madisonville</td>
<td>22,090</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1:199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Adams</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Airy</td>
<td>15,157</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1:224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Auburn</td>
<td>6,477</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Lookout</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Washington</td>
<td>20,567</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1:160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Avondale/Paddock Hills</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fairmount/English Woods</td>
<td>4,665</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:2356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>9,415</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td>11,205</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-The-Rhine</td>
<td>7,921</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1:135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Ridge</td>
<td>9,468</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensgate</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselawn</td>
<td>10,404</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1:90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayler Park</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedamsville</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cumminsville/Millvale</td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fairmount</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Heights</td>
<td>8,731</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:1,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Hills</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1:143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>8,022</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1:492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Price Hill</td>
<td>29,145</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:2,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>45,622</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:1,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Hills</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:3,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Place</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Service to Poverty Ratio = Poverty Population/Number of Antipoverty Organizations*
Figure 4.1 Map of Services to Poverty Population Ratio, Cincinnati Neighborhoods, 1990

*Numbers indicate the number of antipoverty nonprofits in each community.
*Colors on legend correspond to ratio.
Figure 4.1 Map of Services to Poverty Population Ratio, Cincinnati Neighborhoods, 2000

*Numbers indicate the number of anti-poverty nonprofits in each community.
*Colors on legend correspond to ratio.