PhD in Organizational Leadership

Summer 2022

Diversified Collaboration, Strategic Plan Design, and Strategic Planning Outcomes in Public Sector Aging Services

Jennifer B. Elmore
Southeastern University - Lakeland

Diversified Collaboration, Strategic Plan Design, and Strategic Planning Outcomes
in Public Sector Aging Services

Submitted to Southeastern University

Jannetides College of Business and Entrepreneurial Leadership

In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Organizational Leadership

Jennifer B. Elmore
July 2022

Jannetides College of Business and Entrepreneurial Leadership

Southeastern University

This is to certify that the dissertation prepared by:

Jennifer B. Elmore

titled

DIVERSIFIED COLLABORATION, STRATEGIC PLAN DESIGN, AND STRATEGIC PLANNING OUTCOMES IN PUBLIC SECTOR AGING SERVICES

Has been approved by his/her committee as satisfactory completion of the

dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved By:

Jennifer Carter, Ph.D., Chair

Jannetides College of Business and Entrepreneurial Leadership/Southeastern University

Thomas Gollery, Ed.D., Committee Member

College of Education/Southeastern University

Bethany Peters, Ph.D., Committee Member

Jannetides College of Business and Entrepreneurial Leadership/Southeastern University

Chinue Uecker, D.B.A., Committee Member

Healthcare & Health Services/The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Southeastern University Institutional Review Board Approval:

December 2021

July 2022

Abstract

Effective strategic planning in aging services is needed to help public sector agencies and their networks successfully meet the needs of a growing and aging U.S. population of older adults. The purpose of this mixed-method study was to explore public sector state strategic plans and the effect of diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and regional and state characteristics on related outcomes and organizational performance. This study reviewed State Plans on Aging and the effect of the diversity of stakeholders contributing to developing the plans, the comprehensiveness of the plans' design, and the states' performance in areas related to long-term services and supports. This study sought to provide insights that would add to the existing body of knowledge on public sector strategic planning, and help to enhance strategic planning activities aimed at improving services and supports for older adults. This study found that diversified collaboration and strategic plan design could have a positive effect on strategic planning outcomes. The study also employed a framework for studying strategic planning that answered previous calls for more research linking process/micro and practice/macro approaches to strategic planning research. Process-based research focuses on the microlevels of planning. Practice-based research focuses on the macro levels. When integrated together, these two types of strategic planning perspectives allow researchers to understand better how, why, and when strategic planning works. This study offers some insights into future research, provides implications for practice, and serves as a call to further action in addressing a broad social challenge.

Keywords: strategic planning, public sector, aging services, diversified collaboration, older adults

Dedication

This work is dedicated to God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. From God, this work has flowed, and through Jesus, all these things have been possible. Thank you, Holy Spirit, for being a constant guide. This dissertation is also dedicated to my husband, Jerry, the love of my life and my best friend, who has always believed in me and been there for me. I also dedicate this research to my sons, Jerremiah and Joseph. You are incredible young men, and I am proud to be your mom. Finally, I dedicate this work to all my family members, especially my parents, Terry and Selma, who planted the idea of pursuing a Ph.D. a long time ago, and my sister, Elizabeth, who knows how to set the bar exceptionally high when it comes to graduating college. Thank you all. I love you.

Acknowledgements

This Ph.D. would have been impossible without the support of many. First,
I acknowledge that it is by grace through Jesus that I have been able to complete
this program. I am grateful to God for His unfailing provision throughout this
journey. Next, I would like to acknowledge the support of my husband, who has
encouraged and supported me through my bachelor's degree, master's degree, and a
doctoral degree. Jerry, you proofread papers, talked me off ledges, raised kids,
cleaned house, cooked meals, and more—and you did it all with a smile and good
humor. I am so appreciative of your personal sacrifices to help make this work a
reality. I would also like to acknowledge the support of my two sons, who have
lived most of their lives with a mother in school. Jeremiah and Joseph, thank you
for helping, especially during the last 4 years when you were old enough to
understand what we were trying to accomplish as a team. I also acknowledge the
support and encouragement provided by my parents. Thank you for cheering me on
through the process and listening to me tell you all about my courses, comps,
conferences, and research. Thank you, also, to all my family members, including
my sister, Elizabeth; her husband, Jason (I finished the last part of Chapter Five at
their house); and my father and mother-in-law, George and Millie, who have been
very supportive. I would also like to thank and acknowledge the professors and
leaders at Southeastern University, and my committee members. Thank you, Dr.
Carter, for serving as my chair. Your authenticity and support have been
invaluable. Thank you also to Dr. Peters for being a listening ear and Dr. Gollery
for your inspirational words. Thank you, Dr. Uecker, for sharing your knowledge
of strategic planning and being a source of mentorship. Thanks, also, to Dr.
Hawkins, Dr. Rohm, and Dr. VanWhy for being there on the first day and helping
me believe this work was possible. I am also grateful to have shared this experience
with the AlphaDocs, especially the Lady AlphaDocs, April, Lynette, Pat, Shanna,
Sherrita, and Violet. I also want to recognize Elise and Staci who shared this Ph.D.
journey with me—we did it! Finally, thank you to all who encouraged me
professionally, including my colleagues who share a passion for public sector
health and human services.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Strategic planning is viewed as making a positive impact (Bryson, 2010a; B. George et al., 2019; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). However, current scholarly literature indicates mixed results, with some studies reporting a positive outcome from strategic planning (Bryson et al., 2010; B. George et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2018; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Conversely, others report negative outcomes from a strategic plan (Brunsson, 1982; Martin, 2014; Mintzberg, 1994; Raharjo & Eriksson, 2017). Additionally, the number of published articles on strategic planning in highly ranked academic journals has decreased. According to Wolf and Floyd (2017), approximately four to seven articles were published annually between 1980 and 1994, while only one or two were published after 1994, with even fewer published after 2000.

Within the public sector, strategic planning is considered a beneficial activity (Boyne, 2001; Bryson, 2010a; Johnsen, 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Walker & Andrews, 2015), but there is insufficient empirical research on strategic plans in the public sector (Bryson et al., 2010, 2018; B. George et al., 2018; Johnsen, 2018; Lee et al., 2018). This lack of research is surprising, given the resources often dedicated to strategic planning each year. For example, an organization may spend more than $200,000 to $300,000 for a consulting firm to support a comprehensive redesign of the organization's strategy (Tecker, 2017). This mixed-method dissertation explored the strategic plans of one public sector unit, the State Plans on Aging, within all 50 states in the United States.

Background of the Study

Strategic planning is a popular management approach in contemporary organizations (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2019; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). In general, strategy and strategic planning help organizations understand where they are currently, where they want to go, and the steps they will take to get there. In other words, strategic planning is a bridge that links organizational aspirations, meaning where they want to go, with organizational capabilities and where they are currently (Bryson et al., 2021). Strategic planning is one part of an overall organizational tool known as strategic management. Strategic management combines strategic planning and implementing a strategic plan on an ongoing basis (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2019; Rigby &

Bilodeau, 2018; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Strategic planning has numerous definitions. One widely accepted definition from Bryson (2010a) suggested that strategic planning helps an organization define its identity, activities, and purpose. According to Bryson (2010a), strategic planning is defined as

> a deliberative, disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is (its identity), what it does (its strategies and actions), and why it does it (mandates, mission, goals, and the creation of public value). (pp. 256–257)

In this way, strategic planning helps decision-makers focus organizational efforts by answering questions about what, how, and why their organizations pursue certain activities (Bryson, 2010a; Johnsen, 2018; Wolf & Floyd, 2017).

Strategic planning was an activity within the private sector. By the 1980s, strategic planning occurred in the public sector, initially centered around managing state power and military affairs (Bryson et al., 2018). Although private sector strategic planning was conducted to maximize market shares and profits, public sector organizations began using strategic planning more often to increase efficiency and effectiveness (Bryson et al., 2018). During the 1990s, research on the benefits of strategic planning was inconclusive in both the private and public sectors. During this time, researchers engaged in much debate on the topic and largely centered on whether strategic planning improved organizational performance. In 1994, C. C. Miller and Cardinal published a meta-analysis on the association between strategic planning and organizational performance, finding a modest but positive relationship. At the same time, Mintzberg (1994) criticized strategic planning as ineffective. Despite criticism, strategic planning remained standard in the private and public sectors.

By the early 2000s, research remained inconclusive, especially in the public sector. Boyne (2001) suggested that public sector planning could be beneficial, but it was not necessary or sufficient for enhanced organizational performance. Bryson et al. (2009) contended that many studies by the critics of strategic planning in the public sector paid little attention to the larger context within which the planning occurred, who was involved in the planning, how these actors were connected, how the planning was done, what was learned, and how the resulting learning was applied and to what effect. B.

George et al. (2019) conducted a meta-analysis. The researchers confirmed C. C. Miller and Cardinal's (1994) findings 25 years later—that strategic planning, conducted in both the private and public sectors, had a significant, moderate, and positive impact on organizational performance.

Within the last 10 years, applying strategic planning expanded further into the public sector, although questions remained about the benefits (Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015). The Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 (2011) began requiring strategic planning activities to improve public sector accountability and compliance (Bryson et al., 2018). Since then, strategic planning has remained a part of public sector operations, shifting to an enhanced focus on addressing "contemporary issues of broader societal relevance" (Vaara & Whittington, 2012, p. 248). These serious issues are found within societal systems and are often ambiguous and consequential public problems and ills (Bryson, 2010a; B. George et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Vaara & Whittington, 2012).

Further, strategic planning in the public sector is increasingly seen as an approach to public policymaking aimed at solving problems that are "dynamic and cannot be addressed through a static or one-time decision" (Lee et al., 2018, p. 360). As public problems have become more complex, the need to understand how to best conduct strategic planning to solve these problems has become more critical (Bryson et al., 2010; Vaara & Durand, 2012). More research is needed to gain this understanding. This study expanded previous research to improve strategic planning in the public sector and contribute positively to solving broad social problems. This study also sought to contribute to the modern discussion on strategic planning research in the public sector by examining who was involved in the planning, how the planning was presented, and to what effect.

Theoretical Framework

Researchers have approached strategic planning differently. One approach considers strategic planning as a process and focuses on the microlevels of planning. The other approach considers strategic planning practice and focuses on the macro levels (Bryson et al., 2018; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; B. George et al., 2018; Seidl & Whittington, 2014). Methodologically, process-based and microlevel approaches are

useful because they focus on how strategic planning is conducted (Bryson et al., 2018). For example, this type of research may focus on individuals' or stakeholders' experiences when involved in strategic planning efforts (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2018). Researchers have viewed planning participants as having unique intrinsic interpretative schemes, applicable norms, and stocks of knowledge that are contributed during planning (Iasbech & Lavarda, 2018). Another important component of the process-based and microlevel research approach is the type of artifacts produced during strategic planning. These artifacts include plans and parts of plans, such as mission and vision statements, goals, strategies, actions, and performance indicators (Bryson et al., 2018). These artifacts become components of a strategic plan's overall design and composition when integrated. In process-based microlevel strategic planning research, the uniqueness of stakeholders during planning and the types of artifacts produced are fundamental components for understanding how strategic planning is conducted.

Practice-based and macro-level research, also known as variance research, differs from the process-based/microlevel approach. Instead of centering on how strategic planning is conducted, practice-based and macro-level research is based on if strategic planning works (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018). This research approach focuses on the relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance. The focus is on strategic planning outcomes and the effectiveness of strategic planning (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2018). In the public sector, the focus is on the relationship between strategic planning and, as the outcome, its impact on solving a social problem.

Combined, process/micro and practice/macro perspectives in strategic planning research can produce rich insights. When integrated, these two types of strategic planning allow researchers to explore how planning participants, along with their unique experiences, cognitive styles, levels of commitment, and plan acceptance, are critical contributors to the design of a strategic plan. Such integration may show how they may influence whether the plans they helped to develop may succeed or fail in practice (B. George et al., 2018; Iasbech & Lavarda, 2018; Johnsen, 2018). For example, Lee et al. (2018) found that collaboratively involving multiple stakeholders during strategic planning contributed positively to the design of strategic plans. Those plans were more

likely to address a social issue positively. Still, a need exists for more research with theoretical strength, including those that "simultaneously investigate different organizational performance dimensions using multiple data sources with stakeholder involvement as a moderator" (B. George et al., 2019, p. 818). This study leveraged both process/micro and practice/macro approaches to strategic planning research to gain the depth of understanding that can be achieved by using both approaches. As such, process/micro- and practice/macro-based research served as the theoretical frameworks for this study.

In addition to using process/micro and practice/macro approaches to strategic planning research as the primary theoretical frameworks for this study, the researcher used other concepts from literature to serve as a theoretical foundation. The researcher employed concepts from literature to identify the variables of diversified collaboration and strategic plan design. The concept of diversified collaboration, referred to as group diversity throughout this study, comprised research-based elements related to participation and representation by 10 different types of stakeholders during the development of the strategic plan. The stakeholder types were derived from distinct categories of stakeholders found in research, including cross-sector groups (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018), intergovernmental organizations (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018), and internal and external collaborators (Fernandes et al., 2021; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003).

For strategic plan design, the researcher chose to use Bryson and Alston's (2011) 12 strategic plan components as the framework for the design. The presence of these 12 components was commonly accepted as constituting an effective and robustly designed strategic plan. Chapter Two – Literature Review and Chapter Three – Methodology present more information about the theoretical foundations of diversified collaboration and strategic plan design.

Statement of the Problem

There is insufficient research, especially recent research, on strategic planning (Bryson et al., 2010, 2018; B. George et al., 2018; Johnsen, 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Although researchers have considered

strategic planning in the public sector a beneficial activity (Boyne, 2001; Bryson, 2010a; Johnsen, 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Walker & Andrews, 2015), there is insufficient strategic planning research within the public sector, especially related to exploring "how the micro interrelates with the macro in strategy work" (Elbasha & Wright, 2017, p. 107). A range of process and practice-based research is needed to advance the field of strategic planning (Bryson et al., 2018). There is also a need for more specific strategic planning research that investigates dimensions of strategic planning outcomes with a focus on stakeholder involvement (B. George et al., 2018). This study sought to address these gaps by linking macro and micro approaches to strategic planning research, utilizing both process- and practice-based research. Further, the study explored strategic planning artifacts and outcomes with a focus on the stakeholders involved in developing the plan, specifically the diversity of the stakeholder group, and if there were any regional effects on these variables.

Purpose of the Research

The intent of this study was to address gaps in public sector strategic planning research by employing a mixed-method paradigm designed to link the microlevel and process-based research approach with the macro-level and practice-based research approach. The study explored diversity within the group of collaborative contributors during strategic plan development and the presence (or lack) of strategic plan artifacts in strategic plan design. The study also investigated the relationships between diversified collaboration (group diversity), strategic plan design (plan design), and strategic planning outcomes. The researcher collected data about the diversity within strategic plan contributors and artifacts from strategic plans (State Plans on Aging) from public sector entities (State Units on Aging [SUAs]). The researcher compared the performance of these public sector entities in strategically addressing issues related to aging and older adults. This research contributed to the knowledge of strategic planning in the public sector, especially in statewide public sector aging services. It also contributed to understanding how microlevel strategic planning processes interrelated with macro-level strategic planning practice in the field strategy work and the effects of state-level demographic characteristics as controls in measuring state performance.

Research Questions

Two qualitative and six quantitative research questions were stated to guide the study. The following qualitative questions guided the qualitative portion of this study:

1. How many aspects of diversified collaboration (Group Diversity) at the time of plan development are documented in each of the State Plans on Aging?

2. How many [of Bryson and Alston's (2011) indicators of robust strategic plan design are included in each of the State Plans on Aging? (For more information, see the Definition of Terms in Chapter One – Introduction or the section below on Strategic Plan Design).

The results of the qualitative strand of the study were used in the quantitative strand of the study. The following quantitative questions guided the quantitative portion of this study:

3. What is the degree of relationship between diversified collaboration and strategic plan design?

4. What is the degree of relationship between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes [as indicated on the AARP Scorecard score]?

5. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon plan design?

6. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon group diversity?

7. Was there a statistically significant effect for region of the United States for percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities by lower quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

8. Was there a statistically significant effect of difference in percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities between the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

The two qualitative research questions and three quantitative research question (Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) aligned with microlevel and process-based approaches. They related to how the strategic planning efforts were conducted, specifically the diversity of the stakeholders involved, the artifacts produced in the planning process, and differences in where the planning occurred. Three of the quantitative research questions (Questions 4,

7, and 8) were based on macrolevel and practice-based research approaches. They were designed to explore the outcomes of strategic planning efforts by focusing on organizational performance and the influence of other data on the measurement.

Significance of the Research

This study has additional significance beyond its contributions to understanding micro/process- and macro/practice-based strategic planning approaches. Advancements in public-sector strategic planning research may "foster more effective government actions" (B. George et al., 2018, p. 317). A better understanding of how strategic planning works and what works in strategic planning will help public sector planning practitioners improve strategic planning outcomes. This improved understanding is significant given the range and complexity of modern social problems. Improved strategic planning outcomes may have a greater impact on the public problems the outcomes are trying to solve. Additional research on the relationship between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic planning outcomes may help public sector organizations improve their strategic planning efforts. The additional research may be important in public sector aging services.

According to the Administration on Aging (2021), the older adult population (age 65 and over) in the United States has steadily grown since 2009 compared to the under-65 population. In 2019 (the most recent year for which data were available), there were 54.1 million older adults aged 65 and older. This number of older adults represents an increase of 14.4 million (or 36%) since 2009. The growth is projected to continue to increase. It is estimated that there will be 80.8 million older adults by 2040 and 94.7 million by 2060.

Further, older adults live longer lives due to increases in life expectancy. As the population of older adults continues to increase and live longer, the need for accessible and extended aging services increases. Effective strategic planning in aging services is needed to help improve agency outcomes and enable agencies to successfully meet the needs of the current and future population of older adults (Cameron, 2008; Campbell et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Feng, 2019; Hyer et al., 2019; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021).

Conceptual Framework

In addition to leveraging micro/process- and macro/practice-based theoretical research approaches, the research of Lee et al. (2018) guided the analytical design of this study. The study applied and expanded Lee et al.'s (2018) mixed-method study that examined "how the design of a collaboratively derived strategic plan affects the efforts of government to resolve a public ill" (p. 360). Lee et al.'s study was used as a model for this study in several ways. First, Lee et al. focused on the public sector (rather than private or nonprofit), and this study focused on the public sector. Next, Lee et al. answered questions about the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact. Similarly, some research questions in this study focused on relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact. Finally, as did this study, Lee et al.'s methodology used content analysis to develop a database of information for quantitative analysis. Despite evident similarities, this study expanded Lee et al.'s research through important differences.

One of the first differences between this study and Lee et al.'s (2018) study was the area of focus. Lee et al. focused on county-level strategic plans, but this study focused on state-level strategic plans. Next, Lee et al. reviewed strategic plans aimed at reducing homelessness. This study focused on strategic plans developed to address aging services. Finally, though the Lee et al. study served as a foundation for independent and dependent variable selection, there were differences in the exact variables selected, the way the variables were operationalized, and the method of analysis. This difference was the main differentiation between Lee et al.'s study and this study. These differences were necessary to expand from a county-level study focused on homelessness to a state-level study focused on aging services and explore new information about the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact.

This study sought state-level rather than county-level insights into the relationship between diversified collaboration (group diversity) and strategic plan design (Plan design) and the relationship between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes to help further explain the differentiation between this study and the Lee et al. study. Lee et al. found a positive relationship between diversified collaboration (as operationalized in their study) and strategic plan design and a positive relationship

between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes (as operationalized in the study). This study also offered new insights with the addition of research questions designed to explore the possible effect of regional differences within the United States upon group diversity and plan design. The questions designed to explore regional differences in plan development were based on evidence from the literature that attitudes, values, and behaviors of Americans were geographically clustered, resulting in regional differences in political orientation, attitudes toward minority groups, occupational performance, and health (Rentfrow, 2010; Rentfrow et al., 2008). These regional questions were possible because the study was conducted at the state rather than a county level.

Additional insights were also found through research questions designed to explore the effects of data controlling for socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Lee et al. (2018) included socio-economic and other population characteristics deemed to be relevant to their study as control data. Demographic data were included in the analysis because the characteristics were believed to influence the relationship between strategic plan design and planning outcomes (performance). This study similarly controlled for demographic characteristics and further explored the effect of the demographic data on the AARP Scorecard scores. These research questions were included in this study to expand on the questions and findings presented in Lee et al.

Methodology

This study used a mixed-method research paradigm. Mixed-method research is "an approach to inquiry that combines or integrates both qualitative and quantitative forms of research" (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 249). It requires the collection and use of qualitative and quantitative data and is accompanied by rigorous methods of qualitative and quantitative research (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The researcher chose a mixed-method research design because qualitative and quantitative methods were needed to answer the research questions. The researcher employed an exploratory sequential mixed-method research design. Exploratory sequential mixed-method research design is most often used when the researcher needs to quantify the results of a qualitative investigation (Creswell et al., 2003; Terrell, 2016). For this study, the qualitative data collection and analysis were built on quantitative analysis and interpretation. The

researcher operationalized content gathered during the qualitative portion of the study to conduct the quantitative portion.

It is standard for qualitative data collection and analysis to occur first in exploratory sequential mixed-method designs (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In this study, the researcher gathered qualitative data operationalized for quantitative analysis. The qualitative information of interest was gathered from specified strategic plans through a process known as content analysis. Content analysis is a document review process recognized and most frequently applied in mixed-method research (Kansteiner & König, 2020). Content analysis allows researchers to assess the types of words, themes, or ideas used in the data source and determine how often they are used (Patton, 2015; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). This type of content analysis is important in mixed-method research because the analysis gives linear structure to qualitative content (Gläser-Zikuda et al., 2020; Kansteiner & König, 2020). In this study, the researcher employed content analysis during the first phase to gather qualitative data of interest from specified strategic plans. The qualitative results of the content analysis were used to build a variables database. These variables were used during the quantitative analysis in the third phase.

The strategic plans selected for this study were State Plans on Aging (i.e., State Plans). State Plans on Aging are publicly available strategic plans periodically produced by the designated governmental entity in each state. The governmental entities are known as SUAs in each state. State Plans are intended to describe how the state will meet the needs of older adults in that state, integrate health and social services delivery systems, and build capacity for long-term care (Administration for Community Living, 2019). The researcher used content analysis to gather qualitative information of interest from State Plans. The information was about diversified collaboration (group diversity) and strategic plan design (plan design). Content analysis was used to clarify how many aspects of diversified collaboration and how many indicators of robust strategic plans were documented in each State Plans.

The researcher operationalized the concept of robust strategic plan design using an index of ideal strategic plan components to include the presence (or lack) of 12 indicators. The indicators are considered critical components of a robust strategic plan (Bryson & Alston, 2011). Lee et al. (2018) used the same 12 indicators, and the

researcher chose to remain consistent for this study. The concept of diversified collaboration during the period when the SUA developed the State Plan was also referred to in this study as group diversity. Group diversity was operationalized using theoretical propositions from the literature on diversified collaboration during strategic plan development. Group diversity comprised research-based elements related to participation and representation by nine different types of stakeholders during the development of the strategic plan. The stakeholder types were derived from different categories of stakeholders found in research, including cross-sector (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018), intergovernmental (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018), and internal and external collaborators (Fernandes et al., 2021; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003). The results of the qualitative content analysis were compiled to answer the first and second research questions about how many components of group diversity were in each of the State Plans and how many indicators of robust strategic plan design were in each of the State Plans.

Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used to address the study's quantitative research questions. The information gathered from the State Plans about group diversity during plan development and Bryson and Alston's (2011) 12 components of strategic plan design, as described in the previous qualitative section, represented the point in the study when the data from the qualitative strand and the quantitative strand were merged. The data gathered during the qualitative portion of the study was transformed for quantitative analysis to answer the quantitative research questions. The areas of strategic planning group diversity and plan design were operationalized by transforming the raw data into percentages and then decimals.

The quantitative portion of the study also used two other sources of secondary data for analysis. These sources were the 2020 edition of the AARP State Scorecard on long-term services and supports (LTSS) and the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.). Using states as the level of analysis allowed for a comparison of State Plans with the 2020 edition of AARP's LTSS State Scorecard (AARP Scorecard), which presented rankings and information by states (Reinhard et al., 2020). The AARP Scorecard was designed to capture information across LTSS categories to measure state-level "system performance

from the viewpoint of users of services and their families" (AARP, n.d., "What is the Scorecard" section). Information from the AARP Scorecard included each state's overall ranking and placement. The unit of measurement for the overall placement is quartiles. The AARP Scorecard also included 26 individual indicators divided among five dimensions. The scores for each state for each of the five dimensions were also presented as a quartile placement. The AARP Scorecard standardized the measurement of state LTSS across all 50 states, which was published four times since 2011, making it a reliable data source. The researcher used the AARP Scorecard as the variable to measure strategic planning outcomes. This use of data relevant to the policy area under examination was in alignment with Lee et al. (2018), who used county-level data on homelessness from the relevant period.

Additionally, data from the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.) were used to control for socio-economic and demographic characteristics anticipated to impact or skew statistical relationships. Using data that controls for confounding differences in demographic characteristics may produce a resulting measure that is a "purer, more unambiguous estimate of the underlying variable" (Bode, 1994, p. 4). Lee et al. (2018) included socio-economic and other population characteristics deemed relevant as control data; therefore, data collected by the researcher from the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.) included state-level data relevant to the demographic populations of older adults in each state.

Research Questions 3 and 4 used the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) to analyze the relationship between group diversity and plan design and strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes, as measured using the AARP Scorecard. In Research Questions 5 and 6, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to assess the degree to which statistically significant differences existed in group diversity and plan design by the U.S. region. In Research Questions 7 and 8, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess the degree to which there were significant differences in the linear combination of socio-economic and demographic characteristics for the state scores in the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard and between state scores in the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard. The findings were analyzed and reported using the 28th version of IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Scope and Limitations

This study had a defined scope and limitations. Demographic diversity (e.g., race, gender, age) was not a part of evaluating diversified collaboration (group diversity). The State Plans did not report demographic information about the individuals participating in the planning efforts. Additionally, this study was limited to the information presented in the State Plans, which was self-reported and variable information. It may not have been a full representation of all the planning efforts or stakeholders that contributed to the plan's development. State Plans were developed by SUAs using instructions provided by the federal authorizing entity, which specified minimum standards for required elements and content. Although each state was provided the same guidance, the development of the plans was open to interpretation by the state agency; therefore, the content of the plans was variable. This variability of the plans was accepted and acknowledged assumption for this study. Chapter Three – Methodology discusses more information about the variability of the plans.

Additionally, the study focused on the strategic planning aspect of strategic management. It did not include an investigation of the implementation efforts, the rigor applied during implementation, or the adjustments made to the plan during the implementation period. These inclusions might or might not have contributed to the success of the SUA in addressing aging issues.

Lastly, the issues of collaboration and diversity present unique challenges beyond this study's scope. For example, collaboration-only approaches to planning may have difficulty achieving deep-seated system change, equity, and justice compared to community organizing, coalition building, and advocacy to create social movements (J. M. Bryson, personal communication, September 9, 2021). This study focused on diversified collaboration, but its association with fully resolving a public ill may be limited. Chapter Five – Discussion presents additional information about the limitations of this study.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms and definitions are provided to clarify concepts within this study.

Actionable Strategies

Actionable strategies are "the means by which an organization intends to accomplish a goal or objective. It summarizes a pattern across policy, programs, projects, decisions, and resources allocations" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170).

Administration for Community Living

The Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a) is the federal operating division within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (n.d.). The mission is to maximize the independence, well-being, and health of older adults, people with disabilities across the lifespan, and their families and caregivers. Administration for Community Living (n.d.-c) advocates within government for older adults, people with disabilities, and families and caregivers; funds services and supports provided primarily by states and aging networks; and invests in training, education, research, and innovation.

Aging Network

Aging Network is defined as the national, state, and local organizations that support community living options for older adults and their caregivers (Administration for Community Living, n.d.-c).

Aging Services

Aging services refer to home- and community-based, noninstitutional care that supports older adults and their caregivers through services focused on health and wellness, protecting rights, preventing abuse, supporting consumer control, and strengthening the aging networks (Administration for Community Living, n.d.-d).

Available Resources

Available resources describe how or where to attain "the necessary resources [that] will bring life to the strategies and create real value for the organization and its stakeholders" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 121).

Content Analysis

Content analysis is a document review process recognized and most frequently applied in mixed-method research that gives linear structure to qualitative content (Gläser-Zikuda et al., 2020; Kansteiner & König, 2020) to apply quantitative meaning to the material (Patton, 2015; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018).

Diversified Collaboration

Diversified collaboration, also referred to as group diversity, is defined as the number of the different types of organizations involved in developing the State Plan on Aging; specifically, it includes participation and representation by the following organizations:

- private organization,
- nonprofit organization,
- academic institution,
- health care organization or system,
- local public agency (city, county, or regional),
- state public agency (other than the state agency leading the planning),
- federal public agency,
- internal staff, and
- public input.

Federal Fiscal Year

Federal fiscal years differ from a traditional calendar year. The federal fiscal year applicable to this study began on October 1 (rather than January 1) and ended on September 30 (rather than December 31) each year (Administration for Community Living, 2019).

Goal Statements

Goal statements provide "a long-term organizational target or direction of development … [that] provides a basis for decisions about the nature, scope, and relative priorities of all projects and activities" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 169).

Intended Outcomes

Intended outcomes are the ideal results, consequences, or benefits for stakeholders or the larger meanings associated with strategic outputs (Bryson & Alston, 2011).

Issue Identification

Issues identification is defined as identifying the set of "policy choice[s] or change challenge[s] affecting an organization's mandates, mission, product or service level and mix, clients or users, costs, financing, structure, processes, or management" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 85). Issue identification may include a strengths, weaknesses,

opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis and consider how the components of the SWOT are related to the organization's "ability to meet its mandates, fulfill its mission, realize its vision, or create public value" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 89).

Long-Term Services and Supports

LTSS are a continuum of services provided in the home, community, or institutional setting. LTSS help older people and adults with physical disabilities manage daily tasks that would be difficult or impossible to perform on their own, such as "personal care (e.g., bathing, dressing, and toileting), complex care (e.g., medication administration, and wound care), home care (e.g., help with housekeeping and meal preparation), and transportation" (Reinhard et al., 2020, p. 7).

Measurable Objective

Bryson and Alston (2011) defined a measurable objective as "a measurable target that must be met on the way to attaining a goal" (p. 169).

Mission Statement

Bryson and Alston (2011) defined a mission statement as "a statement of organizational purpose" (p. 169) that "provides a reason for stakeholders to support the organization" (p. 151).

Older Adult

An older adult is a person who is 60 years or older.

Older Americans Act

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (OAA, 1965) is the federal legislation originally passed in 1965. It authorizes a wide array of service programs through a national network of 56 SUAs; 618 area agencies on aging (AAAs); nearly 20,000 service providers; 281 Tribal organizations; and 1 Native Hawaiian organization representing 400 Tribes (Administration for Community Living, n.d.-b).

Organizational Performance

Organizational performance in strategic planning has been historically related to a firm's financial performance, such as profitability or growth in market share (Wolf & Floyd, 2017). However, in the public sector, the definition can include outcomes such as effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness (B. George et al., 2019).

Organizations Responsible for Implementation

Identifying organizations responsible for implementation means identifying the roles and responsibilities of specific groups or entities who will help enact a plan (Bryson & Alston, 2011).

Partner Organizations

Partner organizations are stakeholders, meaning "any person, group, or entity that can place a claim on the organization's attention, resources, or output, or that is affected by that output" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170). Partners may or may not be involved or have a role in the strategic planning or implementation process.

Performance Measures

Performance measures are short-term or long-term metrics used to measure organizational performance. The measures can be objective using administrative or operational data or subjective based on perceptions of organizational service quality and mission achievement (Johnsen, 2018; Jung & Lee, 2013).

State Plans on Aging

State Plans on Aging are the written strategic plans produced by the State Unit on Aging in each state periodically and intended to describe how the state will meet the needs of older adults in the state, integrate health and social services delivery systems, and build capacity for long-term care (Administration for Community Living, 2019).

State Units on Aging

SUAs are the state-level government agencies federally selected to develop and oversee multiyear state plans that advocate for and aid older adults, their caregivers, and families. In many states, they advocate for adults with physical disabilities. Federal funding is allocated to the SUAs based on the number of adults aged 60 and older in the state (Administration for Community Living, n.d.-d).

Strategic Artifacts

Strategic planning artifacts include physical tools, representations, or materials used during the planning process (e.g., displays, presentations, flipcharts, and photographs) and documents or parts of documents that are the outputs of planning activities (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010).

Strategic Management

Strategic management is how organizations define where they are and want to be and implement the change needed through an action agenda (the strategic plan) to achieve the desired future (Bryson & Alston, 2011).

Strategic Plan Design

Strategic plan design is the extent to which 12 components commonly accepted as constituting a robust and effective strategic plan are present in a plan (Bryson & Alston, 2011; Lee et al., 2018). The 12 ideal strategic plan elements considered necessary for a strategic plan to be robust and effective are as follows:

- identified vision statement,
- identified mission statement,
- values or a values statement,
- issue identification,
- goal statement(s),
- measurable objectives,
- actionable strategies,
- identified organizations responsible for implementation,
- identified partner organizations,
- identified available resources,
- specified timeline, and
- explicitly identified intended outcomes.

Each of the above terms is also defined in this section.

Strategic Planning

Strategic planning is defined as

a deliberative, disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is (its identity), what it does (its strategies and actions), and why it does it (mandates, mission, goals, and the creation of public value). (Bryson, 2010a, pp. 256–257)

Timelines

Timelines in a strategic plan suggest when the actions will be taken and the expected milestones during implementation (Bryson & Alston, 2011).

Values or Values Statement

An organization's values or values statement is "a description of the code of behavior (in relation to employees, other key stakeholders, and society at large) to which an organization adheres or aspires" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170).

Vision Statement

A vision statement is "a description of what an organization will look like if it succeeds in implementing its strategies and achieves its full potential" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170).

Summary

Given the mixed results in the strategic planning literature, the perceived positive impact of strategic planning, and the complexity between micro, macro, process, and practice approaches to strategic planning, further research is needed. This study examined strategic plans in the public sector using a robust methodology. This mixed-method dissertation explored the strategic plans of one public sector unit, the State Plans on Aging, within all 50 states in the United States. The study explored the relationship between diversified collaboration and strategic plan design and the relationship between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes. The study explored the possible effect of regional differences within the United States upon diversified collaboration and strategic plan design and the effect of state demographic data on states' AARP Scorecard placement within quartiles.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

The purpose of the study was to explore strategic plan effectiveness within public sector aging services. The study was designed to explore the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact, along with the effects of the U.S. region and demographic characteristics of states, while leveraging and linking process/micro and practice/macro approaches to strategic planning research. This chapter provides context to the study by reviewing and synthesizing the existing scholarly literature on strategic planning and aging services. This literature review is divided into three main parts.

The first part addresses strategic planning, management, and leadership definitions. The first part also includes a brief history of strategic planning and strategic planning research and a review of three themes from more recent studies. The second part provides additional context around strategic planning, specifically in the public sector. The second part also includes a brief history of public sector planning, notes on the differences between private and public sector planning, and an overview of research on strategic planning in the public sector. The third part reviews strategic planning theories and approaches to strategic planning research. This part includes two important subsections related to this study: one subsection on process- and micro-based approaches to strategic planning research and another subsection on practice- and macro-based approaches. As part of these two specific subsections, information is presented about the variables and issues under examination in this study, including diversified collaboration in strategic planning, strategic plan artifacts and design, and organizational performance as it relates to large-scale public problems—more specifically for this study—the issues and challenges surrounding the older adult population in the United States, the aging and long-term services and supports that seek to address them.

Part 1 – Strategic Planning Overview

Part 1 of this chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section introduces and defines strategic planning. The second section reviews literature on strategic management, strategy in organizational design, and strategic leadership theories. The third section provides a history of strategic planning and strategic planning research

and an overview of more recent research on strategic planning. This recent research overview focuses on three themes: planning participation, improvements and innovations, and internal and external planning considerations. The intent is to provide a broad synopsis of strategic planning and general context for the current study.

Strategic Planning

Strategic planning is one of the most widely used management tools in contemporary organizations (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2019; Rigby & Bilodeau, 2018; Whittington, 2006; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Strategic planning is rooted in strategy, defined as a pattern of purposes and policies that define the company and its business (K. R. Andrews, 1980). The literature differentiates strategy as a property of an organization (e.g., the organization has a strategy); however, strategic planning is an activity completed by people in the organization (Hambrick, 2004; Jarzabkowski, 2004; Whittington, 2006). Strategy and strategic planning help organizations understand where they are currently, where they want to go, and the steps they will take to get there. Rigby and Bilodeau (2018) summarized strategic planning as the process of determining what an organization should become and the best way to achieve that goal. K. R. Andrews (1997) suggested that strategic planning involves determining what an organization "might do in terms of environmental opportunity [and] what it can do in terms of ability and power, and [then] bringing these two considerations together in optimal equilibrium" (p. 54). In other words, strategy and strategic planning form a bridge that links organizational aspirations—where the organization wants to go—with organizational capabilities—where the organization is currently (Bryson et al., 2021).

The definition of strategic planning differs within the literature over the years, though most definitions are overlapping and consistent (Johnsen, 2016; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Most strategic planning definitions emphasize a systematic and stepwise approach to strategy development (Armstrong, 1982; Ocasio & Joseph, 2008; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). In 1962, Chandler offered one of the first definitions of strategy in the business context in his seminal work entitled *Strategy and Structure*. Chandler defined strategic planning as the determination of long-term goals and objectives of an organization, the adoption of actions, and the allocation of resources necessary for carrying out those goals and objectives (Horwath, 2006). In 1979, Schendel and Hofer defined strategic planning

as a series of logical steps that included identifying and documenting a mission statement, long-term goals, environmental analyses, strategy formulation, strategy implementation, and control (Wolf & Floyd, 2017). By 1982, Armstrong suggested that strategic planning included a formal process for determining an organization's long-range objectives, generating and evaluating alternative strategies, and a system for monitoring the results of the plan as it was implemented. Almost 15 years later, Hopkins and Hopkins (1997) defined strategic planning as a formal process using systematic criteria and rigorous investigation to formulate, document, implement, and control strategic expectations for an organization. In 2004, Ketokivi and Castañer defined strategic planning differently as a cyclical process including annual assessments of performance goals, budgeting, and resource allocation decisions that support priorities. In 2017, Wolf and Floyd synthesized these definitions when conducting a systematic review of strategic planning research.

Wolf and Floyd (2017) offered a definition for strategic planning that characterized it as a

> more or less formalized, periodic process that provides a structured approach to strategy formulation, implementation, and control. The purpose of strategic planning is to influence an organization's strategic direction for a given period and to coordinate and integrate deliberate as well as emerging strategic decisions. Strategic planning comprises a range of different activities designed to fulfill this purpose (such as strategy reviews, meetings, generation of strategic plans, etc).; the extent to which such activities are governed by explicit rules and procedures … varies both within and between organizations. (p. 1758)

Though Wolf and Floyd's (2017) definition reflected a range of previous research efforts, for this study, the researcher has chosen to employ the seminal definition of strategic planning offered by Bryson (2010a), which suggested that strategic planning is

> a deliberative, disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is (its identity), what it does (its strategies and actions), and why it does it (mandates, mission, goals, and the creation of public value). (pp. 256–257)

Bryson's definition of strategic planning is often applied in the public sector and nonprofit sector strategic planning contexts.

Strategic Management and Leadership

Strategic planning is part of an overall organizational leadership tool known as strategic management. Strategic management combines strategic planning and implementing a strategic plan on an ongoing basis (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2019; Rigby & Bilodeau, 2018; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Thus, strategic management is action-oriented and linked to other tactical and organizational planning efforts (Bryson & Alston, 2011). Through these linkages, a strategically managed organization defines where it wants to be and manages the change needed to achieve its desired future through an action-oriented agenda of implementation (Bryson & Alston, 2011). In this way, strategic planning helps decision-makers—often leaders within or surrounding an organization—focus organizational efforts by answering questions about what, how, and why their organizations pursue certain activities (Bryson, 2010a; Johnsen, 2018; Wolf & Floyd, 2017).

Strategic approaches to leadership move beyond specific or concentrated activities related to strategic management. Qualities related to strategic leadership are frequent elements within the overall leadership literature. For example, strategic planning and visioning are important elements of servant leadership, authentic leadership, and transformational leadership theories (Avolio et al., 2004; Bass, 1985; W. George, 2003; Greenleaf, 2002; Russell & Stone, 2002). Leadership has been characterized as a complex array of elements within a shared, strategic, and global social dynamic (Avolio et al., 2009). Leaders use strategy and strategic characteristics to establish and execute pioneering direction by developing and articulating a vision and complementary actions to achieve the vision (Bachiochi et al., 2000; Dyer et al., 2013; Engelbrecht et al., 2018; Greenleaf, 2002; House, 1996; Kotter, 1990; Russell & Stone, 2002; Senge, 2006; Simonet & Tett, 2013). Skilled visioning and planning equate to leadership activities that focus organizations' goals (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005; Dennis & Winston, 2003; Patterson, 2003; Russell & Stone, 2002; Wong & Page, 2003). Leaders create organizational direction and purpose through executive design and foresight (W. George, 2003; Greenleaf, 2002; Senge, 2006; Simonet & Tett, 2013).

Strategy in Organizational Design

Strategy is also a part of organizational design theories based on systems thinking. Systems thinking refers to a framework for implementing solutions in an interrelated and comprehensive manner (Senge, 2006). Organizations are complex social systems that require a comprehensive approach to their design (Daryani et al., 2012; Galbraith, 2014). Leaders use systems thinking to coordinate various organizational functions organically and integrate leadership disciplines that transcend a traditional hierarchy (Daryani et al., 2012; Galbraith, 2014; Hatchuel & Segrestin, 2019; Senge, 2006).

The star model is a framework for implementing organizational solutions in an interrelated and comprehensive manner. The model provides a systems model of internal organizational design comprising strategy, structure, process, rewards, and people (Galbraith, 2014). The organization's strategy helps define how to allocate limited resources and guides decisions. It also helps the organization to align individuals' skill sets and mindsets with the organization's strategy and ensure that the correct people are in the right positions (Galbraith, 2014).

Further, strategic decisions may involve responding to external influences as organizations impact and are impacted by their external environment. Because of the impactful relationship between organizations and the environment, organizations will attempt to influence the environment strategically. They want to maintain or increase autonomy, power, resources, and stability (Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976; Davis & Cobb, 2010).

Strategic Leadership Theory

Although strategy and planning are prominent components of leadership and organizational theories and frameworks, strategic leadership is its own specific leadership theory. Strategic leadership generally involves achieving direction, alignment, and commitment (Drath et al., 2008). It is often associated with the leadership styles of individuals within the top levels of an organization (Samimi et al., 2020). Strategic leadership is demonstrated by individuals who create and communicate vision and effect improvement in organizational outcomes. These leaders are skilled in problem-solving, decision-making, creative thinking, and critical thinking (Barron & Henderson, 1995).

Strategic leadership can occur at the organizational, collaborative, or social movement levels (Bryson et al., 2021). The multi-leveled approach to strategic leadership aligns with research on leadership in general, indicating that leadership is a function of multiple hierarchical levels, with variable cross-level and mixed-level effects (Yammarino et al., 2008). Leadership considerations exist on each level and consist of conceptual implications and practical applications. The following paragraph explains the meaning of each level of strategic leadership (organizational, collaborative, or social movement) in more detail.

The organizational level of strategic leadership involves only one organization. Research on strategic leadership within a single organization is the most prevalent type of strategic leadership research (Bryson et al., 2021). Although strategic organizational leadership has received the most attention, there are two additional types: strategic leadership at the collaborative and social movement levels. Strategic leadership at the collaborative level means leading strategy across multiple organizations. This type of leadership is considered an *at-scale* type of leadership and is defined as leading a collaboration between more than one organization focused on achieving collective impact (Bryson et al., 2021; Prange et al., 2016). Collective impact refers to "the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem" (Kania & Kramer, 2011, p. 36). According to Kania and Kramer (2011), leaders achieve collective impact through a disciplined, cross-organizational, and cross-sector approach to problem-solving on a scale that matches the challenge. The final type, the social transformation level, is the most complex level of strategic leadership. The social transformation level of strategic leadership means leading many cross-sectoral initiatives that are loosely coordinated and co-aligned, guided by shared principles, and seeking to create major social system changes (Bryson et al., 2021). This type of strategic leadership is most critical when the needed context and type of change shifts beyond a single organization—or a group of organizations—and expands to collaborative social movements (Bryson et al., 2021; Drath et al., 2008). Strategic leadership of social transformations may include community organizing, coalition building, and advocacy (Bryson et al., 2021).

Collaborative-level strategic leadership represented the level of leadership examined for this study because it included a review of multiple organizations. Diversified collaboration (group diversity) was explored according to the number and type of organizations involved in strategic planning efforts. Understanding cross-sectoral and collaborative-level strategic leadership is important because it leads to more advanced societal strategic efforts (Bryson et al., 2021; Prange et al., 2016). Advanced strategy efforts are important because some researchers have suggested that collaborative or collective impact-style initiatives alone are not enough to achieve the system, power, or policy changes needed for major societal issues, such as equality or justice (Christens & Inzeo, 2015; Wolff et al., 2016). More information about major social problems and collaboration within strategic planning is provided later in this chapter.

History of Strategic Planning and Research

Strategic planning is a significant part of modern organizations; however, it is not a recent concept. Writers have credited military applications as the origins of strategic planning as far back as ancient times (Blackerby, 1994; Freedman, 2013; Nartisa et al., 2012; Woyzbun, n.d.). The term "strategy" derives from the Greek word *strategos*, which means "the art of the general of the army" (Blackerby, 1994, p. 20). Ancient Greek tribes annually elected a strategos to head their regiments. Over time, the role of the strategos expanded to include civil duties as elected officials (Blackerby, 1994; Freedman, 2013; Woyzbun, n.d.). Sun Tzu, a Chinese military strategist, famously wrote about and taught military strategy in 500 B.C., focusing on strategy as the foundation of success (Freedman, 2013; Woyzbun, n.d.). Strategy and strategic planning are present in these ancient examples and have proliferated throughout history (Freedman, 2013). This section provides an overview of strategic planning in the 20th century, followed by a more detailed review of past strategic planning research, including an overview of varying theories and findings.

Strategic Planning in the 20th Century

Strategic planning occurred primarily in the private sector (comprised of for-profit businesses) during the 20th century. In the early 1920s, the Harvard Business School developed the Harvard business policy model as one of the first strategic planning

methodologies for private businesses (Blackerby, 1994; Bryson & Roering, 1987). The Harvard business policy model would become one of the most widely used and enduring frameworks for strategic management (Alford & Greve, 2017). The purpose of the model was to help businesses define the value to be created and then find the best fit between the business's capabilities and its environment (Alford & Greve, 2017; Bryson & Roering, 1987). Around the same time, one practitioner, Alfred Sloan, head of General Motors, became a pioneer in strategic planning by developing and implementing novel business strategies. Sloan's strategy primarily centered around a 1921 reorganization of General Motors to align the company (Horwath, 2006). As a result of Sloan's planning and implementation, by 1927, General Motors had sold 1.8 million vehicles, causing them to be the market leader over their competitor, Ford Motors (Freedman, 2013). Nearly 20 years later, Drucker (1946/2017) published *Concepts of the Corporation* to examine Sloan, General Motors, and other large organizations, such as General Electric, IBM, and Sears. Through interviews, observations, and analysis, Drucker (1946/2017) concluded that the most successful companies were centralized and goal-oriented (Freedman, 2013; Horwath, 2006).

Shortly after, during the 1950s, the focus of strategic planning shifted away from organizational policy and structure and instead focused on managing risks and growing market share (Blackerby, 1994). Strategic planning focuses on budgetary, financial control, and investment planning (Horwath, 2006). Ansoff (1957) outlined a new conceptual framework for planning, the Ansoff Matrix, which provided strategic planners with a decision-making guide for setting corporate marketing or market-oriented business unit direction (Freedman, 2013; Nartisa et al., 2012; Woyzbun, n.d.). Ansoff (1957) suggested that strategic planning should include formal and detailed procedures to help organizations achieve their objectives (Horwath, 2006). This work, along with other advancements, provided the catalyst for the expansion of corporate planning.

By the 1960s, the business community fully acknowledged corporate strategic planning (Freedman, 2013; Horwath, 2006). A range of strategic planning concepts, procedures, and means had been developed and used within the for-profit sector (Bryson et al., 2018). Strategic planning had become a standard management tool used by nearly every *Fortune 500* company (Blackerby, 1994). Firms worked first to determine their

strategies and then developed the structure needed to support the strategy (Horwath, 2006). The popularity of strategic planning was evident as corporations established planning departments that oversaw forecasting, investment decision-making, and the creation of long-term plans (Horwath, 2006).

In 1963, Bruce Henderson founded a management consulting firm—the Boston Consulting Group. The group developed another foundational strategic tool, the Growth/Share Matrix. The matrix was designed to directly compare competitors and cost structures to assess a firm's market growth rate concerning its relative market share (Freedman, 2013; Horwath, 2006). This tool was widely accepted and helped to accelerate strategic planning into the 1970s (Horwath, 2006).

During the 1970s and 1980s, strategic management experienced additional expansion and continued to be a popular activity in the private sector (Bryson et al., 2018). During this time, strategic planning was used to establish connections between individual business units within a centralized corporation's portfolio (Horwath, 2006). Drucker (1973) released another seminal work called *Management*. Drucker (1973) asserted that strategic planning was a disciplined and continuous process of balancing risks with actions and expectations (Woyzbun, n.d.).

Over the next several years, planning experts continued to conduct strategic planning as a disciplined and formal process whereby they analyzed their choice of industries, markets, segments, and positions within those segments and their competitors (Horwath, 2006). Despite its popularity, by the 1980s, strategic planning was beginning to be heavily critiqued. According to Freedman (2013), "planning departments had become large and expensive, the next [planning] cycle began as soon as the previous one finished, and the outputs were ever more complicated" (p. 503). General Motors, once famed for its strategic planning acumen, abolished corporate strategic planning in its organization. In 1984, *Business Week* (as cited in Freedman, 2013) published an article citing the changes in General Motors and pronouncing the end of strategic planning. Henry Mintzberg (1987, 1994) criticized strategic planning. In 1994, Mintzberg suggested that strategic planning, in a prescriptive form, was ineffective. Mintzberg (1994) believed real strategy was more intuitive and evolving and could not be captured in a stringent strategic plan (Freedman, 2013; Nartisa et al., 2012; Wolf & Floyd, 2017).

As such, strategic thinking, rather than planning, was necessary and accomplished through creativity, intuition, and "a not-too-precisely articulated vision of direction that must be free to appear at any time and at any place in the organization" (Nartisa et al., 2012, p. 242). According to Wolf and Floyd (2017), 1994 became a turning point in the conversation about strategic planning. Other approaches to strategic planning were needed to address conflicts and realities within and between organizations. Economic approaches to strategic planning needed to be tempered with concepts found in sociology (Freedman, 2013).

In 1994, Hamel and Prahalad introduced and defined the concept of core competencies as a bundle of skills, capacities, and technologies giving an organization an advantage over its competitors (Horwath, 2006). This shift toward a more holistic view of the organization led to the development of the balanced scorecard. Kaplan and Norton (2001) developed this tool in *The Strategy-Focused Organization*. The balanced scorecard was designed to improve strategic planning and effectiveness by creating a stronger link between objectives and day-to-day operational realities (Woyzbun, n.d.). The balanced scorecard was also designed to be easier for staff at all levels to understand and support (Freedman, 2013). These new approaches to strategic planning afforded more attention to the elements comprising strategic planning activities, including why the process was being undertaken, what the circumstances were, the stakeholders and customers involved, what was learned, and how the learning was applied (Bryson et al., 2009; Horwath, 2006). Other strategic innovations, implementation approaches, thinking, and technologies propelled strategic planning into the 21st century. Further, strategic planning has since expanded into the public and nonprofit sectors, where it is widely practiced (Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; B. George et al., 2019; Horwath, 2006). More information on strategic planning, specifically in the public sector, is presented later in this chapter after a general review of previous strategic planning research.

History of Strategic Planning Research

Most strategic planning research is rooted in industrial economics and social sciences (Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Whittington, 2006). Wolf and Floyd (2017) reviewed more than 30 years of strategic planning research to explore diverse topics, such as stakeholders involved in planning and whether differences in how the planning activities

were completed influenced organizational outcomes. Wolf and Floyd's (2017) meta-analysis also resulted in several important findings. For example, Wolf and Floyd found that the *Strategic Management Journal*—considered the most prominent source of academic articles on strategic planning since its founding in 1980—had experienced a significant decline in the number of articles it published on strategic planning beginning in the 1990s. As just one example, the *Strategic Management Journal* published 32 articles on strategic planning between 1980 and 1989 but only nine articles since 1990 and only one between 2000 and 2013. Wolf and Floyd (2017) identified and categorized different types of strategic planning research:

> (a) articles focusing on normative planning models; (b) descriptive articles on how organizations actually plan; (c) articles focusing on the relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance, including those articles that elaborate contingencies in the planning-performance relationship and those that focus on the operationalization of planning; (d) articles elaborating on the role of actors in strategic planning; and (e) previously published reviews. (p. 1785)

The following paragraphs provide a more detailed review of past and recent strategic planning research and findings.

During the 1970s, researchers focused on the characteristics of strategic planning and whether it was practiced in organizations. During the 1980s and early 1990s, the focus shifted toward finding empirical linkages between strategic planning and organizational performance (Wolf & Floyd, 2017). The planning-performance relationship dominated the research during this time and formed a peak in the number of publications available on the topic (Whittington & Cailluet, 2008). The studies ranged from assessments on the direct link between strategic planning and organizational performance to supplemental studies connecting planning and performance to other internal and external environmental factors (Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Organizational performance was usually operationalized as financial performance to examine the link between planning and performance (Wolf & Floyd, 2017). The results of such empirical studies were mixed, with some studies showing positively correlated relationships, some showing negative relationships, and some showing no statistical connection.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, researchers indicated that firms could control costs, increase net income and growth, and minimize areas of underachievement through strategic planning (M. Berry, 1998; Bracker et al., 1988; Guerard et al., 1990; Rhyne, 1986). During the same period, other studies showed that organizations did not seem to realize any competitive advantage from formal and complex planning approaches (Kudla, 1980; Mick et al., 1994; Pearce et al., 1987; Rhyne, 1987; Robinson & Pearce, 1983; Shrader et al., 1984). Researchers conducting meta-analyses at the time purported controllable methodological inconsistencies in the various studies and interactions between contingency variables. The implication for future research was to improve future research designs (Pearce et al., 1987).

Other reviews continued the debate on the relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance (Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Boyd's (1991) and Schwenk and Shrader's (1993) meta-analyses contended that there was support for a positive relationship between the extensiveness of strategic planning and organizational performance. In 1994, C. C. Miller and Cardinal published a meta-analysis on the association between strategic planning and organizational performance, finding a modest but positive relationship. At the same time, Mintzberg (1994) criticized strategic planning as being ineffective. Mintzberg's seminal works are presented later in this chapter. The consensus among researchers during this time—along with overwhelming empirical evidence for a positive relationship between planning and organizational performance— remained inconclusive (T. J. Andersen, 2000; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1997; Wolf & Floyd, 2017).

Recent Strategic Planning Research

Research during the 2000s declined but was still conducted by scholars. Nearly 25 years later, B. George et al. (2019) conducted a meta-analysis and confirmed C. C. Miller and Cardinal's (1994) findings that strategic planning has a significant, moderate, and positive impact on organizational performance. B. George et al. (2019) reviewed and expanded the definition of organizational performance from financial performance to include outcomes such as effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness. Though some of the studies included in B. George et al.'s review showed no relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance (Lemak & Goodrick, 2003; Saleh et al., 2013;

Wells et al., 2004), most studies reviewed found mixed or positive results. In addition to examining the relationship between planning and performance, the studies also explored tangential elements of planning and their link to other organizational efforts. For example, some researchers studied the effectiveness of strategic planning to potentially link long-range strategic goals and organizational performance with mid-range and operational activities and plans (Falshaw et al., 2006). Other studies included examining planning participation, the extent of planning activities, the relationship with process improvement and innovation, and other internal and external factors. The following subsections highlight some results from more recent strategic planning research, including the mixed nature of the findings. The subsections are divided into three themes: planning and participation, improvements and innovations, and internal and external considerations.

Planning and Participation. Kaissi and Begun (2008) studied how strategic planning and its processes might influence the relationship between planning and organizational performance. The researchers found that having a strategic plan, assigning the CEO responsible for the plan, and involving the governing board in the planning process were all associated with higher organizational performance, specifically financial performance. Still, Kaissi and Begun's results were mixed, with the extent to which the plan was fully developed and implemented showing no relationship with performance. Similarly, Ouakouak and Ouedraogo (2013) found mixed results. Ouakouak and Ouedraogo included financial performance and other nonfinancial indicators, such as shareholder, customer, and employee satisfaction. The researchers' results showed that strategic alignment (an employee's agreement with the strategic direction) mediates the positive relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance. The researchers also noted that employee and management participation in developing the strategic plan did not have any relationship with employee strategic alignment or positive firm performance.

In contrast to Ouakouak and Ouedraogo's latter set of findings, Elbanna (2008) found that management participation in the strategic planning process often enhanced strategic planning effectiveness. Similarly, De Baerdemaeker and Bruggeman (2015) found that performance was positively associated with strategic planning when middle

managers participated in the planning process. De Baerdemaeker and Bruggeman measured firm performance using a financial tool known as budgetary slack. Slack is the deliberate inclusion of excess resources in the budget, making it easier to attain budgetary objectives (De Baerdemaeker & Bruggeman, 2015; Fadol et al., 2015). Another contrast emerged, this time to the findings of Kaissi and Begun (2008), when Fadol et al. (2015) noted a positive relationship between organizational performance (as measured again by budgetary slack) and the extensiveness of strategic planning as a mediator. These studies' differences and findings are good examples of mixed yet generally positively correlated results in strategic planning research.

   Improvements and Innovations. Other studies that explored the link between strategic planning and performance and the relationship with other related activities included studies focused on process improvement and innovation. Suarez et al. (2016) examined the role of strategic planning in process and performance management systems, such as total quality management. Researchers have defined total quality management as an organizational culture that supports the continuous improvement of organizational processes and consistent customer satisfaction through an integrated system of tools, techniques, and training (Sila & Ebrahimpour, 2003). Suarez et al. (2016) found that strategic planning mediated between the social factors of total quality management (e.g., leadership and people) and technical factors (e.g., partners, resources, and processes). Similarly, Samuelsson and Nilsson (2002) noted the importance of strategic planning in linking process improvement with priorities that support long-term organizational success and change. These types of improvements create and increase public value. Another way to create and increase public value is through innovations (Borins, 2014). Salomo et al. (2007) studied the link between proficient planning and innovation and found that strategic planning had a positive impact. Comparably, Petkovic et al. (2016) also reported planning elements and activities beneficial in promoting service innovativeness.

   Related to innovation, Song et al. (2011) reported a positive link between certain types of strategic planning, the number of new products developed, and the overall connection with firm performance as measured by return on investment. This linkage may have been because strategic planning helped to reduce risks associated with new product development by balancing resource supply and demand, accelerating product

development, and reducing the likelihood that the organization may disband (Delmar & Shane, 2003). Further, Bachmann et al. (2016) found a positive relationship between strategic planning and a firm's entrepreneurial orientation. Entrepreneurial orientation is a performance-influencing behavior of innovation and positive risk-taking (Wales et al., 2011). Bachmann et al.'s (2016) findings were stronger in certain national cultures than in others, such as in cultures that avoided uncertainty and favored collectivism. Arend et al. (2017) suggested that such results might indicate how strategic planning enables employees and organizations to work strategically within their normal cultural preferences. These studies, like those described in the subsection above, are good examples of mixed yet generally positively correlated results in strategic planning research.

Internal and External Considerations. Other recent research areas included exploring the relationship between strategic planning and performance and the impacts of other internal and external considerations. Glaister et al. (2008) found a strong and positive relationship between formal strategic planning and firm performance. The researchers verified the moderating roles of internal and external factors such as environmental turbulence, organization structure, and firm size. Similarly, Delgado et al. (2009) reported a positive relationship between financial performance and internal activities and functions designed for strategic control. Arend et al. (2017) also found that strategic planning could permeate behaviors within all an organization's hierarchical levels and units. Petkovic et al. (2016) linked strategic planning and performance to the organization's external client network, scope, and internal workplace development. Other researchers confirmed the importance of development and learning related to strategic planning, including how intra-organizational capabilities influenced the benefits an organization might derive from strategic planning (Eisenhardt & Sull, 2001; Liedtka, 2000; S. Miller et al., 2004). Sirén and Kohtamäki (2016) confirmed the importance of development and learning, which highlighted that organizations needed both strategic planning and organizational learning to achieve improved performance. Although the studies presented in the previous subsections are only a sampling of the literature available on internal and external considerations related to planning and performance,

they further highlight the mixed yet generally positively correlated results within strategic planning research.

Part 2 – Strategic Planning in the Public Sector

Thus far, the researcher concentrated the literature review on strategic planning in the private sector to provide a general overview and history of strategic planning; however, strategic planning as a management activity is not confined to the private sector. Part 2 focuses on strategic planning in the public sector. This part is divided into three sections. The first section provides a brief history of strategic planning in the public sector. The second section compares strategic planning in the public sector with strategic planning in the private sector. The third section provides an overview of research focused on strategic planning in the public sector. The third section includes a review of themes from the literature, including goals, mission, and performance; perceived performance and objective performance; and planning conditions and contexts. Aspects relevant to the current study are noted in the third section of this part.

Strategic Planning in the Public Sector

Throughout most of the 20th century, strategic planning was an activity in the private sector, but by the 1980s, strategic planning was also occurring in the public sector (Blackerby, 1994; Bryson et al., 2018; Johnsen, 2016; Nartisa et al., 2012). Although private sector strategic planning was conducted to maximize market shares and profits, public sector organizations began using strategic planning more often to increase efficiency and effectiveness (Bryson et al., 2018). Within the last 10 years, strategic planning in the public sector has expanded with an enhanced focus on addressing broad social issues (Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Vaara & Whittington, 2012).

These serious issues are within societal systems, representing often ambiguous and consequential public problems and ills (Bryson, 2010a; B. George et al., 2018; Kroll & Moynihan, 2015; Lee et al., 2018; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Strategic planning in the public sector is increasingly seen as an approach to public policymaking aimed at solving problems that are "dynamic and cannot be addressed through a static or one-time decision" (Lee et al., 2018, p. 360). As public problems have become more complex, the

need to understand how to best conduct strategic planning to solve these problems has become critical (Bryson et al., 2010; Vaara & Durand, 2012).

History of Strategic Planning in the Public Sector

Public sector strategic planning began in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s and spread to other countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada (Alford & Greve, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Elbanna et al., 2016; Johnsen, 2016). This shift into the public sector marked a return to the origins of strategic planning, which had first emerged in military applications and then in statecraft that entailed managing government affairs (Freedman, 2013). Early public sector plans were focused on efficient public resources and were typically limited to narrow chains of authority within an organization (Blackerby, 1994). This focus was partly because constitutions and laws were viewed as the primary inputs for public administration; thus, planning was focused on internal issues or external mandates (Nartisa et al., 2012).

During the 1980s, a new model for strategic management emerged. The new model was called new public management (Hood, 1991). The original Harvard business policy model was the basis for the new public management model. New public management was presented as a means for applying private sector strategic planning tools found in the Harvard business policy model in the public sector (Alford & Greve, 2017; Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; B. George et al., 2019; Johnsen, 2016). New public management was a proposed solution for addressing inefficiencies in government, which was perceived as big and inefficient. The perspective was that the private sector was more efficient than the public and that efficiencies could be achieved in the public sector by applying corporate approaches to strategic planning (Alford & Greve, 2017; Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015). Leading consulting firms with experience working with *Fortune 500* companies started to work more often with public sector organizations, which led to the growth of private sector strategic planning practices in the public sector (Alford & Greve, 2017).

By the early 1990s, strategic planning in the public sector became even more focused on performance-based and mission-driven government (Alford & Greve, 2017; Elbanna et al., 2016). This focus was meant to balance what had previously been a focus on inputs (the laws that directed the agency) to a more external focus on outputs (the

value the agencies created for the public). With Oregon and Texas leading by example, several state governments began requiring state agencies to submit strategic plans regularly. The agencies must show how their plans aligned with and contributed to achieving broader statewide goals. This practice was paired with a concept known as performance-based budgeting, where agencies built their annual budget requests around tactical and strategic objectives represented in their plans (Blackerby, 1994; Bryson et al., 2010).

The Chief Financial Officer's Act of 1990 (1990) was an important catalyst in changing federal agencies' focus and balancing the internal and external views. The act helped governmental agencies to acknowledge that they could no longer focus solely on what the organization did or produced but also on the external effects of their activities and the value received by the people the organization was mandated to serve (Blackerby, 1994; Bryson et al., 2010). Another law, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (1993), built on the Chief Financial Officer's Act (1990) and required federal agencies to write comprehensive strategic plans, performance plans with program-specific goals and performance indicators, and performance reports (Blackerby, 1994; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013; Schmidle, 2012). Soon after, Vinzant and Vinzant (1996) developed a model for assessing public sector organizations' strategic planning and management processes within three core domains: planning, budgeting, and performance management. This model would capture the defining characteristics of public sector planning (Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013). Through the model, strategic planning would become a guide for "or at least strongly influence, budgeting, performance, and improvement initiatives" (Bryson et al., 2010, p. 2).

Strategic planning in the public sector continued into the 2000s and has since become a conventional and orthodox feature of government organizations at the federal, state, and local levels (Bryson et al., 2021; B. George et al., 2019; Nartisa et al., 2012). It also continues to be shaped by two main results-based components: a strategic management component where plans are aligned to broader governmental goals and a budget component with annual budget requests centered around tactical and strategic objectives represented in the plans (Nartisa et al., 2012; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013). The Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 (2011) was a

congressional mandate that (again) sought to improve public sector agency performance through private sector-style strategic planning (Bryson et al., 2018; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013; Tama, 2015). The Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 (2011) required strategic planning activities in agencies and was premised on improving public sector accountability and compliance, thus promoting both strategic management and budgetary components (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2019; Nartisa et al., 2012).

Beyond the two generally accepted components, modern approaches to strategic planning in the public sector have a stronger focus on three additional key ideas: value creation, digitalization, and involvement (Greve, 2015). According to Greve (2015), public managers are in a "strategic triangle" (p. 55) between their authorizing mandates, organizational goals, and their organizational results. This triangle is called performance governance. Combined with an innovation agenda, performance governance is a part of the stronger focus on value creation (Greve, 2015). Regarding the second key idea, digitalization, strategic planning has sought to enhance transparency through new communication and engagement methods such as social media. As a platform, social media has allowed citizens to become "friends" with public organizations and managers and thus promote more democratic dialogue (Greve, 2015). The third key idea surrounding modern strategic planning in the public sector is involvement. This idea promotes networks, collaboration, public-private partnerships, and better engagement in public affairs (Greve, 2015). Although all three are important, the first and third key ideas are central to this study—the resulting value of strategic planning efforts and the level of engagement through collaboration during plan development.

The three key ideas presented also illustrate the evolving nature of strategic planning in the public sector. According to Alford and Greve (2017), "the public sector is neither static nor monolithic. It is constantly changing, pushed by its tasks, its environment and the capacities it needs" (p. 3). Further, the nature of strategic management in both the private and public sectors has evolved, but not necessarily the same way across sectors (Alford & Greve, 2017). Therefore, one should review (a) the similarities and differences between strategic planning in the public and private sectors

and (b) research focused on the public sector and its unique characteristics. The following two sections provide both.

Private Sector Versus Public Sector Strategic Planning

Significant similarities and differences exist between the private sector and public sector strategic planning (Alford & Greve, 2017; Bryson & Roering, 1987). According to B. George et al. (2019), how strategic planning is practiced "is – at least partially – contingent on who is actually doing strategic planning and why … as well whether a specific form of strategic planning is coerced by an authorizing environment" (p. 811). Both sectors benefit from planning that emphasizes action toward achieving organizational aims and objectives and consideration of internal capacities and external environmental factors (Bryson et al., 2018; Bryson & Roering, 1987; Elbanna et al., 2016; Johnsen, 2016). Strategic planning in private and public sectors involves "general policy and direction setting, situation assessments, strategic issues identification, strategy development, decision making, action, and evaluation" (Bryson & Roering, 1987, p. 14). Strategic planning in both sectors can be further identified by close attention to context; efforts to define purposes, goals, and situational requirements; a broad vision that narrows to a more tactical and action orientation; an emphasis on systems thinking and interrelationships; and the formulation and implementation of strategies (Albrechts & Balducci, 2013; Bryson et al., 2018; Chakraborty et al., 2011). In 1987, just as strategic planning in the public sector began, Bryson and Roering cautioned that although private sector strategic planning might apply to public sector organizations and purposes, "not all approaches are equally useful since several conditions govern the successful use of each approach" (p. 11). Thirty years later, researchers agree on this matter (e.g., Elbanna et al., 2016). Alford and Greve (2017) confirmed that a good strategic approach in the public sector "is one that deploys what the private corporate sector has found to be useful – for example, in articulating strategic intent, looking outward to the environment, or understanding incentives – while being cognizant of the distinctive features of the public sector" (p. 6).

This paragraph lists five main differences between the private and public sector strategic planning to illustrate the distinctive features of the public sector. First, the actors and stakeholders in the public sector's environments are different and more complex than

those in the private sector (Alford & Greve, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Elbanna et al., 2016). Researchers have defined actors and stakeholders as any individual, group, or organization that can "place a claim on the organization's attention, resources, or output or is affected by that output" (Bryson & Roering, 1987, p. 11). Public sector planning involves elected, appointed, and career officials; multiple levels of government and sectors; and multiple external co-producers, collaborators, and volunteers engaging with the organization based on an assumed relationship of trust, altruism, and commitment (Alford & Greve, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Johnsen, 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002).

Second, public sector organizations operate in a political environment, while private sector organizations operate in market environments (Alford & Greve, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018). The public sector's political environment is shaped by a unique set of legal, legislative, administrative, and accountability considerations (Alford & Greve, 2017; Tama, 2018). This external environment may include mandates to conduct strategic planning by an authorizing organization with democratic oversight of the agency (Elbanna et al., 2016). The private sector's market environment is defined by market growth (or lack of growth), competition, and regulations focused on capitalism (Alford & Greve, 2017).

Third, although strategic planning in both the private and public sectors is concerned with optimizing the "fit" between an organization and the environment in which it operates, for public agencies, the focus is on strengthening performance to provide better services to the public (Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). This focus leads to the third difference between private and public sector strategic planning. Private sector strategic planning focuses on a single organization seeking a competitive advantage over others. In contrast, public sector planning seeks to build multi-actor collaborative relationships among private, nonprofit, and other public organizations. Private sector strategic planning is not generally collaborative, though this is evolving as public-private partnerships are becoming more common (Alford & Greve, 2017).

Fourth, private sector strategic planning aims to maximize organizational or work-unit profit, market share, and other business-related outcomes. In contrast, public-sector strategic planning is undertaken to achieve goal alignment and continuity of effort. The goal is to gain performance-related effectiveness (Bryson et al., 2018).

The fifth and final difference between private and public sector strategic planning is that public sector strategic planning may be motivated by political leaders seeking to strengthen their political control over an organization's units and personnel or enhance an organization's external legitimacy and support (Tama, 2018). In the public sector, political influence may be accomplished through a broadened advocacy base and a supportive coalition (Bryson & Alston, 2011; Bryson et al., 2018). Although the expansion of this nature may seem similar to the growth or control sought by private sector leaders, the political motivation and maneuvering set it apart in the public sector.

Further differences in sector planning may exist; however, these five differences highlight why public-sector strategic planning differs from private-sector planning. Bryson and Roering (1987) summarized the differences:

> Corporate strategic planning typically focuses on an *organization* and what it should do to improve its performance, and not on a *community*, the traditional object of attention for [public sector] planners, or on a *function*, such as transportation or health care within a community. (p. 9, emphasis in original).

These differences are experienced not only in how strategic planning is conducted but also in how it is researched. The following section will provide information about strategic planning research in the public sector.

Strategic Planning Research in the Public Sector

Although strategic planning in the public sector is now an established practice, it is still a relatively recent tool. Research and results also have varied (Elbanna et al., 2016; Johnsen, 2018). Even as recent as the early 2000s, research on the effectiveness of strategic planning and implementation in the public sector remained fragmented, dispersed, mixed, and inconclusive (Bossidy & Charan, 2011; Bryson et al., 2018; Elbanna et al., 2014; B. George et al., 2018). Although research in this area is limited, some interesting questions have been examined. In general, previous studies' results and meta-analytic evidence indicated a positively correlated relationship between planning and organizational performance (R. Andrews et al., 2012; Borins, 2014; Elbanna et al., 2016; Walker & Andrews, 2015), though the type of strategic planning is not always clear and effect sizes vary (Bryson et al., 2018). Critics of public-sector strategic planning based their critiques on the formal or mechanistic approaches to planning or

inapplicability in the public sector (Bovaird, 2008). Others suggested that public sector planning could be beneficial, but it was not a necessary or sufficient condition for enhanced organizational performance (Boyne, 2001). Bryson et al. (2009) contended that many studies conducted by the critics of strategic planning in the public sector did not examine "the larger context within which the planning occurred, who was involved in the planning and how these actors were connected, how the planning was done, what was learned, and how the resulting learning was applied" (p. 174).

Further, scholars have struggled to achieve one single definition for strategic planning in the public sector (Johnsen, 2016). This struggle is like the lack of a single definition of strategic planning, as mentioned earlier in this chapter. As a few examples, Olsen and Eadie (1984) defined strategic planning of governmental agencies as "a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions shaping the nature and direction of governmental activities within constitutional bounds" (p. 4). Twenty years later, Boyne and Walker (2004) defined strategic planning very simply as "a means to improve public services" (p. 231). Knutsson et al. (2008) suggested ambiguously that public sector strategy "is not about any single major decision, but rather about series of many small decisions, which taken together, create a pattern of good municipal resource management" (p. 296). Mulgan (2009) defined strategic planning more concretely as "the systematic use of public resources and power, by public agencies, to achieve public goals (p. 19). Joyce (2017) detailed that public strategy meant "looking ahead and planning ahead when making decisions and making use of strategic thinking, planning and management techniques to support public leaders' decision making and action planning" (p. 2). The variety within these definitions highlights the undefined nature of strategic planning in the public sector.

A theoretical and practical need continues to exist to understand better what strategic planning is; what works in planning; how it works and why it works, under different conditions, contexts, and circumstances; and what influence strategic planning has, if any, on organizational performance in the public sector (Bryson et al., 2018; Jung & Lee, 2013). Researchers have shown that strategic planning is a key mechanism for integrating, coordinating, centralizing, and decentralizing organizational decision-making (T. J. Andersen, 2004; Grant, 2003; Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2011; Wolf & Floyd, 2017).

Studies suggest that strategic planning is important in how organizations formulate major problems, analyze alternatives, and choose a strategic direction (Wolf & Floyd, 2017). This important role may stem from the information-processing characteristics of strategic planning. These characteristics include applying creativity to manage uncertainty; the ability to generate ideas and visionary strategies; the means to approach political, administrative, and other concerns; and the analysis and synthesis of information for decision-making (Bryson, 2010b; B. George et al., 2018). Several studies have corroborated the assertion that strategic planning and management improve performance in the public sector (Johnsen, 2018); however, most studies assume that public sector planning that is more rather than less strategic will lead to improved organizational performance and outcomes (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George & Desmidt, 2018). Bryson et al. (2018) questioned, "Two issues, however, become immediately obvious: First, how does one operationally assess the 'strategic-ness' of the planning, and second, what effects do different levels of 'strategic-ness' have on results of various kinds" (p. 321)? Bryson et al. (2018) further found a lack of empirical research on public-sector strategic planning and its connection to organizational performance, "especially with regard to determining the impacts, if any, that different levels of strategic-ness have in different contexts" (p. 321). This study attempted to contribute to this discussion by operationalizing the strategic level of the planning through the diversity in the stakeholder group and the comprehensiveness of the strategic plan design. For this study, higher levels of diversity and design were associated with higher levels of strategy. These variables were compared to the organizational performance results as defined by the AARP Scorecard.

The following subsections provide an overview of a selection of research results from more recent strategic planning research focused on the public sector, including the mixed nature of the findings, to support further the current study design and rationale. The paragraphs focus on three central themes: goals, mission, and performance; perceived performance and objective performance; and planning conditions and contexts. Aspects relevant to the current study are noted within each of the subsections.

Goals, Mission, and Performance. In the public sector, goal ambiguity is problematic and negatively impacts performance (Chun & Rainey, 2005). Strategic

planning establishes goals often related to performance (Bryson, 2010b; Niven, 2003; Poister, 2010; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2011). Goal setting encourages improved performance because it focuses organizations on goal-relevant efforts. Mission statements are the foundation for goals, priorities, and strategies in strategic planning (Kroll & Moynihan, 2015; Pearce & David, 1987). Specific mission statements and goals provide direction while positively influencing and motivating public sector employees; research has linked such specificity with improved performance (Jung & Lee, 2013; Jung & Rainey, 2011). This improvement is likely because, as individuals within the organization are motivated to achieve strategic goals, energy and attention are diverted away from goal-irrelevant activities (Latham, 2004).

Several study findings have supported the claim that organizations that create and implement strategies designed to achieve goals and objectives are expected to achieve improved performance (Bryson, 2010b; Niven, 2003; Poister, 2010; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2011). Setting goals, along with the related objectives and targets, helps organizations focus on priorities, outcomes, and results (Ammons & Rivenbark, 2008; Kelly, 2003; Poister et al., 2015; Van Dooren et al., 2010). By formulating a mission, setting strategic goals, measuring performance results, and reporting them to stakeholders, public organizations can define and document the value they create for the public (Kroll & Moynihan, 2015). As part of this study, the researcher reviewed strategic plans for the presence (or lack) of identifiable mission statements, specific goals, measurable objectives, and actionable strategies, among other elements.

Perceived Performance and Objective Performance. Strategic planning results, usually found in some aspect of organizational performance, have been operationalized in various ways. Earlier in this chapter, the researcher indicated that organizational performance had been traditionally defined as financial performance, including profiting; however, the definition of organizational performance has also been expanded to include outcomes such as effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness (B. George et al., 2019). These expanded outcomes are especially relevant in the public sector. Another important differentiation in measuring planning impacts on organizational performance is whether the performance impact is subjectively perceived or objectively quantified (Jimenez, 2013; Johnsen, 2018). Jung and Lee (2013) studied the effects of goal properties and

strategic planning capacity on perceived organizational performance. Capacity was defined as the organization's ability to balance demands, integrate organizational functioning, and allocate resources effectively. The researchers found that strategic planning capacity positively influenced perceived organizational performance in the public sector (Jung & Lee, 2013). B. George et al. (2018) found that planning team members' cognitive styles impacted their perceived ease of use of planning tools and the overall usefulness of the strategic planning process. B. George et al. (2018) further linked the perceived usefulness of the strategic planning process to increases in commitment to the plan.

Other researchers have investigated objective rather than subjective performance measurements resulting from strategic planning. A meta-analysis of empirical studies of management and performance in the public sector found that strategic planning and related techniques, such as setting measurable benchmarks and targets, were likely to improve performance (Walker & Andrews, 2015). When associated with strategic goals and objectives, monitoring and using quantifiable performance data allows the public manager to make better decisions, manage programs with greater efficiency, and demonstrate improved accountability (Behn, 2003; Hatry, 2002; Poister et al., 2015; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). Objective data can include program quality, efficiency, outputs, and other measurable outcomes (Bernstein, 2001; Moynihan, 2008; Poister et al., 2015), and the impacts of public sector planning on different types of objective outcomes can vary. For example, Poister, Pasha, et al. (2013) found no positive relationship between strategic planning on operating efficiency or cost-effectiveness measures but did find a positive impact on other service effectiveness and system productivity measures. Other research on objective public-sector performance data has investigated how the data are used, whether purposefully, passively, or politically (Kroll & Moynihan, 2015; Tama, 2018).

Several studies in the public sector have examined perceived and actual performance. Jimenez (2013) found that strategic planning was positively associated with perceptions of improving the government's financial health but found no actual effect on financial deficits. Johnsen (2018) created indices to measure strategic planning, assessments of perceived performance, and actual performance measurement and

evaluation. According to the findings, strategic planning generally increased perceived performance but not objective performance as operationalized through the indices. One point of differentiation was the finding that increased stakeholder involvement positively impacted perceived performance and one objective index built on production-based and performance-related measures across a range of services (Johnson et al., 2003). R. Andrews et al. (2012) also found that when administrative data were aggregated into indices and used as a more objective measure for impacts, strategic planning did not seem to have a positive impact or may harm performance. Although strategic planning is positively associated with organizational knowing and learning, as well as perceptions of improved performance, more research is needed on the relationship between strategic planning and objectively measured performance (R. Andrews et al., 2012; Bryson et al., 2018; Johnsen, 2018; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). This study employed indices to measure strategic planning content and stakeholder involvement and used a scorecard as an objective indicator of organizational performance.

Planning Conditions and Contexts. Researchers have also studied the unique conditions and contexts that lead to better strategic planning outcomes. These conditions and contexts are mediating factors that can strengthen or weaken the relationship between strategic planning activities and outcomes such as organizational performance. Although all the findings are interesting, not all the findings are in complete agreement. For example, Jung and Lee (2013) found that strategic planning capacity positively influences organizational performance in the public sector. They also described the relevant conditions that enhanced the positive relationship, including a strong commitment from leaders and managers to strategies, setting clear and reasonably challenging performance goals and measures, and linkages between organizational strategies to critical decision-making processes (Jung & Lee, 2013). B. George et al. (2018) found that planning team members' cognitive styles were related to their acceptance of the strategic planning process and that acceptance of the process was related to team members' commitment to the implementation of the strategic plan. As a condition for enhancing these relationships, B. George et al. (2018) recommended that public sector leaders conduct "plan for planning" sessions before any actual strategic planning to communicate the usefulness of strategic planning in enhancing organizational performance.

Various other conditions and contexts influence the initiation, suitability, or sustainability of strategic planning supported by research. Johnsen (2016) contended that stakeholder involvement was one of the most important determining factors in positively influencing the impacts of strategic planning. However, Tama (2018) stipulated that agencies relying heavily on collaboration will be more likely to focus on general principles within their planning. Researchers also argued that public sector organizations are more likely to conduct strategic planning when they operate near other agencies that plan strategically, work closely with private sector organizations, or operate in market-like conditions (Hansen & Ferlie, 2016; Poister et al., 2010; Tama, 2018).

Similarly, strategic planning may be more suitable when the agency is large, complex, centralized, and autonomous (Glaister et al., 2008; Hansen & Ferlie, 2016; Johnsen, 2016; Poister et al., 2010) or when the agency has weak political influence or is highly dependent on capital investments (Tama, 2018). Additionally, planning may be more beneficial for public sector organizations facing an economic crisis or operating in less stable or unstable environments (Elbanna et al., 2016; Glaister et al., 2008; Tama, 2018). This myriad of conditions and contexts illustrates the diverse opportunities within research on public-sector strategic planning. Systematic investigation and research across various methodologies and cases continue to be needed to understand better themes relating to successful planning and implementation (Bossidy & Charan, 2011; Bryson et al., 2018; Elbanna et al., 2014, 2016).

Part 3 – Strategic Planning Theories and Research Methods

Part 3 of this chapter is intended to offer a review of specific literature highly relevant to this study, including strategic planning theories and approaches to strategic planning research. This part is divided into three main sections. The first section reviews three strategic planning theories or "types" of strategic planning, including formal strategic planning, emergent strategy making, and a hybrid approach known as planned emergence. The second section reviews the literature on the process- and micro-based approaches to strategic planning research. As a component of this section, information is presented on variables and issues under examination in this study, including diversified collaboration in strategic planning and strategic plan artifacts. The third section reviews practice and macro-based approaches to strategic planning research. The third section

also presents information on the variables and issues related to this study, with particular attention given to the connection between organizational performance in the public sector and its potential impact on addressing large-scale public problems.

Strategic Planning Theories

As discussed in the previous subsections, researchers have studied the relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance (Falshaw et al., 2006; Grant, 2003; Mintzberg, 1994; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Planning is seen to assess the strategic direction, frame issues and challenges, integrate decisions, and coordinate action, enhancing effectiveness, gaining efficiency, and improving performance (T. J. Andersen & Nielsen, 2009; Bryson & Alston, 2011; Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2011). However, the results of these studies have been mixed and contradictory, leaving no clear conclusions (Bryson et al., 2018; Falshaw et al., 2006; Grant, 2003; Mintzberg, 1994; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). The mixed nature of the results is unsurprising, given the varying definitions, concepts, procedures, and tools across strategic planning. When considering the breadth of elements that may or may not be present in planning efforts, the success of strategic planning in influencing performance depends on the design and characteristics of the efforts, such as which planning approaches are used, for what purpose, and in what contexts (T. J. Andersen, 2000; Bryson et al., 2010, 2018; Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Grant, 2003; Hutzschenreuter & Kleindienst, 2006).

Varying theorists in strategic planning research have attempted to classify and clarify a set of elements into a "type" of planning. Two primary and contrasting models of strategic planning theory have been the subject of debate since the 1960s: formal strategic planning and emergent strategy making (Bryson et al., 2010; Cepiku et al., 2018; Leach, 1997; Mintzberg, 1987; Papke-Shields et al., 2002; Patanakul & Shenhar, 2012; Segars et al., 1998; Sirén & Kohtamäki, 2016; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). The following subsections discuss formal strategic planning and emergent strategy making, as well as a hybrid approach known as planned emergence.

Formal Strategic Planning

Formal strategic planning is also known as rational-comprehensive planning or rational strategic planning. Formal strategic planning is the classical or normative model

of strategic planning based on rational decision-making and a comprehensive framework (Ansoff, 1991, 1994; Bryson et al., 2018; Cepiku et al., 2018; Hough & White, 2003; Papke-Shields et al., 2006; Pasha et al., 2018; Segars et al., 1998; Walker et al., 2010). Formal strategic planning is an "approach to strategy formulation that uses a systematic process with specific steps such as external and internal assessments, goal setting, analysis, evaluation and action planning to ensure long-term vitality and effectiveness of the organization" (Pasha et al., 2018, p. 5). The timing and frequency of strategic planning can vary and are determined by decision-makers or may be mandated by authorizing agencies (Bryson & Alston, 2011; Elbanna et al., 2016; Greve, 2015). Formal strategic planning is characterized as a disciplined, structured, explicit, logical, and rigorous approach to planning designed to systematically produce rational decisions that determine strategic direction and allow organizations to assess and adapt to changing environments (Allison & Kaye, 2005; Boyne, 2001; Bryson, 2010b; Camillus, 1982; Cepiku et al., 2018; Chaffee, 1985; Fredrickson & Mitchell, 1984; Hough & White, 2003; Jung & Lee, 2013; Obeng & Ugboro, 2008; Poister & Streib, 2005; Porter, 1996).

As part of the controlled and rational nature of formal strategic planning, empirical analysis and scientific methods are preferred to generate and evaluate strategic alternatives (Boyne, 2001; Bryson et al., 2018; Camillus, 1982; Cepiku et al., 2018; Fredrickson & Mitchell, 1984). Leaders and planners apply comprehensive analysis throughout the planning process to consider many relevant factors, identify opportunities, anticipate change, and create strategic options (Bryson et al., 2018; Hough & White, 2003; Obeng & Ugboro, 2008; Poister & Streib, 2005; Rudd et al., 2008). The formulation of strategic direction is approached from a prediction-oriented and means-end perspective where the ends (desired outcomes) are identified, and then the most appropriate means to achieve the ends are determined (Bryson et al., 2018; Kuwada, 1998; Thomas et al., 2001). Formal strategic planning typically follows a continuous pattern of steps. These steps can include defining the mission, values, priorities, and long-term objectives of the organization; analyzing the internal and external environment; generating and evaluating strategic alternatives; formulating clear goals and strategies to accomplish the goals; implementing the chosen strategy; monitoring performance and results; and updating the plans (Allison & Kaye, 2005; R. Andrews et al., 2009; Bendor,

2015; F. S. Berry & Wechsler, 1995; Boyne & Chen, 2007; Bryson et al., 2018; Cepiku et al., 2018; Crittenden & Crittenden, 2000; Eadie, 1983; Feldman & March, 1981; Jimenez, 2013; Niven, 2003; Nutt & Backoff, 1993; Obeng & Ugboro, 2008; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Poister & Streib, 2005).

Researchers have found positive, negative, and no effects from formal strategic planning (S. C. Andersen, 2008; Armstrong, 1982; Boyd, 1991; Boyne & Gould-Williams, 2003; C. C. Miller & Cardinal, 1994; Ramanujam et al., 1986; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Several studies found a strong and positive relationship linking formal strategic planning with organizational performance (S. C. Andersen, 2008; R. Andrews et al., 2012; Boyne & Gould-Williams, 2003; Delmar & Shane, 2003; Elbanna et al., 2016; Glaister et al., 2008; Johnsen, 2018; Ouakouak & Ouedraogo, 2013; Pasha et al., 2018; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Sarason & Tegarden, 2003; Walker et al., 2010). According to proponents of formal strategic planning, rational planning is effective because it requires organizations to collect and analyze pertinent information and then make informed and fact-based strategic decisions best aligned with the environment (Ansoff, 1991, 1994; Robinson & Pearce, 1983). For example, Elbanna et al. (2016) found a positive relationship between formal strategic planning and organizational performance. Elbanna et al. studied more than 150 public service organizations in North America using a questionnaire. The researchers examined the success of strategy implementation, managerial involvement, and stakeholder uncertainty. Based on their findings, Elbanna et al. posited that formal planning may be uniquely suited to the traditional bureaucratic environment in which public organizations operate, typically constrained by public policy and short-term political orientations. The researchers suggested that public managerial and strategic planning is conducted within the context of policy decisions made by elected officials. According to Elbanna et al. (2016), the strength of formal strategic planning is "its ability to reduce uncertainty by inducing managers to look ahead and forecast the future, at least within the political term of the current government" (p. 1035). Despite the value shown across sectors and in the public sector, formal strategic planning is not without its critics.

Mintzberg (1994) provided some of the most widely read critiques of formal strategic planning, suggesting that formal strategic planning was inflexible, procedural,

and rigid. Critics suggested that these characteristics made it difficult for organizations to adapt to changes in the external environment (Hambrick & Cannella, 1989; Mintzberg, 2000; Montgomery, 2008). Other researchers argued that formal strategic planning required an overwhelming amount of information and stakeholder consensus, which detracted from the value it might bring (Atkinson, 2011; Lindblom, 1979). Not surprisingly, some researchers have shown a negative effect between formal strategic planning and firm performance (e.g., Fredrickson & Mitchell, 1984; Honig & Karlsson, 2004; Saleh et al., 2013; Song et al., 2011) or no significant relationship at all (e.g., R. Andrews et al., 2009; Falshaw et al., 2006; Robinson & Pearce, 1983). For example, Saleh et al. (2013) found that formal strategic planning was negatively associated with occupancy rates (one measure of revenue performance) in 79 hospitals. The researchers studied low-income and middle-income healthcare environments and suggested that greater flexibility might be more important in regions with continuous political and economic instability. R. Andrews et al. (2009) hypothesized that rational planning was positively related to organizational performance. The researchers tested their hypothesis using data collected from 47 service departments in local governments while controlling for past performance and service expenditure. The results were positive but statistically insignificant, and the hypothesis was not supported (R. Andrews et al., 2009). In response to the critiques and mixed nature of the results, Mintzberg (1994) proposed an alternative to formal strategic planning. The alternative, emergent strategy making—a more fluid and open approach—has since grown in popularity among researchers.

Emergent Strategy Making

Mintzberg's (1994) theory of emergent strategy making is also known as the adaptive approach to planning and is associated in strategic planning research with logical incrementalism and successive limited comparisons. Emergent strategy making assumes certainty is absent regarding outcomes (Atkinson, 2011; Lindblom, 1979; Mintzberg, 1994; Quinn, 1978). Whereas formal strategic planning is based on a systematic and prediction-oriented approach, emergent strategy making is based on strategic thinking (rather than planning). Strategic thinking is derived from intuition, creativity, interpretation, experimentation, and learning during implementation (Elbanna et al., 2016; Kuwada, 1998; Mintzberg, 1994; Mintzberg & Lampel, 1999; Montgomery,

2008; Quinn, 1978; Thomas et al., 2001). Proponents suggested that emergent strategy making allows planners and leaders to address better-unexpected situations than if they were to rigidly adhere to a predetermined plan. With emergent strategy making, organizations can apply improvisational action to address surprise opportunities or challenges and potential adverse effects (Downs et al., 2003; Elbanna et al., 2016; Montgomery, 2008; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Quinn, 1978). Proponents also argue that emergent strategy making can help organizations avoid conflicts over formal strategies designed as major policy changes around core values, goals, resource allocation, and performance measurement (R. Andrews et al., 2009; Atkinson, 2011; Jung & Lee, 2013; Lindblom, 1979; Poister & Streib, 2005). This aspect of emergent strategy making is accomplished through logical incrementalism.

Logical incrementalism is a significant component of emergent strategy making. It involves using small or incremental yet purposeful decisions (Cepiku et al., 2018; Pal, 2011; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). These small decisions, implemented within a broad strategic framework, define logical incrementalism. The decisions are guided by an overall organizational purpose and general strategic direction. Examples of the types of decisions can include small variations in budgets or processes and may be closely related to existing policies (Boyne et al., 2004; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Cepiku et al., 2018; Quinn, 1978, 1980). As organizations make ongoing incremental decisions, they formulate strategies that are more easily negotiated and accepted by critical stakeholders who may be more willing to accept small decisions that can be revised, remediated, reversed, and adapted to changes in the internal or external environment (Cepiku et al., 2018; Pal, 2011; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Quinn, 1978). Because logical incrementalism involves some trial and error, analysis of the potential consequences or outcomes is limited (Bryson et al., 2018; Cepiku et al., 2018; Walker et al., 2010). Researchers refer to this aspect of emergent strategy making and logical incrementalism as successive limited comparisons.

Successive limited comparisons are based on a search for strategic options that involve little systematic analysis or theory. Stakeholders consider what is mutually practical and possible and may evaluate a few alternatives but give limited consideration to possible impacts on processes or outputs (Atkinson, 2011; Boyne et al., 2004; Bryson

et al., 2018; Cepiku et al., 2018; Lindblom, 1979). Values, goals, and actions are selected to accommodate personal, political, and power relationships (Bryson et al., 2018; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Quinn, 1978). In formal strategic planning, goals and analysis of the actions needed to meet the goals are distinct. In emergent strategy making, they are not mutually exclusive. As such, "good" strategic policies are those that the various stakeholders directly agree to, though the policies may or may not be the most appropriate means to an agreed objective (Bryson et al., 2018). Together, logical incrementalism and successive limited comparisons contribute to emergent strategy making.

Like formal strategic planning, empirical studies of emergent strategy making have mixed results (Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013). Song et al. (2011) found that improvisational or experiential approaches to planning were more effective than formal strategic planning in developing new projects. In such cases, the impromptu and flexible application of strategic knowledge appeared to be more conducive to organizational expansion and adaptable to unexpected challenges than a formal planning approach (Eisenhardt & Tabrizi, 1995; Miner et al., 2001; Moorman & Miner, 1998; Song et al., 2011). Contrastingly, R. Andrews et al. (2009) studied logical incrementalism in local government. The researchers found that both logical incrementalism and the complete absence of strategy harmed performance across a range of municipal services, as measured by a standardized performance index. R. Andrews et al. (2009) contended that emergent strategy-making might lead to poor decision-making and inappropriate interpretation due to the lack of analysis. Separately, Walker et al. (2010) found no relationship between the emergent strategy-making approach to planning and the performance of local government authorities in aggregate measures of core services. In agreement with R. Andrews et al. (2009), Walker et al. (2010) asserted that emergent strategy making lacked a disciplined focus on desired outcomes. The discussion about the effectiveness of emergent strategy making as an alternative to formal strategic planning continues. According to Meissner (2014), "the clear demarcation between the planning and learning approaches has become blurred, with the debate on strategic planning moving from an 'either/or manner' to an integrative approach" (p. 108). The mixed results of research on the two different theories have led some researchers to consider a

new, hybrid model of planning—called planned emergence—that combines the strengths of both theories.

Planned Emergence

Planned emergence integrates attributes from formal strategic planning (e.g., structure, comprehensiveness) and emergent strategy making (e.g., flexibility, learning) and can be referred to as rational adaptive planning (Bryson et al., 2018; Grant, 2003; Papke-Shields & Boyer-Wright, 2017; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). Planned emergence creates a view of a strategy focused on aspirational performance initiatives and goals and allows organizations to deviate from the plan when needed to respond to emerging threats and opportunities (Dibrell et al., 2014; Grant, 2003). Rather than constraining the organization, the planned emergence approach features fluid and open processes to foster learning and adaptation within a general structure that protects against unpredictability and uncertainty (Elbanna et al., 2016; Montgomery, 2008; Wiltbank et al., 2006). According to Dibrell et al. (2014),

> planning flexibility, as well as the ability to effectively conduct formal strategic planning, can be a powerful, though somewhat paradoxical, means to create competitive advantages. Armed with analysis and insights gained from a formal planning process, firms can make more effective decisions about the types of resources to develop or acquire. Matched with a willingness to deviate from formal strategic plans when opportunities present themselves, firms can more effectively leverage and deploy these valuable and difficult to imitate resources in pursuit of innovation. (p. 2001)

Further, planned emergence provides a more realistic and accurate representation of strategic planning efforts in organizations (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1997; Grant, 2003; Meissner, 2014). Characteristics of planned emergence include shorter planning horizons, increased flexibility, the development of alternatives, the integration of divergent pieces of information, and an emphasis on performance targets designed to coordinate between different parts of the organization (Atuahene-Gima & Li, 2004; Grant, 2003; Meissner, 2014; C. C. Miller et al., 2004). When used in combination, planned-emergence elements may help increase organizational outcomes (Barwise & Papadakis, 1998; Camillus, 1982; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Quinn, 1978).

Researchers have acknowledged the benefits of rational adaptive approaches to planning. Researchers have shown planned emergence to enhance organizational performance across industries (T. J. Andersen, 2000; Barzelay & Campbell, 2003; Dibrell et al., 2014; Papke-Shields & Boyer-Wright, 2017; Poister, 2010). Additionally, it may be especially important for public-sector agencies to be deliberate and opportunistic in their strategic planning efforts (Bryson, 2010b; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). One study of public transit agencies indicated that rational adaptive planning was positively associated with improved transit system outcome measures (Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). Planned emergence also enhances strategic-decision quality and innovation, which are associated with improved strategic planning outcomes, especially in unstable environments (Amason, 1996; Brews & Hunt, 1999; Dean & Sharfman, 1996; Dibrell et al., 2014; Forbes, 2007; Hart & Banbury, 1994; Keren & de Bruin, 2003; Meissner, 2014).

For this study, the researcher considered the strategic plans under investigation closely related to the planned emergence approach. The federal authorizing agency that oversees the state organizations provided formal guidance and structure. This guidance included the required elements and analysis that must have been included in the plan. State agencies could also choose short-, medium-, and long-term initiatives and amend their plans during the implementation period if needed. However, implementation activities, including those which might have deviated from the original plan, were outside the scope of this study. Therefore, the effects of adaptation during the implementation period could not necessarily be known or isolated.

Research on formal strategic planning, emergent strategy making, and the hybrid approach known as planned emergence continues to leave many unanswered questions (Bryson et al., 2018; Falshaw et al., 2006; Grant, 2003; Mintzberg, 1994; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Researchers have acknowledged the differences in how strategic planning may be conducted, such as which planning approaches are used, for what purpose, and in what contexts. Researchers have also noted that the success of strategic planning in influencing organizational performance depends on the design and characteristics of the planning efforts (T. J. Andersen, 2000; Bryson et al., 2010, 2018; Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Giraudeau, 2008; Grant, 2003; Hutzschenreuter & Kleindienst, 2006; Meissner, 2014; Vilà & Canales, 2008). However, research into whether and how well strategic planning

"works" depends on how it is theoretically defined and how it is studied (Bryson et al., 2009; Bryson & Edwards, 2017). Due to the breadth and depth of strategic planning attributes, scholars have also taken different methodological approaches to research strategic planning.

Strategic Planning Research Methods

Researchers have approached strategic planning research differently. In general, there are two primary approaches, or methods, in strategic planning research. One approach considers strategic planning as a process and concentrates on the microlevel of planning. The other approach considers strategic planning as a practice centered on the macro level (Bryson et al., 2018; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; B. George et al., 2018; Seidl & Whittington, 2014).

This section provides more details on these two approaches to research methodology, including the attributes and applications of process and micro methodologies and practice and macro methodologies. Because both process/micro- and practice/macro-types of research are fundamental to this study, this section also includes a review of literature on the specific variables under examination. The variables are presented within the pertinent method. They include diversified collaboration, strategic plan design (after the process/micro subsection), and public sector organizational performance related to addressing a broad social problem (after the practice/macro subsection). For this study, the broad social problem under investigation was the collective needs of a growing and aging older adult population in the United States; therefore, the performance variables presented after the practice/macro subsection relate to LTSS for older adults.

Process-Based and Microlevel Approaches

Process-based research methods may help resolve some of the divergent results in strategic planning research and provide crucial insights into why plans succeed or fail in public organizations (B. George et al., 2018; Meissner, 2014); however, few studies have taken a detailed process approach within public sector strategic planning (Bryson et al., 2018; Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009). Process studies approach strategic planning as an ongoing course of activities

rather than a fixed "thing" (Elbasha & Wright, 2017). Strategic planning is viewed as a verb that many actors do through multiple, interrelated, and varied contributions (Bryson et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2003; Rouleau, 2013).

Process studies examine the complex phenomenon and unique characteristics of strategic planning in rich, deep, and holistic terms (Balogun et al., 2003; Meissner, 2014; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Researchers taking a process approach understand that strategic planning is a highly variable and malleable process that originates from specific circumstances, is performed in specific circumstances, and intends to change those circumstances in some way (Bryson et al., 2009). Process methods give attention to the larger context within which the planning occurred, who was involved in the planning and how these actors were connected, how the planning was done, what was learned, how the resulting learning was applied, and to what effect (Bryson et al., 2009, p. 174). These elements become micro-units of analysis and variables (Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010).

Rather than examining if strategic planning, as a static activity, contributes to organizational success, process-based researchers delve into anthropological questions about how planning can and should be designed to obtain desired outcomes (T. J. Andersen, 2000; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Grant, 2003; Meissner, 2014; Whittington, 2006). As such, researchers undertaking process studies generally take two important views: strategic planning is a way of knowing and acting, and strategic planning has a range of outputs and outcomes. The following paragraphs expand on these two views.

Strategic Planning to Know and Act. In process-based strategic planning research, strategic planning is viewed as a complex approach to knowing (thinking and learning) and acting (Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Mintzberg, 2000). Strategic planning is a complex cognitive, behavioral, social, and political process "in which some associations are reinforced, others are created, and still others are dropped in the process of formulating and implementing strategies and plans" (Bryson et al., 2009, p. 176). Whittington (2006) suggested that process-based research should combine practices, praxis, and practitioners to help clarify and organize these many aspects and associations. Whittington (2006) defined practices as shared tools, traditions, norms, behaviors, and strategy-making methods. Praxis was defined as the actual activities completed during

strategic planning. Practitioners were defined as the actors, including their roles and identities, who performed the planning activities within the set of practices (Whittington, 2006). Together with profession as a fourth element, these elements contribute to one type of process research, called strategy-as-practice. Strategy-as-practice research draws heavily from sociological theories and suggests that strategic planning, like any other practice in society, should be studied from many different perspectives (Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Whittington, 2006, 2007). Like process-based research, Whittington's (2006) different strategy-as-practice perspectives include who was involved in the planning, what they did, how they did it, what they used, and the combined strategic implications of these aspects (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009). Though the term "practice" is included in the name and one element of strategy-as-practice research, it should not be confused with practice-based approaches to strategic planning research, which is focused on the macro-level and described in another section.

Process-Based Planning Outputs and Outcomes. In addition to viewing strategic planning as a way of knowing and acting, process-based researchers view strategic planning as having a range of outputs and outcomes beyond organizational performance. A content analysis of 26 years of strategic management research found that "performance" was the most central keyword in the strategic management literature from 1980 to 2005 (Furrer et al., 2008). When considering performance at the macro-level, ambiguity exists around when and how strategic planning "works" because of the lack of details needed to understand the strategizing practices (Balogun et al., 2003; Bryson et al., 2009; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Process-based researchers consider performance as a disaggregated level and assert that strategic planning will be more beneficial if the efforts are designed around microlevel process characteristics, activities, and mechanisms that positively influence a range of outputs and outcomes (Meissner, 2014; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Thus, process-based approaches to research provide alternatives to performance-dominated inquiries (Vaara & Whittington, 2012). The range of outputs explored by process-based researchers includes planning activities (workshops and strategy exercises), analyses (stakeholder analyses and background studies), and strategic artifacts (plans, mission, vision, goals, and strategies), among others (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018). Examples of process-based outcomes may include

- the political consequences of strategic planning activities;
- the involvement of certain types of stakeholders;
- the mobilization of tools or specific skill sets during planning;
- the roles various individuals assumed when engaging in strategic activity;
- the design or effects of strategy tools and artifacts;
- the detailed day-to-day activities (routines, interactions, and conversations) within the organizational environment during planning; and
- the linkages between planning activities and their organizational contexts.

Exploration into an extended range of strategic planning outputs and outcomes, like those provided as examples, as well as how the outputs and outcomes relate to organizational performance, broadens researchers' overall understanding of performance (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; B. George et al., 2016, 2018; Johnson et al., 2003; Rouleau, 2013; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Whittington, 2006). Researchers also seek to link this range of process outputs and outcomes to context by exploring how the process was used to enhance strategic thinking, acting, learning, and knowing (Ackermann et al., 2005; Bryson, 2004; Bryson et al., 2009; Van der Heijden, 2005). Representative studies include Tama (2018), Cepiku et al. (2018), and Wheeland (2003). Tama (2018) proposed and confirmed that public agencies that relied more on collaboration or capital investments would be more likely to focus on general strategies or sophisticated analytical tools. Cepiku et al. (2018) found that economic scarcity and crisis did not change the type of strategic planning conducted by local governments. Wheeland (2003) substantiated the beneficial effects of visionary leadership, inclusive and collaborative planning activities, and coalition building on strategic planning results.

This study integrated a process-based approach by reviewing two microlevel variables: diversified collaboration and strategic plan design. Bryson et al.'s (2009) actor-network theory, which studies associations, can provide a relevant understanding of how, whether, and when strategic planning works. The actor-network theory suggests that the entities that can be connected (associated) can be human or nonhuman (Bryson et al., 2009). The two variables combined (diversified collaboration and strategic plan design) are expected to provide crucial insights into public sector planning by considering the individuals involved in the planning—diversified collaboration—and the output of the

strategic planning efforts—strategic plan design (Bryson et al., 2009; B. George et al., 2016, 2018). The study builds on previous empirical work that measured stakeholder involvement, strategic management tools' use, and strategic planning's impact (Johnsen, 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Poister & Streib, 2005). This study also answered Bryson and Edwards's (2017) call for future research exploring what difference it would make when strategic planning was applied to a collaboration (cross-boundary organizations or functions); how participation by different stakeholders (e.g., internal and external) would make a difference; and the way various strategic plan artifacts (e.g., mission, vision, goals, and performance measurements) would make a difference. The following subsections review the literature supporting diversified collaboration and the elements contributing to strategic plan design.

Collaboration

Strategic planning is a potential accelerator for inclusive public management in a democratic society (Bryson et al., 2009). Further, stakeholder involvement is considered key to successful strategic planning and management (Bryson, 2010b; Fernández & Rainey, 2006; Johnsen, 2018; Moynihan & Hawes, 2012; Mulgan, 2009; Poister & Streib, 2005; Poister & Van Slyke, 2002; Yang & Hsieh, 2007). Collaboration provides the mechanism to engage stakeholders during strategic planning. Broadly defined, collaboration in the public sector is a process whereby a wide range of multiorganizational actors (persons representing one or more entities) engage with one another and work together in a series of associations to address a public problem that one entity alone cannot solve (Alam et al., 2014; Berardo et al., 2014; Bronstein, 2003; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Koontz & Newig, 2014; Lee et al., 2018; O'Leary & Vij, 2012; Petri, 2010; Thompson & McCue, 2016). Collaboration is more than simply bringing people together and is instead a process whereby the varying interests of actors in different entities integrate through active negotiations, explorations, and compromises (Jarzabkowski & Balogun, 2009). During collaborative efforts, multiple stakeholders

> explore and ultimately agree on and implement answers to a series of Socratic questions. These include: What should we be doing? How should we do it? What purposes or goals would be served by doing it? And how can we be sure we are

doing what we agreed we ought to do, and that we are achieving the effects we want? (Bryson & Edwards, 2017, p. 13)

Through the process, collaboration is characterized by participative, communicative, and inclusive approaches to solving problems through innovative solutions (Jarzabkowski & Balogun, 2009; Johnsen, 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Persaud, 2018). The stakeholders share responsibility, decision-making, and power, although facilitators may emerge to help guide the process (D'Amour et al., 2005; Hall, 2005; Henneman et al., 1995; Mizrahi & Abramson, 2000; Petri, 2010; Vazirani et al., 2005; Yeager, 2005; Zwarenstein & Bryant, 2000). For example, collaboration can be organized and occur in settings or units such as networks, committees, workgroups, and coalitions. These collective unit types illustrate that collaborative strategic planning and management involve more stakeholders than traditional managers, executives, or other top leaders, though the plan may guide leaders (Johnsen, 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018).

The presence of collaboration and stakeholder engagement during strategic planning contributes to a range of successful planning outcomes in different policy areas (Alam et al., 2014; Cepiku et al., 2018; Johnsen, 2018; Koontz & Newig, 2014; Lee et al., 2018; Mulgan, 2009; O'Leary & Vij, 2012). Planning team members are more likely to accept the planning process and commit to the resulting strategic plan if they have some ownership in its development (Bryson, 2010b; Fernandes et al., 2021; Fernández & Rainey, 2006; Moynihan & Hawes, 2012; Poister & Streib, 2005; Poister & Van Slyke, 2002; Tama, 2018; Yang & Hsieh, 2007). Acceptance and commitment mean the stakeholders view the plan as a set of ideas worth implementing and share a motivating vision. Stakeholder commitment and acceptance become important drivers of successful implementation because resistance to the planned change is decreased (Bryson, 2010b; Bryson et al., 2009; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; B. George et al., 2018; Poister & Streib, 2005). Further, just as collaboration benefits strategic planning, new or emerging collaborative groups may benefit from strategic planning. The reciprocal effects of strategic planning on collaboration occur because collaborations are strengthened through developing an overall purpose and framework (Lee et al., 2018; McGuire, 2006). The dyadic impact of collaboration and planning creates alignment and interconnected change

in public policy areas (Giles-Corti & Whitzman, 2012; Kent & Thompson, 2012; Mendoza et al., 2012; Thompson & McCue, 2016).

Collaborations contribute positively to strategic planning efforts because of the unique roles, views, and characteristics that each actor contributes to the collaboration (Fernandes et al., 2021; Galinsky et al., 2015; Larson, 2017; Rock & Grant, 2016). Participants in strategic planning efforts bring diverse experiences, relationships, intrinsic interpretative schemes, applicable norms, stocks of knowledge, cognitive styles, and cultural rules. These varied perspectives and characteristics broaden the understanding and analysis of problems, reduce bias, increase the number of alternatives generated as solutions to challenges, and enrich plan implementation (Bryson, 2010b; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Burby, 2003; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; B. George et al., 2018; Iasbech & Lavarda, 2018; Jarzabkowski & Balogun, 2009; Whittington, 2006).

Furthermore, diverse planning groups may be recognized by the unique individuals involved in the planning and the types of stakeholder groups involved. Empirical studies may choose individual or aggregate actors as the unit of analysis when exploring collaboration in strategic planning (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Whittington, 2006). This study focused on aggregate actors as the unit of analysis and the range of stakeholder groups involved in developing the strategic plans under investigation. Combined, these two concepts (aggregate actors as the unit of analysis and the range of stakeholder groups involved) were defined as diversified collaboration. The following paragraphs review the literature supporting diversified collaboration and offer further academic support for the specific stakeholder groups included in this study.

Diversified Collaboration

According to Bryson et al. (2009), the social elements of strategic planning, such as stakeholder groupings, existing and new networks, coalitions, and participant relations, must be explained and cannot be assumed. This study sought to explain the diversity of the represented stakeholder groups involved in developing state-level strategic plans. Research shows that interorganizational collaboration has increased and that strategic planning and tools are frequently used to facilitate relationships between many partnerships and networks (M. Berry, 1998; Borins, 2014; Moynihan & Hawes, 2012; Tama, 2018). The coordination and collaboration of many different organizations and

agencies involve careful attention to stakeholders, including multiple levels of government, multiple sectors, and internal and external participants who are explicitly or implicitly involved in the process of strategy formulation and implementation (Bryson et al., 2018; Nelson et al., 2011). Collaboration of this nature is related to pluralism, which describes variations in organizing and strategizing. Different groups' divergent goals and interests shape pluralistic contexts, resulting in multiple organizing processes, strategic goals, and objectives (Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006). Collaboration enhances synergism and capacity building to address complex problems (Boyd & Peters, 2009).

Almost all public problems require collaboration to solve the issue (Bryson et al., 2015; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Forrer et al., 2014; Tama, 2018). Interorganizational collaboration involves problem-focused entities working together to address challenges with interdependence, flexibility, and collective ownership of goals (Bronstein, 2003; Petri, 2010). The complex relationship between organizations may evolve, develop, and change over time (D'Amour et al., 2005; Lindeke & Sieckert, 2005; Petri, 2010); however, strategic planning enables public sector agencies to manage support from multiple stakeholders to achieve strategic objectives (Elbanna et al., 2016). Through collaboration and cooperation, public organizations respond to diverse actors who have an important stake in the formulation, implementation, and outcomes of strategic activities (Elbanna et al., 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Osborne, 2006; O'Toole & Meier, 2015).

Researchers have shown that social issues, such as income level, education, employment, and environmental conditions, significantly determine health and wellness among individuals and specific populations. These complex social determinants of health require involving multiple groups with a broad view of community standards, strengths, and resources (Boyd & Peters, 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; McGuire, 2006; Persaud, 2018; Phillips et al., 2020). By working together, multiorganizational collaborations plan and implement programs that could not be owned and performed by any one organization, as each organization makes a unique and complementary contribution to the effort (Bronstein, 2003; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lindeke & Sieckert, 2005; Mansourimoaied et al., 2000; Petri, 2010). Collaborations can achieve

desired outcomes through system-level infrastructure, shared resources, and information (Bronstein, 2003; Grant, 2020; Salem et al., 2005).

Societal change is often cited as one reason collaboration is increasing in theoretical literature and practice. According to McGuire (2006), hierarchical organizational structures emerged during the agricultural age, bureaucratic organizational structures dominated the industrial age, and "the nascent information age has given rise to permeable structures in which people can link across organizational functions and boundaries" (p. 34). Collaboration among diverse actors is evident in modern public sector work, especially related to health and human services.

In 1978, the World Health Organization (WHO) acknowledged the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration, especially in medicine and related disciplines (Petri, 2010). The field of public health experienced transitions during the 1990s as local, state, and national agencies recognized that improving population health would require a cross-sector approach (Kimbrell et al., 2002). The transitions occurred as public health demands began to overwhelm the resources available to respond, due in part to the effects of government downsizing, deregulation, budget reductions, workforce limitations, and ongoing financial instability within public health programs (Bryson et al., 2009; Kimbrell et al., 2002). Government agencies, community-based organizations, and private sector health care systems competed for limited resources, and services between these entities were uncoordinated. Several national initiatives emerged to encourage solutions to broad social challenges and better overall system organization, including

- the Robert Wood Johnson and W.K. Kellogg Foundations' Turning Point Initiative,
- the Kellogg Foundation's Community Care Network,
- the Health Resources and Services Administration Community Access Program,
- the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH 2010) project,
- the Healthy Cities/Healthy Communities movement, and
- the New York Academy of Medicine's Medicine and Public Health Project 1 (Kimbrell et al., 2002).

Additionally, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention developed a framework known as Mobilizing for Action through Planning and Partnerships, the Public Health Practice Program, and the National Association of County and City Health Officials. Mobilizing for Action through Planning and Partnerships was designed to promote community engagement, organization, and collaboration and drive planning processes toward innovative and sustainable solutions to complex problems (Boyd & Peters, 2009). These initiatives illustrate the alternative system structures needed to link solutions for population-level challenges, especially within a constrained financial environment (Kimbrell et al., 2002). This study built on the concept of linked system-level structures that contribute to diverse collaborations.

Another related concept, interdisciplinary collaboration, is relevant to this study. Interdisciplinary collaboration is most frequently attributed to nursing, medicine, and social work literature. It can range in meaning to include interactions among healthcare professionals, between healthcare professionals and patients, and between organizations and institutions (Petri, 2010). Interdisciplinary collaboration is essential to providing quality health and educational services to communities (Alberg et al., 2006; Mitchell & Crittensen, 2000; Nelson et al., 2011; Petri, 2010). Bronstein (2003) defined interdisciplinary collaboration as an interpersonal process that effectively facilitates the achievement of goals that could not be reached if individual professionals acted on their own. Like the definition of collaboration—defined as a process involving multiple actors—interdisciplinary collaboration is an interactional process representing a network of relationships between multiple disciplines (Bronstein, 2003; D'Amour et al., 2005; Lindeke & Block, 1998; Petri, 2010).

According to an extensive concept review and analysis performed by Petri (2010), interdisciplinary collaboration has multiple related terms called surrogate concepts, meaning alternative ways of expressing the concept. Petri (2010) noted that the most common surrogate concepts for interdisciplinary collaboration were interprofessional collaboration, multidisciplinary collaboration, interdisciplinary team, interdisciplinary teamwork, interdisciplinary practice, collaborative practice, and teamwork. Other related terms with similar attributes included integrated team, cooperative work, joint practice, and working group. Petri concluded that interdisciplinary collaboration was an essential

element in health care. Bronstein's (2003) conceptualization of interdisciplinary collaboration was vague and allowed for interpretive views and variations in the qualities that constituted interdisciplinary collaboration. This study built on the concept of interdisciplinary collaboration but differentiated diversified collaboration based on the assumption that interdisciplinary collaboration involved different actors in a similar field (e.g., nursing and medicine), while diversified collaboration involved stakeholder groups consisting of multiple actors across diverse fields and sectors.

Stakeholder Groups Comprising Diversified Collaboration

Getting the right actors involved and engaging these actors in the right way are critical to creating the kind of planned change needed to address public issues (Ackermann et al., 2005; Bryson, 2004; Bryson et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2003; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Van der Heijden, 2005). This study explored the diversity of stakeholder groups involved in the development of state-level strategic plans (diversified collaboration) and the relationship between the diversity of the stakeholder groups, the design of the resulting state strategic plan, and the success of the state in remedying the public issue central to the strategic plan. The concept of diversified collaboration, also referred to as group diversity in Chapter Three – Methodology, comprised research-based elements related to participation and representation by nine different types of stakeholders during the development of the strategic plan. The stakeholder types are derived from three distinct categories of stakeholder groups found in research: cross-sector groups (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018), intergovernmental organizations (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018), and internal and external collaborators (Fernandes et al., 2021; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003).

For this study, collaborative public management theory defined the orientation and relationship of the stakeholder groups. Collaborative public management is facilitating and operating multiorganizational arrangements to address public problems that cannot be solved by a single organization (McGuire, 2006). Although the definition seems like the other definitions and concepts presented in earlier paragraphs, the emphasis in collaborative public management is on facilitating and operating processes. Collaborative public management suggests that government is the lead entity facilitating

the collaboration through which the strategic management activities are operationalized (Eriksson et al., 2020; McGuire, 2006). With a focus on facilitation and operation, collaborative public management positions the government as ultimately steering and accountable for the collaborative outcomes (McGuire, 2006). This study used collaborative public management as a theoretical foundation to assume that the state agencies responsible for the state strategic plans handled bringing together and leading the diversified collaboration during plan development. Therefore, the stakeholder groups described in the following paragraphs (cross-sector groups, intergovernmental organizations, and internal and external collaborators) are explained according to an assumed orientation and relationship with the state-level health and human services public agency.

Cross-Sector Groups. Most government agencies collaborate substantially with nongovernmental entities (Bryson et al., 2015; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Fernandes et al., 2021; Forrer et al., 2014; Tama, 2018). Moving beyond the isolation of a single sector (e.g., the public sector) to a cross-sector approach leads to improvements in planning outcomes (Eriksson et al., 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002). Bryson et al. (2009) defined cross-sector collaboration as "the linking or sharing of information, resources, activities, and capabilities by organizations in two or more sectors to achieve jointly an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately" (p. 44). The benefits of cross-sector collaboration include increased public value, resilience, and accountability (Bryson et al., 2015).

This study explored four sectors that might be documented as working with the public sector state agency. These four sectors comprised the cross-sector groups included in the concept of group diversity for this study. The four sectors discussed in the following paragraphs are the private, nonprofit, academic, and health care sectors. The researcher acknowledges that academic and health care institutions can be private, public, or nonprofit. However, within the context of the relationship with the state-governmental agency leading the strategic planning efforts under investigation in this study, the two were categorized as their unique sector. Justification for differentiating academic and health care as their sectors is provided later in this subsection.

Private Sector. This chapter previously defined private sector organizations as businesses or corporations looking to maximize market shares and profits (Bryson et al., 2018). Public-private partnerships have an important role in modern infrastructure (Alam et al., 2014). Like strategic planning competencies described previously in this chapter, other managerial and technical competencies needed to address challenges may arise more often in the private sector than in the public sector (Alam et al., 2014). Public sector agencies can improve their capabilities by increasing the involvement of the private sector (Fisher et al., 2017; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018). Previous research has shown that public agencies are more likely to use strategic planning or other strategic management tools when they work closely with the private sector (M. Berry, 1998; Moynihan & Hawes, 2012).

Although the nature of public-private partnerships may include outsourcing services or other work from the public sector to the private sector, collaborative partnership arrangements have fundamental differences from traditional contractual agreements as the partners share more power, decision making, and risk (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017). Areas of interest for public-private partnerships within aging services often include volunteerism, older worker employment, health promotion, and employer-sponsored eldercare (Coberly, 1994). The types of private sector entities vary and can include businesses (Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Kimbrell et al., 2002; McGuire, 2006; Salem et al., 2005); technical professions, such as architects and builders (Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020); specific industries, such as food service or media (Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020); and private sector advocacy groups, such as chambers of commerce, trade unions, or economic development corporations (Fernandes et al., 2021; Grant, 2020; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Salem et al., 2005).

Nonprofit Sector. The nonprofit sector is comprised of organizations defined by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) code, such as 501(c)(3) charitable and philanthropic organizations and 501(c)(6) trade and professional associations. These organizations are granted a tax-exempt status so long as their net earnings do not benefit shareholders (Eyun-Jung & Moonhee, 2021). Nonprofit groups can serve as service providers or advocates for certain groups (Fraser & Kick, 2007; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Lee et

al., 2018). Nonprofits may rely on membership dues, donations, grants, endowments, and service sales for revenue (Bowman, 2017). Nonprofits may also seek out other revenue sources and financial stability through cross-sector collaborations (Eyun-Jung & Moonhee, 2021; Watson et al., 2020). Nonprofit organizations are vital partners for public sector planning activities (Bryson et al., 2009; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018). Examples of nonprofit organizations include foundations and philanthropies (Bryson et al., 2009; Kimbrell et al., 2002); social services organizations or campaigns (Kimbrell et al., 2002; Salem et al., 2005); employment services (Fernandes et al., 2021; Fisher et al., 2017); professional associations (Eyun-Jung & Moonhee, 2021; Fernandes et al., 2021); special interest coalitions (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Kimbrell et al., 2002); cultural institutions (Fernandes et al., 2021); and churches and other faith-based groups (Grant, 2020; Lee et al., 2018; Salem et al., 2005).

Academic Sector. The academic sector comprises higher education organizations (e.g., universities and colleges) that contribute to society through knowledge generation and transfer (By et al., 2008). Though higher education organizations may be private or public, these institutions were collectively defined as distinct sectors for this study. There is a growing recognition that diverse partnerships between research authorities and policymakers or practitioners are critical to translating research into policy and practice (Fudickar et al., 2018; Giles-Corti & Whitzman, 2012; Lee et al., 2018; Mendoza et al., 2012). Further, outside stakeholders that provide funding or oversight to higher education institutions, such as grant agencies and accreditation bodies, are placing greater emphasis on cross-collaboration (Giles-Corti & Whitzman, 2012; Stephens & Cummings, 2021). Between the external pressures and the established benefits of collaboration, including knowledge creation and impact, higher education institutions are increasingly participating in collaborative activities (Giles-Corti & Whitzman, 2012; Stephens & Cummings, 2021). The academic sector comprises researchers from diverse disciplines who can richly inform public-sector strategic planning (Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Mendoza et al., 2012; Stephens & Cummings, 2021). This contribution can occur through academic consulting, typically defined as "an advisory service performed by academics who apply their scholarly expertise for a nonacademic organization" (Fudickar et al., 2018, p. 699). Representatives from universities or colleges may be more likely to

participate in health and human services-related public-sector strategic planning if they are associated with programs, centers, or cooperative extensions related to medicine, health sciences, public health, human services, geriatrics, pharmaceutical studies, and environmental studies (Boyd & Peters, 2009; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002).

Health Care Sector. The health care sector is a substantial part of the U.S. economy. Estimates suggest that the health care sector employs 11% of American workers, accounts for 24% of government spending, and is one of the largest consumer spending categories (Nunn et al., 2020). In a study on intersectoral action in health policy, Fisher et al. (2017) suggested that "the health sector has been identified as having a crucial stewardship role, to engage other policy sectors in action to address the impacts of their policies on health" (p. 953). Within the growing body of literature on the benefits of cross-sector collaboration, there are calls for more collaboration between healthcare organizations and systems, public agencies, community-based organizations, and the community in general (Grant, 2020; Persaud, 2018). This call for ongoing interdisciplinary education, interprofessional collaboration, cross-sector policy advocacy, and partnerships are driven by the recognition and need to address social determinants of health (Fisher et al., 2017; Persaud, 2018; Phillips et al., 2020). Social determinants of health include the range of social, economic, psychosocial, and cultural factors that enhance or detract from individuals' health and well-being (Boyd & Peters, 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; McGuire, 2006; Persaud, 2018; Phillips et al., 2020).

Because of the significant implications for equity in health and human services public-sector strategic planning, the health care sector was defined separately from the private, public, or nonprofit sectors in this study. Mutual benefits between the health care and public sectors include time and cost savings as care plans and other services are expanded to include community resources. Plans of care and services might include screenings, outpatient services, and case management programs, thus reducing high caseloads and improving information sharing (Persaud, 2018). Individuals and entities included in the health care sector include doctors and nurses (Boyd & Peters, 2009; Kimbrell et al., 2002); hospitals (Grant, 2020; Salem et al., 2005); physician groups, medical groups, and private practices (Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Tama, 2018);

neighborhood health centers (Grant, 2020; Salem et al., 2005); social work, health education, nutrition, mental health, and substance abuse providers (Boyd & Peters, 2009; Grant, 2020); health insurance companies (Grant, 2020; Tama, 2018); and pharmaceutical or medical supplies companies (Fisher et al., 2017; Tama, 2018).

The organizations and entities in the private, nonprofit, academic, and health care sectors are important contributors to diverse strategic planning groups, especially when faced with public problems that cannot be addressed by one sector separately (Bryson et al., 2009). Cross-sector collaboration leads to improved planning outcomes and increased public value, resilience, and accountability (Bryson et al., 2015; Eriksson et al., 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002). The four sectors discussed in the previous paragraphs represent the cross-sector category in this study, one of three distinct categories of stakeholder groups under examination. Further, the previous paragraphs were presented assuming that the public sector is represented and central to cross-sector collaboration. Beyond sectoral boundaries, the diversified collaboration also involves a second stakeholder group comprised of different types and levels of public sector agencies. This category within diversified collaboration will be referred to as intergovernmental organizations. The following subsections will review the literature supporting the inclusion of intergovernmental organizations in group diversity.

Intergovernmental Organizations. The public sector can be defined as the different levels of government that coordinate and deliver public goods and services (Fraser & Kick, 2007). Intergovernmental collaboration includes cooperative interactions between governmental agencies. The collaborations may be horizontal within policy areas or vertical in the different levels of government. The horizontal and vertical structural relations among government agencies create macrosocial sources of social order (Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009). Diverse public sector planning groups require representation from various policy areas and levels of government (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018; McGuire, 2006). The following paragraphs discuss the intergovernmental organizations represented in the public sector's horizontal and vertical aspects.

Horizontal Intergovernmental Organizations. Nearly all governmental agencies collaborate with other agencies in different policy areas (Bryson et al., 2015; Crosby &

Bryson, 2005; Fisher et al., 2017; Forrer et al., 2014; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Tama, 2018). Because state agencies were the lead entities in this study, horizontal intergovernmental collaborations were defined as collaborations occurring with other state agencies—either in the same state or another state—that worked in a policy area other than aging services. As examples, other policy areas of interest found in the literature include public health (Bryson et al., 2018; Fernandes et al., 2021; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018; Tama, 2018); human and social services (Fernandes et al., 2021; Fisher et al., 2017; Salem et al., 2005); court systems or legal authorities (Fisher et al., 2017); law enforcement and emergency responders (Bryson et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Salem et al., 2005); transportation (Bryson et al., 2018; McGuire, 2006); urban planning and environmental health (Fisher et al., 2017); housing (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018); and parks, recreation, and sport (Fernandes et al., 2021; Fisher et al., 2017; Salem et al., 2005).

Vertical Intergovernmental Organizations. The U.S. federal system has three levels—federal, state, and local—and a diverse planning group should have all three planes of the federal system represented to expand its geographic base (Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018; McGuire, 2006). Related to vertical levels of collaboration and important for diversified collaboration are tribal governments, which should be included in intergovernmental planning (Grant, 2020). The policy areas represented within federal and local levels of government may be like the policy areas described in the previous section at the state level, or they may be different. Federal agencies may work in policy or regulation areas such as federal health programs, taxation, finance, welfare, social security, industry and workplace relations, agriculture, and energy (Bryson et al., 2018; Fisher et al., 2017; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Tama, 2018). Federal agencies can also drive innovations within all levels of government, and this role is especially relevant to government services for older adults (Bryson et al., 2018; J. Harris, 1993; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013; Tama, 2015). Federal representatives may also be legislators or legislative committees (Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009; McGuire, 2006). It may be challenging for state agencies to involve federal representatives in planning activities (Fisher et al., 2017); however, Lee et al. (2018) included elected or career representation from all three levels of government in

their study and found that at least 52% of the strategic plans they reviewed included intergovernmental involvement, though the number of federal representatives contributing to that percentage was not reported.

Local agencies are increasingly represented in state-level strategic plans (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018). Local agencies may include agencies from various jurisdictions, including communities, cities, municipalities, counties, or regions (Bryson et al., 2009; Grant, 2020; Johnsen, 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Poister & Streib, 2005). Local agencies are often at the forefront of service delivery, and their staff has important "street-level" interactions with constituents (Clary, 2021; Lavee et al., 2018; Walker & Andrews, 2015). These agencies create a broader sense of community connectedness and can better articulate local needs and quality of life issues (Boyd & Peters, 2009; Fernandes et al., 2021). In one study, local governments participating in intersectoral planning led by a state-level agency were often assigned roles within strategic activities related to environmental health, creating healthy settings, and community development (Fisher et al., 2017). Similar to the federal and state levels, local government agencies may be involved in an array of different policy areas, including education and libraries, housing, transportation, planning and development, parks and recreation, police and emergency responders; and elder care services (Bryson et al., 2018; Fernandes et al., 2021; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Lee et al., 2018; Salem et al., 2005; Walker & Andrews, 2015).

The public sector is defined by different government levels coordinating and delivering public goods and services (Fraser & Kick, 2007). Collaboration between intergovernmental organizations occurs horizontally, within different policy areas at the same level, or vertically between federal, state, and local agencies. Diversified collaboration, as defined in this study, included representation by horizontal (another state) and vertical (federal or local) agencies. In addition to cross-sector groups and intergovernmental organizations, a third and final stakeholder group—internal and external collaborators—was studied within group diversity. The following paragraphs review literature that supports internal and external collaborators as an important part of diversified collaboration.

Internal and External Collaborators. Researchers have established that sound strategic planning must encompass a plurality of actors and consider the capacities, perspectives, and involvement of both internal and external stakeholders (Bryson, 2010b; Fernandes et al., 2021; B. George et al., 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Diversified collaboration moves organizations to consult extensively with internal and external stakeholders, which can positively affect the content of a strategic plan and improve overall accountability, transparency, and quality (Fernandes et al., 2021; Tama, 2018). The following paragraphs discuss the internal and external stakeholders represented in this study and considered an integral part of planning group diversity.

Internal Managers and Staff. Like the multiple levels of government, most organizations often have horizontal and vertical levels (Elbasha & Wright, 2017; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Internal actors are individuals inside their organizations and have a defined place within the organizational hierarchy (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009). Ideally, the strategic planning process would involve all levels of management and frontline operations within organizations (B. George et al., 2016; Johnsen, 2018; Saleh et al., 2013). There is strong theoretical support and empirical evidence for the positive relationship between broad internal participation in strategic planning and important outcomes such as strategic decision quality and organizational performance (De Baerdemaeker & Bruggeman, 2015; Elbanna, 2008; B. George et al., 2016). Historically, chief executive officers were considered the chief strategists in their organizations; however, strategic thinking does not occur solely at the top of a hierarchy (O'Shannassy, 2003). Elbanna (2008) found that broader management participation enhanced strategic planning effectiveness. The involvement of a range of managers in planning is essential for making strategic decisions work, as their participation is likely to increase their organizational commitment and mediate the linkage between strategy formulation and implementation success (De Baerdemaeker & Bruggeman, 2015; Elbanna, 2008; Elbanna et al., 2014; O'Shannassy, 2003).

Additionally, internal communication is enhanced as information is shared vertically and horizontally (Hutzschenreuter & Kleindienst, 2006). It can also be beneficial to include frontline and nonmanagerial staff members in strategic planning

(Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Johnsen, 2018; O'Shannassy, 2003; Tama, 2018). Lower-level staff can provide input and knowledge about the capacities and issues within their respective areas of the organization, thus helping form a clearer picture of the whole value creation system (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; O'Shannassy, 2003). Further, participation in planning and strategic alignment can impact employees' autonomy, behavior, and intentions, which can influence the goals assigned to them and impact the organization's strategic success (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; O'Shannassy, 2003; Ouakouak & Ouedraogo, 2013; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013).

  Public Involvement. In addition to the involvement of internal stakeholders, researchers have also found that strategic planning is more effective when external stakeholders are involved in the plan development and that they are more likely to support its implementation if they have a voice in the process (Bryson, 2010b; Burby, 2003; Fernandes et al., 2021; Fernández & Rainey, 2006; Moynihan & Hawes, 2012; Poister & Streib, 2005; Poister & Van Slyke, 2002; Tama, 2018; Yang & Hsieh, 2007). External actors do not have an allocated hierarchy, line, or role within an organization's structure (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009). These external actors can include consultants, advisory board members, and funders (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; O'Shannassy, 2003), along with the plethora of other actors already discussed in the paragraphs on cross-sector groups and intergovernmental organizations.

  For this study, external actors within the internal and external collaborators stakeholder group were considered individuals who were part of the public. These actors may be individual citizens or residents (Grant, 2020; Johnsen, 2018; Salem et al., 2005); public service recipients who are directly affected by the strategies (Bryson, 2004; Lee et al., 2018); or small civic organizations such as neighborhood associations and block clubs (Fernandes et al., 2021; Salem et al., 2005). A core element of public service delivery involves co-creating value in the lives of service recipients and the public (Bovaird et al., 2017; Burby, 2003). Several studies have demonstrated that public involvement helps throughout the planning process by educating government agencies about issues, increasing social learning, and improving decision-making about solutions. Further, successfully including public stakeholders in public-sector strategic planning helps reduce public cynicism about government and decreases conflict as public stakeholders

feel ownership (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Fernandes et al., 2021). Engagement and involvement of public stakeholders can range in intensity. They may include informing the public about planning efforts, consulting them about priorities, asking them to take part in the decisions or delivery of activities, or inviting them to monitor and evaluate if the plan is working and achieving its intended outcomes (Bovaird et al., 2017; Bryson, 2004; Fernandes et al., 2021).

Summary for Diversified Collaboration

Collaborative planning that involves many different organizations and agencies requires careful attention to stakeholders (Bryson et al., 2018; Nelson et al., 2011). According to Bryson et al. (2009), stakeholder groupings must be explained and cannot be assumed. This subsection on diversified collaboration has reviewed the literature on participation and representation by different stakeholders that should be included in developing public sector strategic plans. Nine different stakeholder types were reviewed and grouped into three distinct categories of stakeholders found in the research:

- Cross-sector groups – Private, nonprofit, academic, and health care sectors
- Intergovernmental organizations – Horizontal organizations and vertical organizations
- Internal and external collaborators – Internal managers/staff and public involvement

This study explored the diversity of the groups involved in the development of state-level strategic plans according to these nine stakeholder types and the relationship between the diversity of the stakeholder groups, the design of the resulting state strategic plan, and the success of the state in remedying the public issue central to the strategic plan. This study answers the call from researchers to explore further the involvement of diverse stakeholders in strategic planning activities (Ely & Thomas, 2020; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). The next section will build on another microlevel variable included in this study—strategic plan design—an aspect of the process-based approach to strategic planning research. The strategic plan design variable is included in the study to answer Bryson and Edwards's (2017) call for more research exploring how various strategic planning artifacts make a difference.

Strategic Planning Artifacts

The artifacts produced during strategic planning are important components of process-based and microlevel research approaches (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018; Bryson & Edwards, 2017). Strategic planning artifacts are physical tools, representations, or materials used during the planning process (e.g., displays, presentations, flipcharts, photographs) and documents or parts of documents that are the outputs of planning activities (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). The visual and textual outputs of planning activities can include the strategic plan or its parts, such as mission statements, vision statements, context, goals, strategies, and performance measures. When integrated, the individual artifacts within the plan become components of a strategic plan's overall design and composition (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Giraudeau, 2008). Further, the actor-network theory suggests that strategic planning artifacts should be considered actants (nonhuman actors) that can be transported over space and time and consumed in a variety of ways and that their associations and connections to human actors should be traced (Bryson et al., 2009; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). For example, investments of time and resources to create open and creative documents may enhance strategic imagination and lead to more innovative strategizing (Giraudeau, 2008). Linkages between material artifacts, including how they are written and read by strategic planning actors, and a range of planning outcomes suggest that it is crucial to achieving the right strategy content (Ackermann et al., 2005; R. Andrews et al., 2006; Bryson, 2004; Bryson et al., 2009; Giraudeau, 2008; Johnson et al., 2003; Van der Heijden, 2005). Further, integrating technology into strategic planning may enhance outcomes because it supports ongoing interpretations and interactions between people and artifacts (Frohman, 1985; Kaptelinin & Nardi, 2006; Orlikowski, 2010).

Material technologies and artifacts are central to modern planning processes (Nicolini et al., 2012). Technology can enable and motivate collaboration by creating platforms for discussion and opportunities to negotiate to mean, providing infrastructure to activities, allowing for adjustments and recombinations as ideas develop, allowing access to a wide range of actors, and supporting the work of participants across different boundaries (Bryson et al., 2021; Kaplan, 2011; Nicolini et al., 2012). Technology is

evident in strategic planning in several different ways. Technology can include project repositories and other information technology facilities which allow planning participants to access planning artifacts (Nicolini et al., 2012). Technology can convert physical artifacts like discussion points captured on a flip chart or strategy maps drawn on a whiteboard into electronic files that are more easily saved and shared (Werle & Seidl, 2015; Zanin et al., 2020).

Further, technology can create engaging visualizations or allow facilitators to edit a document on a screen in front of a planning group (Orlikowski, 2010; Zanin et al., 2020). Technology also supports using electronic surveys to assess an organization's current situation and elicit input from internal and external stakeholders (Shah et al., 2019). It may even allow participants to join meetings and contribute remotely online or by phone (Orlikowski, 2010). Artifacts created by or supported through a range of technologies can shape the strategic exploration process by energizing, anchoring, and steering the direction of the exploration and by offering modes of discussion and interaction between the participants (Werle & Seidl, 2015).

The presence of strategic planning artifacts may indicate that an organization undertakes some elements of strategy management, even if formal strategic planning was not conducted (Elbanna, 2008). Examples of strategic artifacts that could be present, even if strategic planning was not fully undertaken, include goal statement(s) for desired improvements; strategic objectives for improved operational performance; strategies for action; SWOT analysis to identify relevant strategic issues; or performance measures documented in a balanced scorecard (Elbanna, 2008; Fisher et al., 2017; Johnsen, 2018). Organizations that demonstrate comprehensive use of strategic planning artifacts are more likely to improve perceived or actual performance (Elbanna, 2012; Johnsen, 2018); therefore, this study employed an index to examine the comprehensiveness of the strategic plans under investigation based on the components included in the plan (plan design). Additional information provided in Chapter Three – Methodology defines and describes strategic plans conceptually and generally.

For strategic plan design, the researcher chose to use Bryson and Alston's (2011) 12 strategic plan components as the framework for the design. The presence of these 12 components is accepted as constituting an effective and robustly designed strategic plan.

The 12 components also formed the index by which the researcher measured the comprehensiveness of the plan. Chapter Three – Methodology lists the 12 components. Chapter One – Introduction included the definitions for each component.

Previous Research on Strategic Plan Artifacts

Researchers have conducted recent studies using a process-based approach to examine strategic planning artifacts. Fisher et al. (2017) analyzed 266 health policy planning documents to examine the extent to which Australian governments' health policies incorporated goals and strategies for intersectoral action and the extent to which these goals and strategies sought to address social determinants of health and health inequities. Fisher et al. found that the planning and policy documents frequently incorporated goals and strategies for intersectoral action. Most strategies were focused on improving individual medical and behavioral approaches to health rather than addressing broader, population-level social determinants of health and health inequities. Tama (2018) examined U.S. quadrennial national security reviews, which are formal strategic reviews that result in a public report expressing an agency's strategy. Tama explored six quadrennial national security reviews, including the agency report resulting from the review, all publicly available statements by agency officials about the reviews, the transcripts of all congressional hearings about the reviews, and any periodical articles, think tank reports, or transcripts of public conferences that discussed the review. Tama used these documents to understand how the review was conducted, what analytical processes were used in the review if the resulting initiatives or proposals were specific or general principles, and how the agency officials described the fit between the review and their strategic planning needs. Kaplan (2011) studied the content and effects of overhead presentations, specifically PowerPoint presentations, as the prevailing genre for representation and communication in large planning groups or senior management. Kaplan found that PowerPoint slides could be useful in creating space for discussions and providing access to ideas to a wide range of actors. However, that clumsy or oversimplified slides could also detract from strategic initiatives. Heracleous and Jacobs (2008) examined how unique representational artifacts, such as Lego bricks, could promote new strategic understanding, sense-making, and consensus in senior management teams. Heracleous and Jacobs found that constructing and interpreting

artifacts that embody metaphors fostered planning participants' understanding of organizational, divisional, or task identities and engaged actors in new ways that produced positive shifts in their mindsets.

Linking Diversified Collaboration and Strategic Plan Design

The actor-network theory involves the study of associations, including those with and between human actors and nonhuman (material) actants. The actor-network theory provides a suitable method for understanding microlevel contributors to how, whether, when, and why strategic planning works (Bryson et al., 2009). Strategic plans may influence human actors or even appear to have power over them by limiting their choices and freedoms in every day and operational activities they conduct (Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2009; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Additionally, Johnsen (2018) found that certain strategic planning elements, such as strategic objectives, had a positive relationship with an index measuring performance when responsibility for the element was linked to department heads and other managers. Thus, this study explored two variables that link actor collaboration with strategic planning actants. The two variables were:

- diversified collaboration as demonstrated by the number and types of different groups represented during plan development, and
- strategic plan design as measured by the number and types of planning artifacts or components included in the strategic plans under investigation.

These two process-based and microlevel variables are expected to provide crucial insights into public sector planning. This study also linked these two variables to a macro-level variable (organizational performance) by including a practice-based research approach in the study design. In a similar study, Lee et al. (2018) found that—at a county level—collaboratively involving multiple and diverse stakeholders during strategic planning contributed to the comprehensiveness of the strategic plans, and those plans were more likely to improve organizational performance in addressing a social issue. Likewise, this study examined the relationship between diversified collaboration, state plan design, and state-level performance. This study met a gap in the literature, as Jarzabkowski and Spee (2009) argued that the need was to link microlevel outcomes of strategizing activities to more macro-level outcomes, such as organizational performance, and broader social contexts and outcomes. The next section explores the attributes and

applications of practice-based and macro-focused methodologies and reviews literature on the strategic planning performance outcome of interest—state agencies' success in addressing a broad public problem.

Practice-Based and Macro-Level Approaches

Practice-based research, also known as variance research, differs from the process-based research approach. Instead of centering on microlevel variables that explore how strategic planning is conducted, practice-based research examines macro-level outcomes to determine if strategic planning works (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018). This research approach is common and focuses on the relationship between strategic planning and its outcomes and effectiveness—most often, if not always, operationalized as organizational performance (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2018; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Walker & Boyne, 2006). Most of the literature reviewed in this chapter—except for the process-based and microlevel research section—has been from practice-based research. This section will provide expanded details on practice-based research, along with a review of literature about an important public sector outcome of interest, specifically meeting the collective needs of a growing and aging older adult population in the United States through LTSS.

Early quantitative studies assumed a practice-based approach to strategic planning research. In these early studies, organizations were usually asked if they did strategic planning (a yes or no question). Then, the researchers compared the organization's financial performance to see whether strategic planning was related to their results (Bryson et al., 2009). Most concerns about strategic planning's ineffectiveness were based on these early studies (Bryson et al., 2009), which often showed positive, inconsistent, or contradictory effects (C. C. Miller & Cardinal, 1994). Variance studies typically treat strategic planning as a well-defined noun or a routine or practice that is a fixed objective (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010).

Recall early in the chapter that process-based research considers strategic planning a verb (e.g., Bryson et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2003; Rouleau, 2013). Although some practice-based studies may explore a few standardized process steps operationalized as variables, they do not approach planning as a generative system with

many interacting and changeable parts (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018). In general, variance studies assume that strategic planning is an invariant intermediary that transports a cause from inputs to outputs. The inputs are expected to predict the outputs, which means the plan works (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018; Bryson & Edwards, 2017). Although results can be mixed, most variance studies focused on the public sector have found positive, though not always large effects, using linear regression methodologies (R. Andrews et al., 2006, 2012; Boyne & Gould-Williams, 2003; Bryson et al., 2018; Elbanna et al., 2016; Meier et al., 2007).

Performance outcomes remain a dominant theme in practice-based strategy research (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). In this type of research, there is often a consistent macro-level view of outcomes applied to the relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance—still often defined as financial performance (Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010; Walker & Boyne, 2006). Some researchers have asserted that the chosen outcomes should depend on the analytical focus and unit of analysis (Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Wolf and Floyd (2017) identified a list of proximate and distal outcomes from strategic planning. Proximate outcomes identified by Wolf and Floyd (2017) include the following:

- Quality of strategic decisions
- Strategic planning effectiveness
- Integration
- Coordination
- Strategy communication
- Legitimation
- Shared understanding and commitment to strategy
- Strategic thinking (Wolf & Floyd, 2017)

Distal outcomes identified by Wolf and Floyd (2017) include the following:

- Organizational performance
- Adaptation
- Strategic change and renewal
- Realized strategy

- Organizational learning
- Strategic legitimacy
- Dynamic capability

As presented earlier in this chapter, in the public sector, many performance-based outcomes do not relate to financial performance and instead focus on outcomes like those listed by Wolf and Floyd (2017), including target achievement, efficiency, and effectiveness. Additionally, in public sector strategic planning research, the level of organizational performance is often measured through subjective perceptions (Boyne & Gould-Williams, 2003; Poister & Streib, 2005; Ugboro et al., 2011). For example, R. Andrews et al. (2006) surveyed 119 local public authorities in England about their strategic plans' content and perceptions of their organization's performance. In examining the relationship between strategic content and performance, R. Andrews et al. (2006) found that organizations with strategies to move into new markets and provide services to new recipients were more likely to perform well. Because understanding the relationship between planning and performance is crucial to organizations, other researchers have sought to reduce common source bias and measure public sector performance more objectively by utilizing secondary performance measures linked to and compared against survey data. The findings from these studies are mixed as well but demonstrate a positive strategic planning-performance link (R. Andrews et al., 2009; Elbanna et al., 2016; Falshaw et al., 2006; Grant, 2003; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2010). As one example, Johnsen (2018) created objective performance indices to measure the impact of strategic planning. Johnsen found a significant positive correlation between strategic management and an overall impact index; however, municipalities with no formal strategic planning documents scored higher on indices measuring employee cohesion, morale, and operational efficiency than those with formal strategic planning documents. The link between strategic planning and performance needs further study (Poister et al., 2010).

Researchers have noted some challenges with studying the planning and performance link in the public sector. One challenge is that performance in the public sector is difficult to operationalize. Financial performance may be a common measure of success in the private sector. In the public sector, the different levels and government

policy areas have different purposes and resulting performance measures (Bryson & Edwards, 2017). Another challenge is the existence of many direct and indirect links between strategic planning and performance, given the number of different and intermediate outcomes (Bryson & Edwards, 2017). Lastly, an insufficient amount of research has been conducted on broader public values such as participation, learning, communication, equity, social justice, transparency, legitimacy, and accountability (Beck & Bozeman, 2007; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Cook et al., 2015; Vigar, 2006).

In response to the literature presented, this study employed indices to measure diversified collaboration and plan design and measured organizational performance using objective, secondary data. As the outcome of interest, organizational performance was operationalized as the state's performance in addressing a broad public problem. The public problem was the needs of a growing and aging population of older adults, and performance was measured by a third-party data set ranking each state's LTSS. The study achieved a common definition of purpose and performance by selecting state-level public agencies focused on the same policy area within health and human services and the same state-level measure of success across all states. Further, reflecting on diversity and organizational performance related to a public problem is in keeping with important public values of participation and accountability. The following sections review the literature on broad social problems, an important focus for outcomes in the public sector and relevant to this study. The sections provide details about the needs of aging older adults and describe some services available to support them.

Broad and Wicked Public Problems

Public-sector health and human services organizations seek to create and support the conditions in which people can be healthy (Boyd & Peters, 2009). Nevertheless, health and human services agencies are challenged by increasingly complex problems, escalating expectations, and often shrinking or scarce resources (Boyd & Peters, 2009). In the public sector, the relationship between strategic planning and its impact on solving a social problem is a significant outcome of interest when considering organizational performance (Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Since the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 (2011) was established, strategic planning in the public sector has shifted to an enhanced focus on accountability, compliance, and

addressing contemporary issues with broad social relevance (Bryson et al., 2018; Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). These serious issues are found within societal systems and are often ambiguous and consequential public problems and ills (Bryson, 2010a; B. George et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Further, strategic planning in the public sector is increasingly seen as an approach to public policymaking aimed at solving problems that are "dynamic and cannot be addressed through a static or one-time decision" (Lee et al., 2018, p. 360). As public problems have become more complex, the need to understand how to best conduct collaborative strategic planning to solve these problems has become more critical (Bryson et al., 2010; P. Harris et al., 2012; Kent & Thompson, 2012; Lopez & Hynes, 2006; Thompson & McCue, 2016; Vaara & Durand, 2012).

The term "wicked problems" has been used to describe daunting, complex, and multidisciplinary problems not easily defined or solved through traditional methods, frameworks, or means (Kreuter et al., 2004; Thompson & McCue, 2016; Wicks & Jamieson, 2014). In their seminal work, Rittel and Webber (1973) asserted that wicked problems were unrelated to poor moral judgments but rather were "diabolical" problems that were extremely resistant to resolution. According to Rittel and Webber (1973), "the kinds of problems that planners deal with—societal problems—are inherently different problems…planning problems are inherently wicked" (p. 160). The wicked problems that planners face can be found in nearly all public policy issues; they have unclear boundaries, are evolving and unstable, and may have conflicting interpretations of the problem or definitions for success among the public (Kreuter et al., 2004; Rittel & Webber, 1973). Wicked problems are characteristically complex because they are socially embedded and caused by various factors (Kreuter et al., 2004; Signal et al., 2013; Thompson & McCue, 2016). Likened to a constellation of highly interdependent and linked problems, solving one wicked problem may lead to an unforeseen problem in another area (Kreuter et al., 2004; Thompson & McCue, 2016). According to Signal et al. (2013), wicked problems "have no single solution that applies in all circumstances and solutions can only be classified as better or worse, rather than right or wrong" (p. 84).

Because there is no single way to solve wicked problems, solutions are difficult to achieve without collaboration among a diverse group of professionals working across

organizational and disciplinary boundaries (Kreuter et al., 2004; Signal et al., 2013; Thompson & McCue, 2016). Separate and uncoordinated ways of working do not foster solutions to wicked public problems (M. Harris, 2010; Kent & Thompson, 2012; Lopez & Hynes, 2006; Thompson & McCue, 2016). Complex legislative systems can compound the issue and make it even more difficult to foster cross-sectoral collaborations that affect interconnected change in planning and policy areas (Giles-Corti & Whitzman, 2012; Mendoza et al., 2012). Furthering the complexities of these contemporary problems is the "compartmentalization of scientific and professional knowledge, the sector-based division of responsibilities in contemporary society, and the increasingly diverse nature of the societal contexts in which people live" (Lawrence, 2010, p. 125).

A broader, more collaborative, and innovative approach is needed to address wicked problems and their challenges (Thompson & McCue, 2016). Effective contributions to and imaginative solutions to wicked problems may be found through collaboration across disciplinary boundaries, sectors, and levels of government (Clary, 2021; Lawrence, 2010; Thompson & McCue, 2016). Transdisciplinary partnerships and approaches between researchers, policymakers, and professional practitioners from different disciplinary backgrounds create a better understanding of a wicked problem (M. Harris, 2010; Thompson & McCue, 2016; Wicks & Jamieson, 2014). Legitimate conveners—whether individuals or organizations—are needed to initiate and facilitate the types of collaborative efforts required to solve complex and interacting issues (Bryson & Crosby, 2006; Clary, 2021). Conveners can draw attention to wicked public problems and then span boundaries to bring a diverse set of stakeholders together to confront the problems (Bryson & Crosby, 2006). Once collaborative groups are formed, creative and respectful ways of working are needed to nurture knowledge sharing, commitment, systems thinking, and transparent communication among stakeholders (P. Harris et al., 2012; Kreuter et al., 2004; Thompson & McCue, 2016; Wicks & Jamieson, 2014). Public agencies serving as the convener of such collaborative bodies for strategic planning must prioritize these ways of working (Elbanna, 2008; Signal et al., 2013; Wicks & Jamieson, 2014). Further, the resulting strategic plans must encompass an integrative and systems-view model that identifies a range of interventions and considers the views of those affected by the issues as well as the concerns of policymakers (Signal et al., 2013).

The wicked problem under investigation in this study was the burgeoning needs of a growing and aging older adult population in the United States. The ability to meet these needs is an urgent public issue requiring proactive, collaborative, and sustainable solutions (Campbell et al., 2021; Feng, 2019; Hyer et al., 2019; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021). The convening agencies in each state—SUAs—develop strategic State Plans on Aging to drive solutions for meeting the needs of older adults through home- and community-based services (HCBS). State Plans often proposed a range of interventions that support LTSS, so performance in meeting older adults' needs was measured across a range of interventions defined within a set of dimensions identified by a third party. The following section provides more information about the older adult population in the United States and the dimensions of LTSS under investigation in this study.

Older Adults in the United States

An aging population provides challenges and many economic and social opportunities that require proactive and creative planning (Hyer et al., 2019). Worldwide, in 2019 (the most recent year for which data are available), the global population aged 65 years and above was 703 million. The number of older adults is projected to double to 1.5 billion by 2050. By 2050, one in every six people worldwide will be over 65 (PR Newswire, 2020). In the United States, the older adult population (age 65 and over) has steadily grown since 2009 compared to the under-65 population. In 2019, there were 54.1 million older adults ages 65 and older. This number of older adults represents an increase of 14.4 million (or 36%) since 2009. The growth is projected to continue to increase. It is estimated that 80.8 million older adults will be in the United States by 2040 and 94.7 million by 2060. Further, older adults live longer lives due to increased life expectancy (Administration on Aging, 2021; Sanders & Rector, 2021). As the population of older adults continues to increase and live longer, the need for adequate, accessible, and extended aging services increases (Feng, 2019; Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020; Tong et al., 2021).

Most older adults (with some estimates showing as much as 70%) will need some form of aging services and supports in their lifetime, especially when considering the rising prevalence of chronic diseases and Alzheimer's disease in the older adult

population (PR Newswire, 2020; Sanders & Rector, 2021). Family caregivers are not always available or able to meet all the individuals' needs, and paying for these services can be costly with few financing options (Feng, 2019; Genworth, 2019; Johnson, 2020; Sanders & Rector, 2021). In 2017, 14% of adults aged 65 and older had incomes below 125% of the federal poverty level (FPL), and 37% had incomes below 250% (Johnson, 2020). Needing LTSS is one of the greatest financial risks to older adults (Genworth, 2019; Johnson, 2020). Aging in place is one type of policy strategy designed to help older adults successfully remain in their homes and community. Some recent strategic planning efforts have sought to modify the range and types of services available to older adults to promote aging in place, yet further improvements to community-based supports and services are required (Campbell et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Feng, 2019). Effective strategic planning in aging services, with more diverse community-based factors, is needed to help successfully meet the needs of the current and future population of older adults (Cameron, 2008; Campbell et al., 2021; Feng, 2019; Hyer et al., 2019; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021).

States have an important role in operating systems of LTSS for individuals in need of care (Sanders & Rector, 2021). LTSS is defined as a range of services and supports for individuals needing assistance with daily tasks such as bathing, dressing, walking, toileting, and other health-related tasks. It also includes assistance with other instrumental tasks such as housework, meal preparation, medication administration, and transportation (Sanders & Rector, 2021). Although individuals of all ages can receive LTSS, the need is strongly correlated with older adults (Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020; Sanders & Rector, 2021). Neither Medicare nor traditional health insurance pays for these services (Johnson, 2020). Publicly funded LTSS is provided through Medicaid and the federal OAA (1965). Although most Medicaid services are provided through private, for-profit insurance companies receiving state funds, OAA funds are administered through designated state entities—SUAs—and a nonprofit Aging Network, which consists of over 600 AAAs and 1,000s of service providers. Reports show that "state and local Aging Networks have built an extensive infrastructure of [HCBS] over the last 30 years and administered them in a largely efficient, low-cost manner" (Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020, p. 102).

The OAA (1965) requires states to emphasize serving older individuals with the greatest economic and social needs while emphasizing livability and prevention. Economic needs can be defined as individuals living below the FPL, and social needs include living alone or with disabilities. Other risk factors for needing LTSS care may include frailty, a state of decreased capacity, disease, social isolation, or depression (Chu et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021). The Aging Network provides a host of HCBS designed to help older adults age in place. The services include assistance for activities and instrumental activities of daily living, as well as other support such as nutrition, physical activity, chronic disease prevention or management education, companionship, mental health, and injury prevention programs (Campbell et al., 2021; Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021). For this study, Reinhard et al.'s (2020) AARP LTSS State Scorecard (AARP Scorecard) was used to evaluate states' success in meeting the needs of older adults across a range of categories and interventions while using a single score.

Aging Services and Supports

AARP's Scorecard presents rankings and information by states across LTSS categories to measure state-level "system performance from the viewpoint of users of services and their families" (AARP, n.d., "What is the Scorecard" section). The AARP Scorecard includes 26 individual indicators divided among five policy categories, called dimensions, as follows:

- affordability and access,
- choice of setting and provider,
- quality of life and quality of care,
- support for family caregivers, and
- effective transitions.

This section reviews the literature on the five dimensions presented in the AARP Scorecard. These dimensions comprise the overall score for each state combined.

Affordability and Access. LTSS affordability and access are defined by several factors, including nursing home costs, home care costs, and access and care coordination programs (Reinhard et al., 2020). In 2019, nursing care represented the largest cost for LTSS. Nursing facilities offer care, medical supervision, and 24-hour assistance (PR

Newswire, 2020). The cost of these services is unaffordable for most Americans (Reinhard et al., 2020). The annual cost to stay in a nursing home is more than $90,000 for a semi-private room and more than $100,000 for a private room, though this cost ranges across states (Genworth, 2019; Reinhard et al., 2020). Once an individual has exhausted their life savings, services are covered through Medicaid as a public safety net (Johnson, 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020).

Home care is typically much more cost-effective (Johnson, 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020) and has been shown to delay long☐term institutionalization in frail, medically complex Medicare beneficiaries without increasing HCBS costs (Valluru et al., 2019). Home care can range from approximately $35,000 to $44,000 a year, depending on the number of service hours received (Johnson, 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020). Although this process is far less expensive compared to nursing home care, it is still approximately 80% of the income of a typical, older middle-income family (PR Newswire, 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020).

Access points such as aging and disability resources centers (ADRCs) provide a "no wrong door" approach to connecting older adults and their families to LTSS options and coordinating care across a range of providers (Campbell et al., 2021; Reinhard et al., 2020). States with high-performing ADRCs help build strong, collaborative partnerships between state aging, disability, and Medicaid agencies. These ADRC access points may be delivered through AAAs and will generally enhance and strengthen HCBS by reaching target populations, streamlining eligibility, and connecting individuals and entities across sectors (Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020; Tong et al., 2021).

Choice of Setting and Provider. Several indicators comprise this AARP Scorecard dimension that measures the availability and choices that older adults have in deciding the setting and provider of their LTSS. Traditional settings include nursing homes and assisted living facilities; however, most people prefer to receive HCBS in their own homes and communities for as long as possible rather than in nursing care or in a hospital (Cameron, 2008; Johnson, 2020; Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020; PR Newswire, 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020). The choice of setting and provider dimension reflects whether states offer the care older adults prefer in the setting of their choice (Reinhard et al., 2020). One of the most important factors for older adults to age at home

is accessible and affordable housing options and home modification and repair programs (Campbell et al., 2021; T. George & Seidman, 2015). About half of older adults own their homes, which can serve as financial safety nets and help maintain stable monthly housing expenses. Many other older adults are renters and may be vulnerable to market conditions (T. George & Seidman, 2015). Nationally, only about 8.6 million potentially available subsidized housing opportunities such as vouchers or units are available. However, it is estimated that 18.9 million very low-income renter households are in need (Reinhard et al., 2020). Housing and health care costs may dominate the income of low-income older adults and are important factors in helping them remain in their homes (Campbell et al., 2021; T. George & Seidman, 2015; Johnson, 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020).

In addition to having a choice for setting, older adults should also be provided with a choice in their provider (Reinhard et al., 2020). High-performing states empower and support older adults who choose to direct their care. Self-directed care means providing older adults increased control and flexibility over their care, whereby funds are provided directly to individuals, or their families, to arrange at-home care assistance with the activities of daily living (Fitzgerald-Murphy & Kelly, 2019). In 2019, more than 1.2 million older adults participated in public LTSS programs that were self-directing (Reinhard et al., 2020). The ability to choose what care to receive and who will provide it is also highly dependent on the availability of licensed and qualified providers. The choice of setting and providers dimension measures the supply of home health and adult day services and direct care workers. The levels of these types of services and workers range across states and remain uneven (Reinhard et al., 2020). More resources or coordination are often needed, including training and qualified staff, to maintain the capacity needed to deliver quality HCBS (Bragg & Hansen, 2015; Tong et al., 2021). Both self-directed care and concerns over workforce capacity are important topics for further strategic inquiry and pursuit (Bragg & Hansen, 2015; Fitzgerald-Murphy & Kelly, 2019).

Quality of Life and Quality of Care. Though difficult to measure, important indicators of successful aging services include older adults' quality of life and the care they receive (Reinhard et al., 2020). Quality of life involves older adults' health, social, psychological, and environmental well-being (Loayza & Valenzuela, 2021). This process

may include aspects related to healthy physical and psychological states, easier sleep, reduced levels of stress and depression, better compatibility with life events, and more life satisfaction (Sharmila, 2020). Concern for quality of life has grown in importance due to increases in life expectancy and the desire of older adults to live their most advanced years in good condition (Loayza & Valenzuela, 2021). Connecting with others within a community is integral to health, wellness, and aging in place (Campbell et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015; Sharmila, 2020). Nevertheless, social isolation in older adults is associated with numerous public health concerns. Researchers conducting studies on social isolation found loneliness in older adults to have as many profound health consequences as smoking 15 cigarettes a day (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). Social isolation causes increased risks for physical inactivity, cardiovascular disease, depression, and vulnerability (Buffel et al., 2012; Hu et al., 2021). LTSS providers can enhance the quality of life for older adults by promoting new activities and passions and providing opportunities for older adults to contribute positively to their families and communities in various ways (Sharmila, 2020). Quality of life methods of care encourages positive social and behavioral outcomes (Cameron, 2008; Chen et al., 2021; Reinhard et al., 2020).

Quality of care is associated with increasing expectations by older adults and families to receive care that is effective, safe, and people-centered (Chen et al., 2021). States measure quality in their HCBS services using different quality assurance and monitoring systems (Feng, 2019; Reinhard et al., 2020). The AARP Scorecard uses composite indicators measuring states' utilization of four standardized quality monitoring tools to benchmark HCBS quality and allow cross-state comparisons (Reinhard et al., 2020). Planning for LTSS services should include innovative service strategies designed to improve the quality of care and enhance value while reducing quality concerns that can have serious harmful effects (Cameron, 2008; Chen et al., 2021; Reinhard et al., 2020). Possible strategies could include expanding ombudsman programs funded through OAA—designed to advocate for older adults and ensure the quality of care in institutions—to cover other HCBS or prioritizing the development of outcome measures to effectively gauge the quality of HCBS across states (Reinhard et al., 2020).

Support for Family Caregivers. States with successful LTSS programs will include support services and protections for family caregivers. The AARP Scorecard measures support for caregivers using a range of indicators around person- and family-centered care and other measures of key concern to the public (Reinhard et al., 2020). Many older adults rely on caregivers, but informal family care systems are weakening (Feng, 2019; Reckrey et al., 2020). Informal, unpaid caregivers can include a spouse, partner, family member, friend, or neighbor (Family Caregiver Alliance, 2019). However, caregiving can be difficult and create problems for the caregiver with health, depressive symptoms, mental health, and work-related strains (AARP & National Alliance for Caregiving, 2020; National Opinion Research Center, 2018; Reinhard et al., 2020).

States with successful support for family caregivers will provide services to meet caregivers' needs, including appropriate information, training, respite, transportation support, and other services tailored to their individual preferences (PR Newswire, 2020; Reckrey et al., 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020). Other strategies that states might explore are expanding the types of health support that registered nurses can delegate to home care aides (e.g., giving medications, tube feedings, providing routine respiratory care) and ensuring that nurse practitioners can practice to the full extent of their education and training to ease shortages of primary care providers and allow families more flexibility in the provision of care (Reinhard et al., 2020).

Effective Transitions. Transitions include moving between settings within the continuum of care, such as home- and community-based settings, nursing facilities, and hospitals (Cameron, 2008; Conlon et al., 2020; Reinhard et al., 2020). Older adults are more vulnerable to care transitions, and individuals undergoing care transitions may be at risk for service duplication, conflicting care recommendations, and medication errors (Conlon et al., 2020). Burdensome transitions include excessive hospitalizations, recurring hospital readmissions, and unnecessary institutionalization at a nursing facility (Reinhard et al., 2020).

Nationally, 16.8% of long-stay nursing home residents were admitted to the hospital within 6 months of their first nursing care assessment. Successful states will work to reduce unnecessary hospitalizations, readmissions, and institutionalization, especially at the end of life (Reinhard et al., 2020). Home health care and HCBS may

help delay hospital admissions, and some older adults in nursing homes with low care needs could potentially transition to a home- and community-based setting. Nationally, about half of residents in skilled nursing facilities were successfully discharged back to the community (Reinhard et al., 2020). Provider-level and system-level improvements and strategic solutions are needed to improve outcomes and increase the effectiveness of transitions (Conlon et al., 2020).

Summary of Older Adults and Aging Services

The population of older adults in the United States continues to increase, and people live longer lives than before. There is a critical need for adequate, accessible, and extended aging services to meet the needs of the growing and aging population of older adults (Feng, 2019; Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020; Tong et al., 2021). Effective strategic planning in aging services, with more diverse community-based factors, is needed to help successfully meet the needs of the current and future population of older adults (Cameron, 2008; Campbell et al., 2021; Feng, 2019; Hyer et al., 2019; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021). The Aging Network, comprised of state and local partners, provides a range of HCBS designed to help older adults age in place. By leveraging their extensive infrastructure, Aging Networks administer HCBS in an efficient and low-cost manner. Still, an aging population provides challenges and many economic and social opportunities that require proactive and creative planning (Hyer et al., 2019). AARP's Scorecard presents rankings and information by states across LTSS categories to measure state-level performance in meeting the needs of older adults and their families. The AARP Scorecard includes a range of individual indicators divided into five dimensions: affordability and access, choice of setting and provider, quality of life and care, support for family caregivers, and effective transitions. Meeting the needs of older adults through a range of interventions is an urgent public problem to address (Feng, 2019; Hyer et al., 2019; Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021). This study considered states' performance addressing this broad public problem as the macro-level outcome of interest. This study sought to understand the relationship between this macro-level variable (states' performance in meeting older adults' needs) and the microlevel variables of diversified collaboration and plan design.

Combining Process and Practice Approaches to Research

When combined, process/micro and practice/macro perspectives in strategic planning research can produce rich insights (Carter, 2013; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; Seidl & Whittington, 2014; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Whittington, 2006). For example, it can allow researchers to explore how planning participants, along with their unique experiences, cognitive styles, levels of commitment, and plan acceptance are critical contributors to the design of a strategic plan and how they may influence whether the plans they helped to develop ultimately succeed or fail in practice (B. George et al., 2018; Iasbech & Lavarda, 2018; Johnsen, 2018). Still, there is a need for more research with theoretical strength, including those that "simultaneously investigate different organizational performance dimensions using multiple data sources with stakeholder involvement as a moderator" (B. George et al., 2019, p. 818). This study leveraged process/micro and practice/macro approaches to strategic planning research using a mixed methodology to gain the depth of understanding of a complex research paradigm. There is significant support for this undertaking represented in the literature.

Modern organizational settings are large, pluralistic, and diversified and require robust and complementary methods of research that provide more depth, breadth, and relevance (Balogun et al., 2003; Huff et al., 2010; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Many process-based studies are qualitative, and more quantitative studies are needed to provide greater insights (Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). This study incorporated qualitative and quantitative aspects and employed indices to quantify information from public sector strategic plans. Further, studies based on actor-network theory or action research with smaller sample sizes may help explain why strategic planning is useful for some practitioners and stakeholders (Bryson et al., 2009; Johnsen, 2018). This study applied actor-network theory to make associations between actors and actants. There could be no more than 50 included in the sample size because states were the unit of analysis. Additionally, there was a strong call for more research linking process/micro and practice/macro approaches.

Microlevel research may be reductionist and not recognize the effects of broader social issues, meaning little is known about how the micro interrelates with the macro in strategy work (Elbasha & Wright, 2017; Seidl & Whittington, 2014; Vaara &

Whittington, 2012; Whittington, 2006, 2011). Segregating micro and macro studies limits the knowledge and insights that researchers can discover because it hinders researchers from connecting the details of planning to how they contribute to societal issues (Carter, 2013; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; Seidl & Whittington, 2014; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Whittington, 2006). Macro-structures are interrelated with micro-practices, so researchers need to concentrate on context and detail while remaining broad in their scope of the study (Balogun et al., 2003; Carter, 2013; Carter et al., 2008; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Thus, there is a need to study outcomes at a more micro level without losing focus of the wider social factors (Bryson et al., 2009; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). A variety of variance (practice-based) and process studies are needed to advance the field of strategic planning research. Variance studies show what works together, and detailed process studies explain how it works (Bryson, 2010a; Bryson & Edwards, 2017). This study aimed to answer these calls for more research by linking process- and practice-based approaches to research using both microlevel and macro-level variables.

Also relevant to this study, previous researchers have argued that more knowledge is needed about the process design features and social mechanisms that lead to strategic planning success (Barzelay & Campbell, 2003; Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009; Bryson, 2010a; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Mayntz, 2004). In reviewing the research of Lee et al. (2018), Bryson et al. (2018) suggested that it is important to examine further the linking mechanisms between strategic planning processes—such as collaboration and plan components—to organizational performance. Thus, studies are needed linking strategic practices to contexts and outcomes, but connecting microlevel activities to macro-level outcomes is a key challenge (Johnson et al., 2003; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). How individuals and groups interact with the strategy process may create varying organizational outcomes (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Focusing on multiple levels, such as individuals, groups, institutions, and practice communities, will allow for a review of performance based on different outcomes (Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010).

For this study, multiple types and levels of groups were explored, along with a proximate and a distal outcome. These outcomes were identified as the design of the

strategic plans (proximate outcome) and the LTSS dimension associated with state performance (distal outcome). Further analysis is needed in various contexts to understand participation, inclusion, and accountability in strategic planning (Sillince & Mueller, 2007; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). This study explored the diversity of the groups collaborating during state-level strategic plan development; the contextual design of the resulting strategic plan; and the link between the diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and organizational performance measured by the state's success in addressing a broad social problem.

Summary

The theoretical frameworks that guided this study were process-based and practice-based research focused on the micro- and macro-levels of analysis, respectively. Lee et al.'s (2018) study, along with supporting theories such as planned emergence (Grant, 2003), actor-network theory (Bryson et al., 2009), and collaborative public management (McGuire, 2006), also guided this project. The premise of the study was twofold. First, there was a need to connect process-based and microlevel research with practice-based and macro-level research in order to understand better how, when, and why strategic planning works (Balogun et al., 2003; Bryson, 2010a; Bryson et al., 2009, 2018; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Carter, 2013; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; B. George et al., 2019; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Seidl & Whittington, 2014; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010; Whittington, 2011). Second, improvements in how public sector strategic planning is conducted and documented are expected to contribute positively to solving broad social problems (Barzelay & Campbell, 2003; Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009; Bryson, 2010a; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Giles-Corti & Whitzman, 2012; P. Harris et al., 2012; Kreuter et al., 2004; Lawrence, 2010; Mayntz, 2004; Signal et al., 2013; Thompson & McCue, 2016; Wicks & Jamieson, 2014).

This literature review examined the existing research on strategic planning, strategic planning in the public sector, strategic planning theories, process/micro and practice/macro approaches to research, collaboration, diversity in collaboration, strategic planning artifacts, wicked public problems, and the older adult population in the United States. This study sought to provide objective correlational relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and public sector performance in

addressing a broad social problem. Much literature requested further research of this study's specific topic and approach. The calls for more research reviewed in this chapter validated the need for this study to fill the literature gap.

Chapter 3 – Methodology

The researcher explored strategic plan effectiveness within public sector aging services and the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact, as well as the effects on the U.S. region and demographic characteristics of states. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the research methodology for the study. The research plan, including the methodology, research questions, procedures, and analysis, are explained in detail in this section.

The researcher used a mixed-method research paradigm for the study. Mixed-method research is "an approach to inquiry that combines or integrates both qualitative and quantitative forms of research" (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 249). It requires the collection and use of both qualitative and quantitative data and is accompanied by rigorous methods of qualitative and quantitative research (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Each component of the research (qualitative component and quantitative component) is called a "strand" (Terrell, 2016). The data from both strands are synthesized during the analysis and described by the mixed-method procedures used in the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Mixed-method research is often associated with a pragmatic view of research, which emphasizes the researcher's ability to draw from qualitative and quantitative assumptions and subsequently choose methods, techniques, and procedures specifically needed to answer research questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Mixed-method research may be called multimethod or mixed research; however, the term mixed method is the most frequently used in recent academic literature (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Researchers first developed mixed methodologies in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Terrell, 2016). The approach was formed through developmental phases based on the work of researchers in diverse fields (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Mixed-method research was developed on the idea that "no major problem area can be studied exclusively with one research method alone" (Terrell, 2016, p. 196). Researchers realized they could use mixed-method research designs to neutralize a single research method's weaknesses—and minimize its limitations. Researchers benefit from mixed-method studies because of the increased understanding that can be gained by integrating qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Mixed-method research has become increasingly important and popular,

especially in social and health sciences (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A mixed-method research design was chosen because qualitative and quantitative strands are needed to answer the research questions (Terrell, 2016). The strength of using a mixed-method research design is that it included qualitative and quantitative methods, which allowed the researcher to have more insight into the research problems and questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The value of using qualitative and quantitative data in the study is that it was possible to examine relationships and outcomes using qualitative content. The mixed-method research design allowed the researcher to collect qualitative information about diversified collaboration and strategic plan design from specified strategic plans (State Plans on Aging) and then quantitatively examine the relationships between these two variables and between the two variables and the strategic planning outcomes (as measured by the AARP Scorecard).

An exploratory sequential mixed-method research design was employed to address the study's topic. Exploratory sequential mixed-method research is a strategy that occurs in three phases. First, a researcher analyzes qualitative data, then designs a quantitative feature based on the qualitative results, and finally tests the quantitative feature (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A qualitative strand precedes the quantitative strand (Terrell, 2016), though the researcher prioritizes the qualitative and quantitative strands in the design. Exploratory sequential mixed-method research design is often used when a researcher needs to quantify the results of a qualitative investigation (Terrell, 2016).

For this study, the qualitative data collection and analysis were built to the quantitative analysis and interpretation (see Terrell, 2016). Content gathered during the qualitative portion of the study was operationalized to conduct the quantitative portion. The three phases of this study were as follows:

- Phase 1: Explored the qualitative data of the State Plans on Aging.
- Phase 2: Built a database of variables from the results of the qualitative analysis.
- Phase 3: Tested the data using quantitative methods.

Following these three phases, guided by exploratory sequential mixed-method research design principles, insights have identified answers to the research questions, as shown in the next section.

The researcher used Lee et al. (2018) to guide the analytical design of this study. The study applied and expanded Lee et al.'s (2018) mixed-method study that examined "how the design of a collaboratively derived strategic plan affects the efforts of government to resolve a public ill" (p. 360). Lee et al.'s study was used as a model for this study in several ways. First, Lee et al.'s study was focused on the public sector (rather than private or nonprofit), and this study focused on the public sector. Next, Lee et al.'s study was conducted to answer questions about the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact.

Similarly, the research questions in this study focused on relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact. Finally, Lee et al.'s methodology utilized content analysis to develop a database of information for quantitative analysis. Likewise, this study also utilized content analysis to develop a database of information for quantitative analysis. Despite evident similarities, the researcher expanded upon Lee et al.'s research through important differences in this study. First, Lee et al.'s study focused on county-level strategic plans. This study focused on state-level strategic plans. The researcher's rationale for selecting states, rather than counties, as the unit of analysis is explained in more detail in the section describing the quantitative data and analysis. Next, Lee et al. reviewed strategic plans aimed at reducing homelessness. This study focused on strategic plans developed to address aging services. Finally, although the Lee et al. study served as a foundation for independent and dependent variable selection, there were differences in the exact variables selected, the way the variables were operationalized, and the method of analysis. This difference is the main differentiation between Lee et al.'s study and this study. These differences were necessary to expand from a county-level study focused on homelessness to a state-level study focused on aging services–and to explore new information about the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact.

Research Questions

Two qualitative and six quantitative research questions were stated to guide the study. The following qualitative questions guided the qualitative portion of this study:

1. How many aspects of diversified collaboration (Group Diversity) at the time of plan development are documented in each of the State Plans on Aging?

2. How many [of Bryson and Alston's (2011)] indicators of robust strategic plan design are included in each of the State Plans on Aging? (For more information, see the Definition of Terms in Chapter One – Introduction or the section below on Strategic Plan Design).

The results of the qualitative strand of the study were used in the quantitative strand of the study. The following quantitative questions guided the quantitative portion of this study:

3. What is the degree of relationship between diversified collaboration and strategic plan design?

4. What is the degree of relationship between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes [as indicated on the AARP Scorecard score]?

5. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon plan design?

6. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon group diversity?

7. Was there a statistically significant effect for region of the United States for percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities by lower quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

8. Was there a statistically significant effect of difference in percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities between the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher provides details about the qualitative data collection and analysis in this section. It is standard for qualitative data collection and analysis to occur first in exploratory sequential mixed-method designs (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The specific research procedures are determined based on the study's overall goal (Terrell, 2016). In this study, the researcher gathered qualitative data operationalized for quantitative analysis. The qualitative information of interest was gathered from specified strategic plans through a process known as content analysis. In the following sections, the

researcher expands on the concept of content analysis and identity the specified strategic plans and the qualitative information of interest.

Content Analysis

The first phase of this study was defined using content analysis to explore the qualitative data in state strategic plans. Content analysis is a document review process recognized and most frequently applied in mixed-method research (Kansteiner & König, 2020). Lee et al. (2018) further suggested that content analysis is a recognized qualitative process used in social sciences "to understand complicated phenomena that are often unstructured or difficult to derive from documents" (p. 365). As a methodology, qualitative content analysis is a systematic review of print or media materials that involves searching and analyzing text known as manifest content (Kansteiner & König, 2020; Patton, 2015; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018).

The manifest content is readily observable, overt, and apparent surface content in print and media materials. Content analysis allows researchers to assess the types of words, themes, or ideas used in the data source and determine how often they are used (Patton, 2015; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). This type of content analysis is important in mixed-method research because the analysis gives linear structure to qualitative content (Gläser-Zikuda et al., 2020; Kansteiner & König, 2020). Once the content is identified, organized, and categorized, inferences and interpretations from intermediate statistical methods can be made, allowing the researcher to apply quantitative meaning to the material (Patton, 2015; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). In this study, the researcher employed content analysis during the first phase to gather qualitative data of interest from specified strategic plans. The qualitative results of the content analysis were used to build a variables database. These variables were used during the quantitative analysis in the third phase. The strategic plans selected for this study are State Plans on Aging.

State Plans on Aging

State Plans on Aging are publicly available strategic plans. Strategic plans are the written output or product of strategic planning activities (De Andreis, 2019). Written strategic plans serve as a comprehensive reference guide or framework for decision-making and resource allocation. The plan helps decision-makers understand the strategies

needed to meet the organization's mandates and fulfill its mission (Bryson & Alston, 2011; De Andreis, 2019). Content within the strategic plan can vary in scope and order, but strategic plan content can be generally categorized as proactive, tactical, and action-oriented. The written strategic plan should document the answers to three types of questions:

1. Proactive: Where are we?
2. Tactical: Where do we want to be?
3. Action-oriented: How do we get there?

First, written strategic plans are proactive rather than reactive (Bryson & Alston, 2011). The plan provides a written, objective view of the current state in which the organization operates. The current state can include environmental trends and the organization's role in the environment. This part of the strategic plan also clarifies and frames issues, opportunities, and challenges (Bryson & Alston, 2011; De Andreis, 2019). Second, the written strategic plan is tactical, providing written declarations about the type of growth, improvement, or movement the organization wishes to create. This part of the plan is visionary. It provides high-level goals that describe the desired future state (Bryson & Alston, 2011; De Andreis, 2019). It also demonstrates the potential results or outcomes of implementing the plan (De Andreis, 2019). Lastly, the strategic plan is action-oriented, meaning the written strategic plan must outline specific, targeted actions that will be taken by the organization to move from the current state to the future state. Because the plan needs to be actionable, it must be flexible and practical. Additionally, the strategic plan should link or align with other organizational operating plans such as information technology, human resources, financial, and business plans (Bryson & Alston, 2011).

State Plans on Aging are written strategic plans periodically produced by the designated entity in each state. The State Plans are intended to describe how the state will meet the needs of older adults in the state, integrate health and social services delivery systems, and build capacity for long-term care (Administration for Community Living, 2019). State Plans are submitted to the Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a) by SUAs, the designated entity. SUAs are state governmental agencies federally selected to oversee home- and community-based services for older adults, adults with disabilities,

and families and caregivers in the SUA's respective state. Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a), through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (n.d.), manages federal OAA (1965) programs. SUAs oversee OAA programs within their state. These programs provide home- and community-based services through a network of regional and local providers. State Plans are a requirement of OAA and must be submitted to Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a) for review and approval. Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a) requires the State Plan to be approved for the state to continue eligibility for federal funding for OAA programs. This requirement indicates the importance of statewide strategic planning for public sector aging services. Thus, the researcher chose states as the level of analysis for this study.

State Plans are developed by SUAs using instructions provided by Administration for Community Living (2019), which specifies minimum standards for required elements and content. Another national organization, ADvancing States (n.d.-a), also publishes additional guidance and tools for developing robust State Plans. ADvancing States (n.d.-a) is the national association representing SUAs. Its mission is to "design, improve, and sustain state systems delivering long-term services and supports for older adults, people with disabilities, and their caregivers" (ADvancing States, n.d.-a, para. 3). The resources provided by ADvancing States (n.d.-a) are designed to encourage states to develop their plans beyond the minimum set of requirements defined by Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a) and help to standardize State Plan content further.

The content across states' State Plans was expected to be similar enough for comparison. However, some variability existed considering the states' instructions and resources to guide their plans' development. The national instructions and guidance were interpreted and applied differently by each state, resulting in variations in the length of each State Plan, the specific information provided, and the depth of detail within the plans. This study was limited to the information presented in the State Plans, which was self-reported and might not fully represent all the planning efforts or stakeholders contributing to the plan's development. The following paragraphs provide additional details about the variability that was anticipated.

Administration for Community Living (2019) required states to include, at a minimum, goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes in their State Plans. Therefore, it

was expected that all State Plans would include these artifacts in their plan designs. ADvancing States (n.d.-b) provides additional tools and resources to assist states in developing other aspects of their plan, such as the mission statement, values statement, issue identification, and performance measures. It was expected that many states, but likely not all, would include these artifacts in their plan design. Additionally, states were not required to include a list of stakeholders who participated in the plan's development, nor were states required to explain the levels of participation by each stakeholder or group.

For this study, the researcher focused only on the stakeholders explicitly listed as having participated in the plan's development. In some cases, it may not have been clear in the State Plan which stakeholders or groups contributed to the plan's development. The researcher expected to find some State Plans that did not have sufficient stakeholder information documented in the plan to be included in the analysis. Plans without information about the stakeholder group that contributed to the plan development were eliminated from this study. However, enough plans included the information to meet the thresholds ultimately needed for quantitative analysis.

Finally, states can determine the duration of their planning cycle, ranging from 2 to 4 years, meaning states can choose to produce plans every two, three, or four years (Administration for Community Living, 2019). The differences in planning cycles were expected to result in variability in the state plan effective dates. This study focused on State Plans with effective (beginning) dates ranging from the federal fiscal year 2014 to 2018 and with plan end dates no later than 2021. The researcher used the earlier plan when a state had more than one plan within the relevant period. The relevant timeframes were established so that the state would have had the maximum amount of time possible to formulate and implement their State Plan, such that it would have had the maximum opportunity possible to influence the data presented in the AARP Scorecard—data that were largely collected in 2019.

Content analysis was used to gather qualitative information of interest from the State Plans on Aging (State Plans). The information of interest was data about diversified collaboration (group diversity) and strategic plan design. Content analysis was used to clarify how many aspects of diversified collaboration and how many indicators of robust

strategic plan design were documented in each State Plan. The following sections expand on the two areas of interest within the qualitative portion of the study. Appendix A – Coding Agenda provides more information than this chapter.

Planning Group Diversity

Diversified collaboration was referred to as group diversity when the SUA was developing the State Plan. Group diversity was operationalized using theoretical propositions from the literature on diversified collaboration during strategic plan development. Group diversity was comprised of research-based elements related to participation and representation by different types of stakeholders during the development of the strategic plan, as described in detail in Chapter Two – Literature Review. The stakeholder types were derived from different categories of stakeholders found in research, including cross-sector (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018), intergovernmental (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018), and internal and external collaborators (Fernandes et al., 2021; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003). The nine elements (stakeholder types) that comprised group diversity included participation and representation by the following:

- private sector organization(s),
- nonprofit sector organization(s),
- academic sector organization(s),
- health care sector organization(s),
- local public/governmental agency (e.g., city or county),
- state public/governmental agency (other than the state agency leading the planning),
- federal/national public agency,
- internal managers/staff, and
- public input/involvement.

Strategic Plan Design

The concept of strategic plan design (plan design) was operationalized using Lee et al.'s (2018) definition as "the extent to which the steps or factors that constitute an effective strategic plan are present in a plan" (p. 362). This approach used an index of

ideal strategic plan components to include the presence (or lack) of 12 indicators. The indicators are considered critical components of a robust strategic plan (Bryson & Alston, 2011). The 12 ideal strategic plan elements considered necessary for a strategic plan to be deemed comprehensive are as follows:

- identified vision statement,
- identified mission statement,
- values or a values statement,
- issue identification,
- goal statement(s),
- measurable objectives,
- actionable strategies,
- identified organizations responsible for implementation,
- identified partner organizations,
- identified available resources,
- specified timeline, and
- explicitly identified intended outcomes.

Qualitative Research Procedures and Data Analysis

The State Plans were those published on the websites of the SUAs with strategic plan effective dates ranging from the federal fiscal year 2014 to 2018 and with plan end dates no later than 2021. If a more recent State Plan was published on the SUA's website outside the relevant time, the researcher contacted the SUA's public information email or phone number and requested the previous State Plan. Using content analysis, Lee et al. (2018) could "identify the presence (or absence) of different levels and types of collaboration used during the planning process … [and] the existence of various components in a format typically prescribed for effective plans" (p. 361).

For the qualitative analysis, the researcher reviewed each state's State Plan using content analysis and highlighted specific words, sentences, terms, and paragraphs representative of the predetermined elements related to group diversity and strategic plan design. Using a repetitive coding process of content analysis, the researcher reviewed each State Plan multiple times to identify

- how many of the nine aspects of diversified collaboration (group diversity) were explicitly documented in the plans and

- the explicit presence (or lack) of the 12 strategic plan design (plan design) components in the plans.

The researcher reviewed three State Plans, which served as a pilot for the qualitative content analysis. The researcher built a coding agenda (Mayring, 2000) and rules using the three State Plans and in combination with

- the definitions provided by Bryson and Alston for the 12 components of plans design (included in the Definition of Terms section) and

- the examples from literature of stakeholders represented during plan development (as presented in Chapter Two – Literature Review).

Using the coding agenda (which is included in Appendix A – Coding Agenda), the researcher reviewed the remaining State Plans and used Microsoft Excel to code all the data electronically gathered from the State Plans in two waves: (a) group diversity and (b) plan design. If a State Plan did not have sufficient information to analyze it for group diversity, it was removed from the study and was not analyzed for plan design.

During the analysis of group diversity and the groups documented as having participated in the plan development, it was not always immediately clear to the researcher what sector the organization was a part of (e.g., public, private, nonprofit, etc.) when only the name of the organization was listed. When it was unclear, the researcher found the organization's website and reviewed information about the organization, including "About Us" pages to determine the sector of the organization. Consortiums, task forces, or councils were reviewed as a singular entity rather than reviewing each group member unless the group was designated to oversee the development, review, or approval of the State Plan.

In this case, the individuals within the State Plan oversight group were considered separately and the sectors they each represented. If an individual was listed as a contributor to the plan, but no affiliation, title, or organization was specified, then the individual was not included in any category. AAAs or their representatives were categorized based on how the organization had been designated (e.g., county government, private nonprofit, etc.). Regarding public input, the researcher did not include public

input that was specific to the revision of the states' intrastate funding formula (IFF). The IFF is a component reported in State Plans but requires its process and public commenting period when it is updated (Administration for Community Living, 2019); therefore, public input on the IFF alone was not coded as public input on the overall State Plan. Appendix A – Coding Agenda includes additional coding rules specific to each group diversity or plan design element.

Next, the researcher compiled the results in Excel to answer the qualitative research questions about how many components of group diversity were in each State Plan and how many indicators of robust strategic plan design were in each. Throughout the process, the researcher maintained clear notes about how units of analysis were coded and why.

Quantitative Data Collection and Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used to address the study's six quantitative research questions. The information gathered from the State Plans about group diversity during plan development and Bryson and Alston's (2011) 12 components of strategic plan design represented the point when the data from the qualitative and quantitative strands were merged. The quantitative portion of the study also used two other sources of secondary data for analysis. These sources were the 2020 edition of the AARP LTSS State Scorecard (AARP Scorecard) and the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.).

Statistical Power Analysis: Sample Size Projections

Statistical power analysis of an a priori nature using G*Power software (3.1.9.2, Universität Düsseldorf, Germany) was conducted at the outset of the study to provide parameters for sample size expectations necessary to detect a statistically significant finding concerning the analyses associated with the study's six quantitative research questions. A projected sample range of 23 (anticipated large effect $d = .80$) to 67 (anticipated medium effect $d = .50$) was determined to detect a statistically significant finding for research questions three and four using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

For Research Questions 5 and 6, a projected sample size range of 76 (anticipated large effect $f = .40$) to 180 (anticipated medium effect $f = .25$) was determined sufficient

to detect a statistically significant finding for using the ANOVA analysis. For Research Questions 7 and 8, a projected sample range of 92 (anticipated large effect $f = .138$) to 196 (anticipated medium effect $f = .0625$) was determined sufficient to detect a statistically significant finding for using the MANOVA analysis.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical analyses of a foundational nature were conducted before the formal analyses associated with the study's six research questions. The study's missing data was analyzed using the descriptive statistical techniques of frequency counts (n) and percentages (%). Frequency counts (n) and percentages (%) represented the primary descriptive statistical techniques employed for comparative and illustrative purposes. The study's essential data arrays were also assessed using the descriptive statistical techniques of frequencies (n), measures of typicality (mean scores), variability (minimum/maximum, standard deviations), standard errors of the mean, and data normality (skew, kurtosis).

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used in Research Questions 3 and 4. Study data within the essential arrays were represented and interpreted at the interval level of measurement. The primary assumption of using the Pearson coefficient, linearity, was assessed through visual inspection of respective scatter plots. The probability level of $p \leq .05$ represented the threshold for statistical significance of finding in the research questions. In Research Questions 5 and 6, an ANOVA was conducted to assess the degree to which statistically significant differences existed in group diversity and plan design by region of the United States. In Research Question 7, a MANOVA was conducted to assess the degree to which there were significant differences in the linear combination of socio-economic and demographic characteristics for the state scores in the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard and between state scores in the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard. The analysis and reporting of findings were conducted using the 28th version of IBM's SPSS.

Variables

Analyses were conducted using the dataset the researcher developed during the study's qualitative portion and two publicly available secondary data sets: the AARP Scorecard and the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.). This section discusses the independent and

dependent variables. The data gathered during the qualitative portion of the study were transformed for quantitative analysis to answer the quantitative research questions. The diversified collaboration (group diversity) and strategic plan design (plan design) were operationalized by transforming the data into percentages and decimals. The following subsections provide further details.

Diversified Collaboration. The nine elements of diversified collaboration (group diversity) were used to operationalize the variable of group diversity. Each element of group diversity documented in each state's State Plan added 1 point to the state's total group diversity. The sum of the number of elements indicated the state's total for group diversity. The state's total was then divided by the overall number of elements possible (*n* = 9) to achieve the percentage. The percentage was then converted to decimals for analysis. Table 1 contains a list of the elements of group diversity.

Table 1

Elements in Group Diversity

Variable element	Category
Private Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector
Nonprofit Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector
Academic Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector
Health Care Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector
Local Public Agency	Intergovernmental
Other State Agency	Intergovernmental
Federal/National Public Agency	Intergovernmental
Internal Managers/Staff	Internal
Public Involvement/Input	External

Strategic Plan Design. The 12 elements of strategic plan design (plan design) were used to operationalize the variable of plan design. Each element of plan design documented in each state's State Plan added 1 point to the state's total for strategic plan design. Like group diversity, the sum of the number of elements indicated the state's total for plan design. The state's total was then divided by the overall number of elements possible (12) to achieve the percentage. The percentage was then converted to decimals for analysis. Table 2 contains a list of the elements of the plan design.

Table 2

Strategic Plan Design

Variable element
Vision statement
Mission statement
Values or a values statement
Issue identification
Goal statement(s)
Measurable objectives
Actionable strategies
Organizations responsible for implementation
Partner organizations
Identified available resources
Specified timeline
Intended outcomes

AARP Long-Term Services and Supports State Scorecard

Using states as the level of analysis allowed for a comparison of the State Plans with the 2020 edition of AARP's LTSS State Scorecard (AARP Scorecard), which presented rankings and information by states (Reinhard et al., 2020). The AARP Scorecard was designed to capture information across LTSS categories to measure state-level "system performance from the viewpoint of users of services and their families" (AARP, n.d., "What is the Scorecard" section). Information from the AARP Scorecard included an overall ranking for each state and an overall placement for each state. The unit of measurement for the overall placement was quartiles. The overall AARP Scorecard score for each state was derived from 26 individual indicators divided among five dimensions. The five dimensions were as follows:

- affordability and access,
- choice of setting and provider,
- quality of life and quality of care,
- support for family caregivers, and
- effective transitions.

The AARP Scorecard standardized the measurement of state LTSS across all 50 states and has been published four times since 2011, making it a reliable data source. The researcher used the AARP Scorecard as the variable to measure strategic planning outcomes. Using a standardized, third-party measure related to the social problem of interest aligned with Lee et al. (2018), who used county-level data on homelessness each year.

The AARP Scorecard data was already transformed into quartiles in AARP's publication. The AARP Scorecard data were not transformed any further, and the quartiles assigned by AARP for each state were used for analysis. Table 3 contains a list of the variables from the AARP Scorecard, the unit of measurement, and the range established within the AARP Scorecard.

Table 3

AARP State Scorecard

Variables	Unit of measurement	Range
Overall		
State scorecard score	Quartile	1-4
Dimensions included in the score:		
Affordability and access score		
Choice of setting and provider score		
Quality of life and quality of care score		
Support for family caregivers score		
Effective transitions score		

U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey

Finally, using states as the unit of analysis allowed for the State Plan and AARP Scorecard data to be analyzed with U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.) data to control for socio-economic and demographic characteristics. These characteristics were anticipated to impact the relationship between plan design and the results of each state's score on the AARP Scorecard. The intent was to control for confounding differences in the demographic characteristics and produce a more unambiguous estimate of the underlying variable (Bode, 1994), specifically the state's performance on the AARP Scorecard. Lee et al. (2018) included socio-economic and other population characteristics deemed to be

relevant to their study as control data. Similarly, the researcher included data relevant to the older adult population in each state, focusing on aspects related to increased health risk or frailty.

Further, the OAA (1965) required states to emphasize serving older individuals with the greatest economic and social needs. Economic needs can be defined as individuals living below the FPL, and social needs include living alone or with disabilities. The researcher gathered the following socio-economic and demographic data from the U.S. Census Bureau (2019), specifically relevant state-level data from the American Community Survey:

- the percent of older adults compared to the total population,
- the percent of older adults living below the FPL,
- the percent of older adults living alone, and
- the percent of older adults with one or more disabilities.

Independent and Dependent Variables

The first set of quantitative analyses answered the third research question. For the analyses, the independent variables were the decimal values for group diversity for each state. The decimal values for plan design were the dependent variables for each state. The second set of quantitative analyses answered the fourth research question. For the analyses, the decimal values for plan design were the independent variables, and each state's AARP Scorecard quartile values were the dependent variables. For this analysis, the researcher included the socio-demographic variables from the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.) as control variables. The third set of analyses answered the fifth and sixth research questions. The regions of the United States were the independent variables, and the decimal values for group diversity and plan design for each state were the dependent variables. In the final set of analyses, which answered Research Questions 7 and 8, the socio-demographic variables from the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.) were the independent variables, and the overall AARP quartiles were the dependent variables.

Summary

The goal of this chapter was to outline the research method used to answer the research questions. The discussion of the procedures, variables, data collection, and

analyses outlines the methods of the study. A mixed-method methodology was used to answer research questions designed to explore strategic plan effectiveness within public sector aging services, specifically the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact.

Chapter 4 – Findings and Results

This mixed-method study explored strategic plan effectiveness within public sector aging services. The study was designed to explore the relationships between diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and strategic plan impact while leveraging and linking process/micro and practice/macro approaches to strategic planning research. Two qualitative and three quantitative research questions addressed the study's topic and purpose. The following qualitative questions guided the qualitative portion of this study:

1. How many aspects of diversified collaboration (Group Diversity) at the time of plan development are documented in each of the State Plans on Aging?

2. How many of Bryson and Alston's (2011) indicators of robust strategic plan design are included in each of the State Plans on Aging? (For more information, see the Definition of Terms in Chapter One – Introduction or the section below on Strategic Plan Design).

The following quantitative questions guided the quantitative portion of this study:

3. What is the degree of relationship between diversified collaboration and strategic plan design?

4. What is the degree of relationship between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes [as indicated on the AARP Scorecard score]?

5. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon plan design?

6. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon group diversity?

7. Was there a statistically significant effect for region of the United States for percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities by lower quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

8. Was there a statistically significant effect of difference in percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities between the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

Content analysis was used to conduct the qualitative strand of the study, and descriptive, inferential, and associative statistical techniques were used in the analysis of data for the

quantitative strand. This chapter contains the formal reporting of findings and results from both strands.

Qualitative Findings

The study evaluated the State Plans on Aging in all 50 states. The researcher found the State Plans within the relevant period on the websites of 34 SUAs. For 16 states, an updated plan outside of the relevant period had been posted on the website. The researcher called or emailed the public information contact for the remaining 16 states, requesting the previous State Plan. As a result, the researcher received 14 of the 16 remaining State Plans. The researcher could not locate State Plans or successfully contact two states: Minnesota and Mississippi; thus, both states were dropped.

During the review, the first pass was used to locate and code information related to group diversity. During this round of review, 41 State Plans contained sufficient information about the stakeholders engaged during the plan's development. Seven states' State Plans did not meet the criteria for review and were dropped from the study: Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Texas, and West Virginia. These states either did not document the stakeholders involved during planning, or the descriptions of these groups were too generic to count. For example, in New Jersey, the State Plan stated that a planning meeting of 90 stakeholders was held, along with public listening sessions. However, a list of attendees or organizations involved was not included. In North Dakota, stakeholder meetings were held at 20 different sites, 12 public hearings with 438 attendees, and 1,802 comments from individuals reviewing the plan online. However, there was no breakdown of the people who attended the meetings or provided the online comments. Because there was insufficient detail about the planning groups' diversity, these seven State Plans were not reviewed further for plan design.

State Highlights

As expected of the states that were reviewed, there were variations in the types of content presented and in the way it was presented. The Alaska State Plan was the only state to include all nine organization types in group diversity, and in many categories, Alaska had more than one representative. Three states—California, Georgia, and

Vermont—had all 12 plan design components. All states had at least some elements of group diversity and plan design, and most states had several. Nebraska and Wyoming had the least amount of group diversity (as operationalized in this study) within the stakeholders that contributed to the plan's development, with each state only having three categories of stakeholders represented. Iowa and Nebraska had six components for plan design, and Wisconsin had five, making these three states the lowest ranking states for plan design.

Group Diversity

A review of the types of stakeholders engaged during plan development showed that representatives of nonprofits and the public were the most engaged groups, with only Wyoming not documenting nonprofit collaborators and Florida not noting public comments. The next most popular groups were SUA internal staff/managers and health care providers, with 33 states documenting direct participation by these groups. Additionally, although only 33 states credited the efforts of their internal staff, it is assumed that all states utilized internal employees during the plan's development. The least represented category of stakeholders was the federal level of government, with only eight states engaging a public organization or representative at the federal level. Private organizations and academic institutions were the next two stakeholder categories that were the least represented in the development of State Plans, with 10 states engaging private businesses or private-sector advocacy organizations and12 states noting institutions of higher education as planning partners. Table 4 provides a summary of the highlights described in this section. Appendix B – Content Analysis Findings: Group Diversity includes a full list of the number of aspects of diversified collaboration (group diversity) at the time of plan development for each state.

Table 4

Highlights from Group Diversity

Variable element	Category	Number of states
Private Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector	10
Nonprofit Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector	40
Academic Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector	12
Health Care Sector Organization(s)	Cross-sector	33
Local Public Agency	Intergovernmental	31
Other State Agency	Intergovernmental	30
Federal/National Public Agency	Intergovernmental	8
Internal Managers/Staff	Internal	33
Public Involvement/Input	External	40

Plan Design

A review of the plan design components also uncovered a range of findings. Though none of the categories of stakeholders were included in all reviewed plans, one component of plan design was included in all reviewed plans: Identified partner organizations. The presence of this component in all plans likely showed the overall model of the aging network comprised of many organizations working together. Almost all states included goals (39 states), objectives (40 states), strategies (37 states), and outcomes (39 states). The high frequency of these components was likely due to the federal requirements for the State Plans as provided in the instructions from Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a). Although mission statements were frequently included (36 plans), values were the least frequently included component (12 plans). The next least frequently included component was identified resources (19 plans). Since the State Plans are a requirement to receive federal funding, perhaps the states intended to use the OAA funds to implement the plan. Table 5 provides a summary of the highlights described in this section. Appendix C – Content Analysis Findings: Plan Design includes the full data set for the number of indicators of robust strategic plan design by each state.

Table 5

Highlights from Strategic Plan Design

Variable element	Number of states
Vision statement	28
Mission statement	36
Values or a values statement	12
Issue identification	37
Goal statement(s)	39
Measurable objectives	40
Actionable strategies	37
Organizations responsible for implementation	20
Partner organizations	41
Identified available resources	19
Specified timeline	25
Intended outcomes	39

Quantitative Results

Descriptive Statistics: Study Demography

Descriptive statistical techniques were used to assess the study's demographic-identifying information. The study's demographic information was specifically addressed using descriptive statistical techniques (frequencies and percentages). Table 6 contains a summary of findings for the descriptive statistical analysis of the study's demographic identifying information for the variable of the region of the United States.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics Summary Table: Study Representation by Region of the United States

Variable	*n*	*%*	Cumulative *%*
Region			
Northeast	9	21.95	21.95
Southeast	10	24.39	46.34
Midwest	10	24.39	70.73
West	12	29.27	100.00
Missing	0	0.00	100.00

Descriptive Statistics: Preliminary Findings

Descriptive statistical techniques were used to assess the study's data set. The study's data set were addressed using frequencies (*n*), measures of central tendency (mean scores), variability (minimum/maximum; standard deviations), standard errors of the mean (SE_M), and data normality (skew; kurtosis). Table 7 contains a summary of findings for the descriptive statistical analysis of the study's data by weighting and scaling for group diversity and plan design.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics Summary Table: Group Diversity & Plan Design

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*	SE_M	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Diversity Weight	2.89	0.75	41	0.12	1.50	4.50	0.11	-0.82
Diversity Scale	3.15	0.79	41	0.12	2.00	5.00	0.04	-0.77
Plan Design Weight	4.55	0.83	41	0.13	2.50	6.00	-0.32	-0.15
Plan Design Scale	4.27	0.90	41	0.14	2.00	6.00	-0.13	-0.09

Table 8 contains a summary of findings for the descriptive statistical analysis of the study's data for the overall AARP Scorecard score and dimension of the AARP Scorecard score.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics Summary Table: AARP Score Card Categories and Total Score

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*SE_M*	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Affordability/Access	2.49	1.10	41	0.17	1.00	4.00	-0.03	-1.28
Setting Provider Choice	2.46	1.19	41	0.19	1.00	4.00	0.13	-1.46
QOL/QOC	2.56	1.12	41	0.17	1.00	4.00	-0.05	-1.33
Family Caregiver Support	2.41	1.09	41	0.17	1.00	4.00	0.05	-1.28
Transition Efficacy	2.63	1.11	41	0.17	1.00	4.00	-0.12	-1.31
AARP Total	2.51	1.14	41	0.18	1.00	4.00	0.02	-1.39

Table 9 contains a summary of findings for the descriptive statistical analysis of the study's data for percentages (converted to decimal) of older adults, older adults living below the poverty level, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics Summary Table: Essential Demographic Identifier Variables by Percentage (Converted to Decimal)

Variable by percentage	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*SE_M*	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Older Adults	0.16	0.02	41	0.003	0.11	0.20	-0.45	1.15
Older Adults Below FPL	0.09	0.01	41	0.002	0.06	0.13	0.70	1.25
Older Adults Living Alone	0.27	0.03	41	0.004	0.20	0.31	-0.84	0.32
Older Adults Disabled	0.35	0.03	41	0.005	0.30	0.42	0.84	0.12

Table 10 contains a summary of findings for the descriptive statistical analysis of the study's data for percentages (converted to decimal) of older adults, older adults living below the poverty level, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities by region of the United States.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics Summary Table: Essential Demographic Identifier Variables by Percentage (Converted to Decimal) and Region

Region/Identifier	M	SD	n	SE_M	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Northeast								
Percent Older Adults	0.17	0.02	9	0.005	0.15	0.20	0.008	-0.95
Percent Below FPL	0.08	0.02	9	0.006	0.06	0.12	1.05	0.78
Percent Living Alone	0.28	0.02	9	0.007	0.24	0.31	-0.64	-0.21
Percent Disabilities	0.32	0.01	9	0.005	0.30	0.34	0.52	-0.79
Southeast								
Percent Older Adults	0.16	0.02	10	0.005	0.14	0.20	0.94	0.82
Percent Below FPL	0.10	0.01	10	0.004	0.08	0.13	1.01	0.81
Percent Living Alone	0.27	0.02	10	0.005	0.24	0.29	-0.37	-0.56
Percent Disabilities	0.37	0.03	10	0.010	0.33	0.42	0.06	-1.31
Midwest								
Percent Older Adults	0.16	0.010	10	0.003	0.15	0.17	-0.20	-1.85
Percent Below FPL	0.08	0.006	10	0.002	0.07	0.09	-0.11	-0.44
Percent Living Alone	0.30	0.006	10	0.002	0.29	0.31	0.11	-0.44
Percent Disabilities	0.34	0.02	10	0.007	0.31	0.37	0.19	-1.20
West								
Percent Older Adults	0.15	0.02	12	0.006	0.11	0.18	-0.56	-0.40
Percent Below FPL	0.08	0.01	12	0.004	0.06	0.10	-0.46	-0.68
Percent Living Alone	0.25	0.03	12	0.007	0.20	0.28	-0.61	-0.57
Percent Disabilities	0.35	0.03	12	0.008	0.32	0.42	1.39	1.53

Findings by Research Question

The study's research questions were addressed using descriptive, inferential, and associative/predictive statistical techniques. The probability level of $p \le .05$ was adopted as the threshold value for findings to be considered statistically significant. Magnitudes of effect were interpreted using the conventions of effect size interpretations offered by Sawilowsky (2009). The following sections represent the formal reporting of finding by research question stated in the study.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 was the following: What is the degree of relationship between diversified collaboration and strategic plan design? The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (*r*) was used to assess the mathematical relationship between the variable of group diversity and plan design. The assumption of linearity was addressed and satisfied through visual inspection of the scatter plot for the analysis.

The mathematical relationship between group diversity and plan design was not statistically significant at $p < .05$. However, it was statistically significant at the $p < .10$ level ($r = .28$ [-.03, .45]; $p = .08$). Table 11 contains a summary of findings for the correlational analysis featuring the variables of group diversity and plan design.

Table 11

Correlation Summary Table: Association Between Diversity and Plan Design

Combination	*r*	95.00% CI	*n*	*p*
Diversity: Plan Design	.28	[-.03, .45]	41	.08[t]

[t]$p < .10$

Follow-Up Regression Analysis. The simple linear regression statistical technique was used to evaluate the viability of group diversity in predicting subsequent plan design. The assumptions of linear regression were addressed and satisfied through statistical means (independence of error, normality of residuals, and influential outliers) and visual inspection of scatter plots (linearity; homoscedasticity). The predictive model was statistically significant at the $p < .10$ level, $F(1,39) = 3.29$, $p = .08$, $R^2 = .08$, indicating group diversity explained approximately 8% of the variation of data in plan design. Table 12 contains a summary of findings for the predictive model using the variables of group diversity and plan design:

Table 12

Regression Summary Table: Group Diversity Predicting Plan Design

Model	*B*	*SE*	95.00% CI	β	*t*	*p*
(Intercept)	0.61	0.08	[0.44, 0.78]	0.00	7.27	< .001
Group Diversity	0.23	0.13	[-0.03, 0.49]	0.28	1.82	.08[t]

[t]$p < .10$

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 was the following: What is the degree of relationship between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes [as indicated on the AARP Scorecard score]? The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (*r*) was used to assess the mathematical relationship between the variable of plan design and the AARP Scorecard score. The assumption of linearity was addressed and satisfied through visual inspection of the scatter plot for the analysis. The mathematical relationship between plan design and AARP Scorecard score was non-statistically significant (*r* = .18 [-.14, .46]; *p* = .260. Table 13 contains a summary of findings for the correlational analysis featuring the variables of plan design and AARP Scorecard score.

Table 13

Correlation Summary Table: Association Between Plan Design and AARP Scorecard Score

Variables	*r*	95.00% CI	*n*	*p*
AARP Score-Plan Design	.18	[-.14, .46]	41	.26

Follow-Up Regression Analysis. The simple linear regression statistical technique was used to evaluate the viability of the plan design in predicting subsequent AARP Scorecard scores. The assumptions of linear regression were addressed and satisfied through statistical means (independence of error, normality of residuals, and influential outliers) and visual inspection of scatter plots (linearity; homoscedasticity). The predictive model was non-statistically significant, $F(1,39) = 1.31$, $p = .26$, $R^2 = .03$, with plan design explaining 3% of the variation of data in the AARP Scorecard score. Table 14 contains a summary of findings for the predictive model using the variables of plan design and AARP Scorecard score.

Table 14

Regression Summary Table: Plan Design Predicting AARP Scorecard Score

Model	*B*	*SE*	95.00% CI	β	*t*	*p*
(Intercept)	1.53	0.88	[-0.24, 3.30]	0.00	1.75	.089
Plan Design	0.23	0.20	[-0.18, 0.64]	0.18	1.14	.260

Follow-Up Analyses: Stepwise Regression With Demographic Variables.
Stepwise multiple linear regression modeling was used to evaluate the degree of
explained variance in the dependent variable of the AARP Scorecard that might be
increased with the addition of demographic-identifying variables to the independent
variable of plan design in the predictive modeling process. Stepwise models that included
the independent demographic variables of a percentage of older adults and the percentage
of older adults living alone reflected non-statistically significant degrees of increased
explained variance (r^2) in the dependent variable of the AARP Scorecard. Two
independent demographic variables did exert statistically significant increases in the
explained variance of the dependent variables of the AARP Scorecard: percentage of
older adults living below the FPL and percentage of adults with one or more disabilities.

Percentage of Adults Living Below Federal Poverty Level. A stepwise, non-
interaction predictive modeling technique using MLR was conducted to determine the
degree of increase in explained variance (r^2) that might be reflected in the modeling
process when the demographic variable of a percentage of older adults living below the
FPL was added in a stepwise fashion to the independent variable of plan design. As a
result, the addition of the demographic variable of a percentage of older adults living
below the FPL was statistically significant in adding 11% ($r^2 = .11$) to the predictive
model, $F(1, 38) = 4.88; p = .03$. The addition of the demographic variable of a percentage
of older adults living below the FPL to the independent variable of plan design increased
the degree of explained variance for the dependent variables of AARP Scorecard in the
overall predictive model from 3.2% to 14.3%. Table 15 summarizes the finding for the
simple effects and non-interaction predictive model featured in the follow-up analysis for
the demographic variable of a percentage of older adults living below the FPL.

Table 15

Stepwise MLR Table: AARP Scorecard Predicted by Plan Design and by Percentage of Older Adults Living Below the FPL

Predictor	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*
Step 1: Simple Effects Model					
(Intercept)	1.53	0.88		1.75	.09
Plan Design	0.23	0.20	0.18	1.14	.26
Step 2: Non-Interaction Model					
(Intercept)	3.57	1.24		2.87	.007
Plan Design	0.28	0.19	0.22	1.47	.15
Older Adults Living Below FPL	-26.39	11.95	-0.33	-2.21	.03*

*$p \le .05$

Percentage of Adults With One or More Disabilities

A stepwise, non-interaction predictive modeling technique using MLR was conducted to determine the degree of increase in explained variance (r^2) that might be reflected in the modeling process when the demographic variable of a percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities was added in a stepwise fashion to the independent variable of plan design. As a result, the addition of the demographic variable of percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities was statistically significant in adding 39.6% ($r^2 = .396$) to the predictive model, $F(1, 38) = 26.24$; $p < .001$. Adding the demographic variable of a percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities to the independent variable of the plan design increased the degree of explained variance for the dependent variable of the AARP Scorecard in the overall predictive model from 3.2% to 42.9%. Table 16 contains a summary of finding for the simple effects and non-interaction predictive model featured in the follow-up analysis for the demographic variable of a percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities.

Table 16

Stepwise MLR Table: AARP Scorecard Predicted by Plan Design and by Percentage of Older Adults Living Below the FPL

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Step 1: Simple Effects Model					
(Intercept)	1.53	0.88		1.75	.09
Plan Design	0.23	0.20	0.18	1.14	.26
Step 2: Non-Interaction Model					
(Intercept)	9.54	1.70		5.60	< .001
Plan Design	0.29	0.16	0.23	1.84	.074
Older Adults: 1 or More Disabilities	-23.90	4.66	-0.63	-5.13	< .001

Research Question 5

Research Question 3 was the following: Was there an effect for region of the United States upon Plan Design? An analysis of variance (1 x 4 ANOVA) was conducted to assess the degree to which statistically significant differences existed in plan design by region of the United States. The assumptions of ANOVA, normality of data distribution and homogeneity of variances, were addressed and satisfied by statistical means.

The effect of the region of the United States upon plan design was non-statistically significant, $F(3, 37) = 1.33$, $p = .28$, indicating the differences in plan design among the levels of the region of the United States were all similar (Table 17). The effect of the region of the United States upon plan design was considered between medium and large ($n_p^2 = .10$). Table 18 shows the means and standard deviations of the omnibus 1 x 4 ANOVA analysis.

Table 17

Summary Table: Effect of Region of the United States for Plan Design

Model	SS	df	F	p	η_p2
Region	3.13	3	1.33	.28	0.10
Residuals	28.92	37			

Table 18

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Plan Design by Region of the United States

Region	M	SD	n
Northeast	4.44	0.73	9
Southeast	4.30	0.82	10
Midwest	3.80	1.14	10
West	4.50	0.80	12

Research Question 6

Research Question 6 was the following: Was there an effect for region of the United States upon Group Diversity? An analysis of variance (1 x 4 ANOVA) was conducted to assess the degree to which statistically significant differences existed in group diversity by region of the United States. The assumptions of ANOVA, normality of data distribution and homogeneity of variances, were addressed and satisfied by statistical means.

The effect of the region of the United States upon group diversity was non-statistically significant, $F(3, 37) = 1.26$, $p = .30$, indicating the differences in group diversity among the levels of the region of the United States were all similar (Table 19). The effect of the U.S. region upon Group Diversity was considered between medium and large at ($n_p^2 = .09$). Table 20 shows the means and standard deviations of the omnibus 1 x 4 ANOVA analysis.

Table 19

Summary Table: Effect of Region of the United States for Diversity of Plan Design

Model	SS	df	F	p	η_p2
Region	2.33	3	1.26	.30	0.09
Residuals	22.79	37			

Table 20

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Diversity of Plan Design by Region of the United States

Region	M	SD	n
Northeast	2.89	0.60	9
Southeast	3.00	0.82	10
Midwest	3.10	0.88	10
West	3.50	0.80	12

Research Question 7

Research Question 7 was the following: Was there a statistically significant effect for region of the United States for percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities by lower quartiles of the AARP Scorecard? A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to assess the degree to which there were significant differences in the linear combination of percentages of older adults, older adults living below the FPL, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities between the levels of the region of the United States for the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard.

The main effect for the region of the United States was statistically significant, $F(12, 48) = 3.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = 0.49$, indicating that the linear combination of percentages of older adults, older adults living below the FPL, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities was significantly different among the levels of the region of the United States for the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard. Table 21 contains a summary of findings for the effect of region of the United States upon demographic variables associated with older adults for the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard.

Table 21

MANOVA Summary Table: Effect of Region of the United States Upon Demographic Variables Associated With Older Adults for the Bottom Quartiles of AARP Scorecard

Variable	Pillai	F	df	Residual df	p	η_p2
Region	1.48	3.87	12	48	< .001	0.49

Follow-Up Post Hoc Analyses. ANOVA statistical techniques were used in a post hoc follow-up to the statistically significant MANOVA finding in Research Question 5. Non-statistically significant effects were observed for the variables of older adult percentage, $F(3, 17) = 2.51$, $p = .09$, and percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities, $F(3, 17) = 2.40$, $p = .10$. Statistically significant effects were observed for the percentage of older adults living below the FPL, $F(3, 17) = 6.87$, $p = .003$, and percentage of older adults living alone, $F(3, 17) = 5.40$, $p = .009$.

Older Adults Living Below Federal Poverty Level. Table 22 contains the finding of the follow-up ANOVA conducted to determine the effect of the region of the United States on the percentage of older adults living below the FPL for the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard.

Table 22

ANOVA Summary Table: Effect Region of the United States Upon Percentage of Older Adults Living Below the Federal Poverty Level for the Bottom Quartiles of the AARP Scorecard

Model	SS	df	F	p	η_p2
Region	0.003	3	6.87	.003**	0.55
Residuals	0.002	17			

**$p < .01$

Table 23 contains the means and standard deviations for the follow-up ANOVA analysis.

Table 23

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Percentage of Older Adults Living Below Federal Poverty Level by Region and for the Bottom Quartiles of AARP Scorecard.

Combination	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Northeast	0.06	-	1
Southeast	0.10	0.01	9
Midwest	0.08	0.008	6
West	0.08	0.01	5

Older Adults Living Alone. Table 24 contains the finding of the follow-up ANOVA conducted to determine the effect of the region of the United States on the percentage of older adults living alone for the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard.

Table 24

ANOVA Summary Table: Effect Region of the United States Upon Percentage of Older Adults Living Alone for the Bottom Quartiles of the AARP Scorecard

Model	*SS*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p2
Region	0.005	3	5.40	.009	0.49
Residuals	0.005	17			

***p* < .01

Table 25 contains the means and standard deviations for the follow-up ANOVA analysis.

Table 25

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for Percentage of Older Adults Living Alone by Region and for the Bottom Quartiles of AARP Scorecard.

Region	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Northeast	0.26	-	1
Southeast	0.27	0.02	9
Midwest	0.29	0.005	6
West	0.26	0.03	5

Research Question 8

Research Question 8 was the following: Was there a statistically significant effect of difference in percentages of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities between the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard? A MANOVA was conducted to assess if there were significant differences in the linear combination of percentages of older adults, older adults living below the FPL, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities between the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard. As a result, the main effect was statistically significant, $F(4, 36) = 2.69$, $p = .046$, $\eta^2 p = 0.23$, indicating that the linear combination of percentages of older adults, older adults living below the FPL, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities were significantly different between the levels of AARP Scorecard Quartiles. Table 26 presents the MANOVA results.

Table 26

MANOVA Summary Table: Effect for Quartiles of AARP Scorecard for Demographic Variables Associated with Older Adults

Variable	Pillai	*F*	*df*	Residual df	*p*	$\eta_p 2$
AARP (Binary Quartiles)	0.23	2.69	4	36	.046*	0.23

*p < .05

Follow-Up Post Hoc Analyses. ANOVA statistical techniques were used in a post hoc follow-up to the statistically significant MANOVA finding in research question six. Non-statistically significant effects were observed for the variables of older adult percentage, $F(1, 39) = 0.17$, $p = .68$, percentage of older adults living alone, $F(1, 39) = 0.01$, $p = .92$, and older adults living below the FPL, $F(1, 39) = 2.15$, $p = .15$. A statistically significant effect was observed for the percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities, $F(1, 39) = 11.58$, $p = .002$.

Older Adults With One or More Disabilities. Table 27 contains the finding of the follow-up ANOVA conducted to determine the effect of AARP Scorecard Quartiles on the percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities.

Table 27

ANOVA Summary Table: Effect of AARP Scorecard upon Variables Associated with Older Adults

Term	SS	df	F	p	η_p^2
AARP (Binary Quartiles)	0.008	1	11.58	.002**	0.23
Residuals	0.03	39			

**p < .01*

Table 28 contains the means and standard deviations for the follow-up ANOVA analysis.

Table 28

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Sample Size for the Percentage of Older Adults With One or More Disabilities by AARP Scorecard Quartiles

Quartiles	M	SD	n
Bottom Quartiles	0.36	0.03	21
Top Quartiles	0.33	0.02	20

Summary

Chapter 4 – Findings and Results contained a report of the findings and results achieved in the study. The qualitative findings suggest there is variability in how SUAs develop and design State Plans, but also that aspects of group diversity and plan design are present within the plans. The 41 states included in the study equitably represented the four regions of the United States. However, the mathematical relationship between group diversity and plan design was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, it was statistically significant at the $p < .10$ level, with a medium effect size. When controlling for specified state demographic characteristics (percentage of older adults with 1 or more disabilities and the percentage of older adults living below FPL), the plan design had a large, statistically significant effect on states' AARP Scorecard scores. A non-statistically significant effect was exerted for the region of the United States upon group diversity and plan design, but medium effect sizes were noted. Finally, large and statistically significant effects were found between the demographic characteristics of older adults

living below the FPL, the percentage of older adults living alone, and the state's placement within the AARP Scorecard quartiles. Chapter Five – Discussion contains a discussion of the findings achieved in the study.

Chapter 5 – Discussion

Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study's problem, purpose, and design, as well as a review of the findings and results by research question. A discussion on the findings and results is provided. Several limitations were noted during research and are reported in this chapter. This chapter also includes implications for practice and contributions to research from the findings and results of this study. Finally, recommendations are made for further research.

Strategic planning is one of the most widely used management tools in contemporary organizations (Bryson et al., 2018; B. George et al., 2019; Rigby & Bilodeau, 2018; Whittington, 2006; Wolf & Floyd, 2017). Public sector organizations often plan strategically to increase efficiency and effectiveness (Bryson et al., 2018). Within the last 10 years, strategic planning in the public sector has expanded with an enhanced focus on addressing broad social issues (Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). As public problems have become more complex, the need to understand how to best conduct strategic planning to solve these problems has become critical (Bryson et al., 2010). The older adult population (age 65 and over) in the United States has steadily grown since 2009, and growth is projected to continue (Administration on Aging, 2021). As the population of older adults continues to increase and live longer, the need for accessible and extended aging services also increases. Effective strategic planning in aging services is needed to help improve agency outcomes and enable agencies to meet the needs of the current and future population of older adults (Cameron, 2008; Campbell et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Feng, 2019; Hyer et al., 2019; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021).

Previous research has characterized strategic planning from either a process/micro-based or practice/macro-based perspective. Although strategic planning in the public sector is considered a beneficial activity (Boyne, 2001; Bryson, 2010a; Johnsen, 2018; Lee et al., 2018; Walker & Andrews, 2015), there is insufficient strategic planning research within the public sector, especially research that connects process-based and microlevel research with practice-based and macro-level research to understand better how, when, and why strategic planning works (Balogun et al., 2003; Bryson, 2010a; Bryson et al., 2009, 2018; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Carter, 2013;

Elbasha & Wright, 2017; B. George et al., 2019; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Seidl & Whittington, 2014; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010; Whittington, 2011). This study answered the literature gap by leveraging process/micro-based and practice/macro-based approaches. This study also sought to identify potential improvements in how public sector strategic planning is conducted and documented to contribute positively to solving a broad social problem.

A mixed-methods research paradigm was used to answer the study's research questions. Two qualitative and six quantitative research questions were stated to guide the study. The following qualitative questions guided the qualitative portion of this study:

1. How many aspects of diversified collaboration (Group Diversity) at the time of plan development are documented in each of the State Plans on Aging?

2. How many of Bryson and Alston's (2011) indicators of robust strategic plan design are included in each of the State Plans on Aging? (For more information, see the Definition of Terms in Chapter One – Introduction or the section below on Strategic Plan Design).

The results of the qualitative strand of the study were used in the quantitative strand of the study. The following quantitative questions guided the quantitative portion of this study:

3. What is the degree of relationship between diversified collaboration and strategic plan design?

4. What is the degree of relationship between strategic plan design and strategic planning outcomes [as indicated on the AARP Scorecard score]?

5. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon plan design?

6. Was there an effect for region of the United States upon group diversity?

7. Was there a statistically significant effect for region of the United States for percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and older adults with one or more disabilities by lower quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

8. Was there a statistically significant effect of difference in percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the poverty level, and

older adults with one or more disabilities between the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard?

In addition to using process/micro and practice/macro approaches to strategic planning research as the primary theoretical frameworks for this study, the researcher also used other concepts from literature to serve as a theoretical foundation and conceptual framework. The research of Lee et al. (2018) was used as a guide for the analytical design of this study. Group diversity was comprised of research-based elements related to participation and representation during the development of the strategic plan derived from different categories of stakeholders found in literature, including cross-sector (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018), intergovernmental (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018), and internal and external collaborators (Fernandes et al., 2021; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003). The researcher also operationalized the concept of robust strategic plan design using Bryson and Alston's (2011) ideal strategic plan components, generally accepted as critical components of a robust strategic plan. Other supporting theories such as planned emergence (Grant, 2003), actor-network theory (Bryson et al., 2009), and collaborative public management (McGuire, 2006) were used to guide the study as well.

The researcher used content analysis to gather information about group diversity and plan design from State Plans on Aging. State Plans are publicly available strategic plans periodically produced by the designated governmental entity in each state. The governmental entities are known as SUAs. The State Plans are intended to describe how the state will meet the needs of older adults in that state, integrate health and social services delivery systems, and build capacity for long-term care (Administration for Community Living, 2019). This study focused on State Plans with effective (beginning) dates ranging from the federal fiscal year 2014 to 2018 and with plan end dates no later than 2021. The sample size included 41 states spread evenly across regional areas of the United States. The 2020 edition of the AARP's LTSS State Scorecard was used to measure state performance in LTSS for the 41 states included in the study. The AARP Scorecard presented rankings and information by states (Reinhard et al., 2020). It was designed to capture information across LTSS categories to measure state-level "system

performance from the viewpoint of users of services and their families" (AARP, n.d., "What is the Scorecard" section). Finally, U.S. Census Bureau's (n.d.) American Community Survey data were used to control for socio-economic and demographic characteristics. These characteristics were anticipated to impact the relationship between plan design and the results of each state's score on the AARP Scorecard. The data selected were deemed relevant to the older adult population in each state, focusing on aspects related to increased health risk or frailty. The data were added to control for population characteristics which may increase the need for LTSS or the complexity states may face in successfully providing LTSS.

Quantitative research questions were addressed using descriptive, inferential, and associative/predictive statistical techniques. Research Questions 3 and 4 used the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) to analyze the relationship between diversified collaboration (group diversity), strategic plan design, and strategic planning outcomes, as measured using the AARP Scorecard. In Research Questions 5 and 6, an ANOVA was conducted to assess the degree to which statistically significant differences existed in group diversity and plan design by region of the United States. In Research Questions 7 and 8, a MANOVA was conducted to assess the degree to which there were significant differences in the linear combination of socio-economic and demographic characteristics for the state scores in the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard and between state scores in the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard. The following section discusses the data analysis results by the research question, focusing on the quantitative research questions.

Discussion by Research Question

This section discusses the major findings of the research question. The section integrates study findings and results with existing literature to inform researchers and practitioners better.

Diversified Collaboration (Group Diversity) at State Plan Development

According to Bryson et al. (2009), the social elements of strategic planning, such as stakeholder groupings; existing and new networks; coalitions; and participant relations, must be explained and cannot be assumed. Getting the right actors involved and

engaging these actors in the right way are critical to creating the kind of planned change needed to address public issues (Ackermann et al., 2005; Bryson, 2004; Bryson et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2003; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Van der Heijden, 2005). This study used collaborative public management as a theoretical foundation to assume that the SUAs handled bringing together and leading the diversified collaboration during plan development. Diversified collaboration (group diversity) comprised research-based elements related to participation and representation by nine different types of stakeholders while developing the strategic plan. The stakeholder types were derived from three distinct categories of stakeholder groups found in research: cross-sector groups (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018), intergovernmental organizations (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018), and internal and external collaborators (Fernandes et al., 2021; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003).

Cross-Sector Groups. Bryson et al. (2009) defined cross-sector collaboration as "the linking or sharing of information, resources, activities, and capabilities by organizations in one or more sectors to achieve jointly an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately" (p. 44). Moving beyond the isolation of a single sector (e.g., the public sector) to a cross-sector approach leads to improvements in planning outcomes (Eriksson et al., 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002). This study explored four sectors that may be documented as working with the public sector state agency. These four sectors comprised the cross-sector groups included in the concept of group diversity for this study and are as follows: private sector, nonprofit sector, academic sector, and health care sector.

The results of the review show that representatives of nonprofits were one of the most engaged groups, and one of the next most popular groups was the health care sector. OAA funds are administered through SUAs and the nonprofit Aging Network, built on an extensive infrastructure of over 600 AAAs and thousands of service providers (Polivka & Polivka-West, 2020). Most of the AAAs were nonprofit agencies, and AAAs are also OAA-required contractors of the SUAs, making them one of the SUA's closest partners. OAA stipulates that the State Plan must consider the Area Plans on Aging, which are the federally required regional plans of the AAAs. Local service providers (coded in this

study as a part of the health care sector) contract with AAAs, making them another important part of the aging network. Nonprofit organizations are vital partners for public sector planning activities (Bryson et al., 2009; Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018). The strong presence of the nonprofit sector in the State Plans is promising. Additionally, within the growing body of literature on the benefits of cross-sector collaboration, there are calls for more collaboration between healthcare organizations and systems, public agencies, community-based organizations, and the community in general (Grant, 2020; Persaud, 2018). Because the healthcare sector was well-represented in the states' planning processes, the Aging Network's approach to engaging the healthcare sector may be a model for other public planning efforts.

Unlike the nonprofit and health care sectors, the private and academic sectors were not well-represented in the State Plans. Private organizations and academic institutions were among the two least represented stakeholder groups during the development of State Plans. The SUAs may engage in public-private partnerships, though their private sector stakeholders were not frequently included in the planning efforts. For example, the SUAs may outsource services or work through traditional contractual agreements. More collaborative partnership arrangements have fundamental differences where the partners share more power, decision-making, and risk (Alam et al., 2014; Bryson et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2017). When public sector agencies engage with private sector organizations during planning, they may have better exposure to managerial and technical competencies needed to address challenges that arise more often in the private sector than in the public sector (Alam et al., 2014). Public sector agencies can improve their capabilities by increasing the involvement of the private sector (Fisher et al., 2017; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018).

Similarly, diverse partnerships between academic institutions and policymakers or practitioners are critical to translating research into policy and practice (Fudickar et al., 2018; Giles-Corti & Whitzman, 2012; Lee et al., 2018; Mendoza et al., 2012). The SUAs may have engaged with academic institutions in other ways, perhaps academic consulting on a specific program area of interest. However, academic representatives did not appear as popular partners during plan development. The researcher noted during the content review that the private and academic sectors were identified in the plans as important

implementation partners; however, by not engaging the private and academic sectors more intently during plan development, the Aging Network may be missing opportunities to gain efficiencies, capabilities, and insights from emerging research.

Intergovernmental Organizations. The public sector is defined by the government's different levels that coordinate and delivers public goods and services (Fraser & Kick, 2007). Intergovernmental collaboration includes cooperative interactions between governmental agencies. The collaborations may be horizontal within policy areas or vertical in the different levels of government. The horizontal and vertical structural relations among government agencies create macrosocial sources of social order (Barzelay & Jacobsen, 2009). Diverse public planning groups should have all three planes of the federal system (federal, state, and local) represented to expand their geographic base (Grant, 2020; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2018; McGuire, 2006). Diverse planning groups also require representation from various policy areas and levels of government (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018; McGuire, 2006). Since state agencies are the lead entities in this study, horizontal intergovernmental collaborations were defined as collaborations occurring with other state agencies—either in the same state or another state—that work in a policy area other than aging services. Vertical intergovernmental collaborations were defined as collaborations with local or federal public agencies.

Most states appeared to have engaged with local public agencies and other state agencies. As a general trend, local agencies are increasingly represented in state-level strategic plans (Fisher et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2018). Local agencies are often at the forefront of service delivery, and their staff has important street-level interactions with constituents (Clary, 2021; Lavee et al., 2018; Walker & Andrews, 2015). These agencies create a broader sense of community connectedness and can better articulate local needs and quality of life issues (Boyd & Peters, 2009; Fernandes et al., 2021). AAAs contract with local service providers and frequently work with senior centers and local aging councils. Because these organizations are important parts of the Aging Network's infrastructure, it is unsurprising that they were well-represented in the State Plans.

Additionally, it was not surprising that most SUAs included other state agencies in their planning efforts. Nearly all governmental agencies collaborate with other

agencies in different policy areas (Bryson et al., 2015; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Fisher et al., 2017; Forrer et al., 2014; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Tama, 2018). During the content analysis, the researcher noted that many other state agencies were still within the health and human services field, including state departments of health, adult protective services, or agencies serving persons with disabilities. The least represented category of stakeholders was the federal level of government, with only eight states engaging a public organization or representative at the federal level. Researchers have previously noted that it may be challenging for state agencies to involve federal representatives in planning activities (Fisher et al., 2017). Still, federal agencies can drive innovations within all levels of government, and this role is especially relevant to government services for older adults (Bryson et al., 2018; J. Harris, 1993; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013; Tama, 2015), and a lack of representation by this section of government may indicate an opportunity for SUAs to improve their planning efforts and outcomes.

Internal and External Collaborators. Researchers have established that strategic planning must encompass a plurality of actors and consider the capacities, perspectives, and involvement of both internal and external stakeholders (Bryson, 2010b; Fernandes et al., 2021; B. George et al., 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; O'Shannassy, 2003; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Diversified collaboration moves organizations to consult extensively with internal and external stakeholders, which can positively affect the content of a strategic plan and improve overall accountability, transparency, and quality (Fernandes et al., 2021; Tama, 2018). Like the multiple levels of government, there are also often horizontal and vertical levels within most organizations (Elbasha & Wright, 2017; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Internal actors are individuals inside their organizations and have a defined place within the organizational hierarchy (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009). Ideally, the strategic planning process would involve all levels of management and frontline operations within organizations (B. George et al., 2016; Johnsen, 2018; Saleh et al., 2013).

There is strong theoretical support and empirical evidence for the positive relationship between broad internal participation in strategic planning and important outcomes such as strategic decision quality and organizational performance (De Baerdemaeker & Bruggeman, 2015; Elbanna, 2008; B. George et al., 2016). Although

only 33 states credited the efforts of their internal staff, it is assumed that all states utilized internal employees during the plan's development. Intentionally listing the names of the internal individuals who participated in the development of the State Plan indicated that these states recognized the efforts and input of their internal stakeholders.

In addition to involving internal stakeholders, researchers have found that strategic planning is more effective when external stakeholders are involved in the plan development and that they are more likely to support its implementation if they have a voice in the process (Bryson, 2010b; Burby, 2003; Fernandes et al., 2021; Fernández & Rainey, 2006; Moynihan & Hawes, 2012; Poister & Streib, 2005; Poister & Van Slyke, 2002; Tama, 2018; Yang & Hsieh, 2007). External actors do not have an allocated hierarchy, line, or role within an organization's structure (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009). The review results showed that public representatives were among the most engaged groups. OAA requires states and AAAs to submit their State and Area Plans for public comment. Successfully including public stakeholders in public-sector strategic planning helps to reduce public cynicism about government and decrease conflict as public stakeholders have a feeling of ownership (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Fernandes et al., 2021), though engagement and involvement of public stakeholders can range in intensity (Bovaird et al., 2017; Bryson, 2004; Fernandes et al., 2021). Different methods and ranges of public involvement were noted in the State Plans. However, public comment in the planning process illustrates that, as a field, public sector aging services operate within known best practices for this area.

Elements of Robust Strategic Plan Design in State Plans

The artifacts produced during strategic planning are important components of process-based and microlevel research approaches (Bryson et al., 2009, 2018; Bryson & Edwards, 2017). Strategic planning artifacts are physical tools, representations, or materials used during the planning process (e.g., displays, presentations, flipcharts, photographs) and documents or parts of documents that are the outputs of planning activities (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Vaara & Whittington, 2012; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). The visual and textual outputs of planning activities can include the strategic plan in its entirety or its parts, such as mission statements, vision statements, context, goals, strategies, and performance measures. When integrated, the individual

artifacts within the plan become components of a strategic plan's overall design and composition (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Giraudeau, 2008). Linkages between material artifacts, including how they are written and read by strategic planning actors, and a range of planning outcomes suggest that it is crucial to achieving the right strategy content (Ackermann et al., 2005; R. Andrews et al., 2006; Bryson, 2004; Bryson et al., 2009; Giraudeau, 2008; Johnson et al., 2003; Van der Heijden, 2005).

Organizations that demonstrate comprehensive use of strategic planning artifacts are more likely to improve perceived or actual performance (Elbanna, 2012; Johnsen, 2018). This study employed an index to examine the comprehensiveness of the strategic plans under investigation based on the components included in the plan (plan design). The researcher chose to use Bryson and Alston's (2011) 12 strategic plan components as the framework for the design. The presence of these 12 components is commonly accepted as constituting an effective and robustly designed strategic plan. A review of the plan design components also uncovered a range of findings. The following paragraphs discuss the findings, with elements of plan design grouped for the discussion.

Identified Partner Organizations and Organizations Responsible for Implementation. Identified partner organizations were the one component of plan design included in all the reviewed State Plans. Identified partner organizations were stakeholders, meaning "any person, group, or entity that can place a claim on the organization's attention, resources, or output, or that is affected by that output" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170). Identified partner organizations might or might not have been involved or had a role in the strategic planning or implementation process but were named in the plan as partners. This finding likely speaks to the overall model of the Aging Network, which is comprised of many organizations working together, as previously mentioned. Conversely, less than half of the reviewed State Plans identified the organizations responsible for implementation. Identifying organizations responsible for implementation means identifying the roles and responsibilities of specific groups or entities who will help enact a plan (Bryson & Alston, 2011).

During the content review, the researcher noted that many SUAs listed themselves as the organization responsible for implementation. Other responsible partners were listed less frequently. For the more than half of reviewed State Plans that did not list an

organization responsible for implementation, it was assumed that the SUA would be the implementing body.

Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Outcomes. Almost all states included goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes. The researcher used the following definitions for this study's goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes. Goal statements provide "a long-term organizational target or direction of development … [that] provides a basis for decisions about the nature, scope, and relative priorities of all projects and activities" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 169). A measurable objective is "a measurable target that must be met on the way to attaining a goal" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 169). Actionable strategies are "the means by which an organization intends to accomplish a goal or objective. It summarizes a pattern across policy, programs, projects, decisions, and resources allocations" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170). Intended outcomes are the ideal results, consequences, or benefits for stakeholders or the larger meanings associated with strategic outputs (Bryson & Alston, 2011). The high frequency of these components is likely due to the federal requirements for the State Plans as provided in the instructions from Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a). Although subject to interpretation, State Plans are developed by SUAs using instructions provided by Administration for Community Living (2019), which specifies minimum standards for required elements and content. Thus, the researcher chose to accept elements in the plans labeled as either "outcomes" or "performance measures" as an outcome because it was impossible to distinguish between the two in the plans. For more information about the coding rules used in the analysis, refer to Appendix A – Coding Agenda.

Mission Statements, Vision Statements, and Values Statements. Formal strategic planning often includes defining organizational attributes, such as a mission and values (Bendor, 2015; Bryson et al., 2018; Cepiku et al., 2018). A mission statement is "a statement of organizational purpose" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 169) that "provides a reason for stakeholders to support the organization" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 151). A vision statement is "a description of what an organization will look like if it succeeds in implementing its strategies and achieves its full potential" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170). Though indirectly required by Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a), ADvancing States (n.d.-b) provides additional tools and resources to assist states in

developing other aspects of their plan, such as the mission statement, vision statement, and values statement. The findings of this study showed that most State Plans included a mission statement, and a little more than half of the plans included a vision statement.

Mission and vision statements are the foundation for strategic planning goals, priorities, and strategies (Kroll & Moynihan, 2015; Pearce & David, 1987). Specific mission and vision statements provide direction, positively influence and motivate public sector employees, and have been linked with improved performance (Jung & Lee, 2013; Jung & Rainey, 2011). This improvement is likely because, as individuals within the organization are motivated to achieve a strategic direction, energy and attention are diverted away from goal-irrelevant activities (Latham, 2004). The least frequently included component in the State Plans was values. An organization's values or values statement is "a description of the code of behavior (concerning employees, other key stakeholders, and society at large) to which an organization adheres or aspires" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170). Though the elements were not included consistently, the presence of missions, vision, and values statements helps to confirm that SUAs include some formal strategic planning activities in their planning efforts.

Issue Identification, Identified Resources, and Timelines. Issues identification is defined as the identification of the set of "policy choice[s] or change challenge[s] affecting an organization's mandates, mission, product or service level and mix, clients or users, costs, financing, structure, processes, or management" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 85). Issue identification may include a SWOT analysis and consider how the components of the SWOT are related to the organization's "ability to meet its mandates, fulfill its mission, realize its vision, or create public value" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 89). Administration for Community Living (2019) requires that states conduct needs assessment activities as a part of the development of their State Plan and report in the plan: the methods used to conduct the assessment, the findings of the assessment, and how the data were used to guide the plan's development. Because of this requirement, most reviewed plans included issue identification.

Conversely, few states included identified resources or timelines in their plans. Available resources describe how or where to attain "the necessary resources [that] will bring life to the strategies and create real value for the organization and its stakeholders"

(Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 121). Timelines in a strategic plan suggest when the actions will be taken and the expected milestones during implementation (Bryson & Alston, 2011). Since the State Plans are a requirement to receive federal funding, perhaps the states intended to use the OAA funds to implement the plan. Though timelines during the State Plans relevant period would make the plan more specific, it is assumed the plan would be implemented during its relevant period.

Additionally, as reviewed in Chapter 2 – Literature Review, planned emergence integrates attributes from formal strategic planning, such as structure and comprehensiveness, and emergent strategy making, such as flexibility and learning (Bryson et al., 2018; Grant, 2003; Papke-Shields & Boyer-Wright, 2017; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013). Planned emergence allows strategists to focus on aspirational performance initiatives and goals and provides an avenue for organizations to deviate from the plan when needed to respond to emerging threats and opportunities (Dibrell et al., 2014; Grant, 2003). The general lack of timelines in the plans supports the assumption that SUAs follow a planned emergence approach to strategic planning.

Relationship Between Diversified Collaboration and Strategic Plan Design

Interorganizational collaboration has increased, and strategic planning and tools are frequently used to facilitate relationships between many partnerships and networks (M. Berry, 1998; Borins, 2014; Moynihan & Hawes, 2012; Tama, 2018). The coordination and collaboration of many different organizations and agencies involve careful attention to stakeholders, including multiple levels of government, multiple sectors, and internal and external participants explicitly or implicitly involved in the process of strategy formulation and implementation (Bryson et al., 2018; Nelson et al., 2011). Almost all public problems require collaboration to solve the issue (Bryson et al., 2015; Crosby & Bryson, 2005; Forrer et al., 2014; Tama, 2018). Interorganizational collaboration involves problem-focused entities that work together to address challenges with interdependence, flexibility, and collective ownership of goals (Bronstein, 2003; Petri, 2010). The complex relationship between organizations may evolve, develop, and change over time (D'Amour et al., 2005; Lindeke & Sieckert, 2005; Petri, 2010); however, strategic planning enables public sector agencies to manage support from multiple stakeholders to achieve strategic objectives (Elbanna et al., 2016). Through

collaboration and cooperation, public organizations respond to diverse actors who have an important stake in the formulation, implementation, and outcomes of strategic activities (Elbanna et al., 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Osborne, 2006; O'Toole & Meier, 2015).

Diverse planning groups may be recognized by the unique individuals involved in the planning and the types of stakeholder groups involved. Empirical studies may choose individual or aggregate actors as the unit of analysis when exploring collaboration in strategic planning (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Whittington, 2006). This study focused on aggregate actors as the unit of analysis and the range of stakeholder groups involved in developing the strategic plans under investigation. Combined, these two concepts (aggregate actors as the unit of analysis and the range of stakeholder groups involved) were defined as diversified collaboration. The actor-network theory involves the study of associations, including those with and between human actors and nonhuman (material) actants. The actor-network theory suggests that strategic planning artifacts are actants that can be transported over space and time and consumed in various ways. Their associations and connections to human actors should be traced (Bryson et al., 2009; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). The actor-network theory provides a suitable method for understanding microlevel contributors to how, whether, when, and why strategic planning works (Bryson et al., 2009). Strategic plans may influence human actors or even appear to have power over them by limiting their choices and freedoms in everyday and operational activities (Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2009; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Thus, this study explored two variables that linked actor collaboration with strategic planning actants. The two variables were

- diversified collaboration (group diversity) demonstrated by the number and types of different groups represented during plan development, and
- strategic plan design (plan design) measured by the number and types of planning artifacts or components included in the strategic plans under investigation.

The mathematical relationship between group diversity and plan design was non-statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level; however, it was statistically significant at the $p < .10$ level, with a p level of .08 and a concomitant medium effect size. Additionally, the viability of group diversity in predicting subsequent plan design was statistically

significant at the $p < .10$ level, with a p level of .08 and a concomitant medium effect size. The findings in Research Question 3 (the first quantitative question) would appear promising, considering the importance of the research question and the noteworthy effect achieved within such a small sample size. A considerable amount of support is evident in the professional literature that highlights the role and importance of effect size when considering p values and results. Statistical inference methods in scientific research have recently been scrutinized and questioned (Wasserstein & Lazar, 2016). The threshold value, $p < .05$, has been described as arbitrary, and although it is common practice to assign p the value of .05 as a measure of evidence against a null effect, countless methodologists point out the importance of effect sizes (Lambdin, 2012). Significant tests can be made more stringent by moving to .01 (1%) or less stringent by moving the borderline to .10 (10%), but the primary product of a research inquiry is one or more measures of effect size, not merely p values (Cohen, 2016; Dahiru, 2008). This type of measurement means describing the results in terms of measures of magnitude (Kline, 2004). According to Sullivan and Feinn (2012),

> the effect size is the main finding of a quantitative study. While a p value can inform the reader whether an effect exists, the p value will not reveal the size of the effect. In reporting and interpreting studies, both the substantive significance (effect size) and statistical significance (p value) are essential results to be reported. (p. 279)

Through the perspective offered by these researchers, the results of this study have linked, with a positive association, the extent of group diversity with the robustness of plan design.

In a similar study, Lee et al. (2018) found that—at a county level—collaboratively involving multiple and diverse stakeholders during strategic planning contributed to the comprehensiveness of strategic plan design. The results of this study are also in keeping with previous research that suggested that the presence of collaboration and stakeholder engagement during strategic planning contributes to a range of successful planning outcomes (Alam et al., 2014; Cepiku et al., 2018; Johnsen, 2018; Koontz & Newig, 2014; Lee et al., 2018; Mulgan, 2009; O'Leary & Vij, 2012). Diverse collaborations contribute positively to strategic planning efforts because of the unique roles, views, and

characteristics that each actor contributes to the collaboration (Fernandes et al., 2021; Galinsky et al., 2015; Larson, 2017; Rock & Grant, 2016). Participants in strategic planning efforts bring diverse experiences, relationships, intrinsic interpretative schemes, applicable norms, stocks of knowledge, cognitive styles, and cultural rules. Through the varied perspectives and characteristics of the participants, there is a broadened understanding and analysis of problems and an increase in the number of alternatives generated as solutions to challenges (Bryson, 2010b; Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Bryson et al., 2018; Burby, 2003; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; B. George et al., 2018; Iasbech & Lavarda, 2018; Jarzabkowski & Balogun, 2009; Whittington, 2006). The link between group diversity and plan design can be thus understood—a strategic plan's design will more comprehensively capture a range of issues, ideas, and elements related to implementation when the planning group is comprised of a diverse group of actors.

Relationship Between Strategic Plan Design and Strategic Planning Outcomes

Organizational performance outcomes are a dominant theme in practice-based strategy research (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). This study linked a micro-level variable (plan design) to a macro-level variable (organizational performance). By doing so, this study met a gap in the literature, noted by Jarzabkowski and Spee (2009), who argued the ultimate need was to link microlevel outcomes of strategizing activities to more macro-level outcomes, such as organizational performance, and broader social contexts and outcomes. The strategic plan design variable was also included in the study to answer Bryson and Edwards's (2017) call for more research exploring how various strategic planning artifacts make a difference.

Understanding the relationship between strategic planning and performance is crucial to organizations. Researchers have sought to reduce common source bias and measure public sector performance objectively by utilizing secondary performance measures. The findings from these studies are mixed but demonstrate a positive strategic planning-performance link (R. Andrews et al., 2009; Elbanna et al., 2016; Falshaw et al., 2006; Grant, 2003; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2010). This study measured organizational performance using objective, secondary data. As the outcome of interest, organizational performance was operationalized as the state's performance in addressing a broad public problem. The public problem was the needs of a growing and

aging population of older adults, and performance was measured using the 2020 edition of the AARP's LTSS State Scorecard. The AARP Scorecard presented rankings and information by state (Reinhard et al., 2020). It was designed to capture information across LTSS categories measuring state-level "system performance from the viewpoint of users of services and their families" (AARP, n.d., "What is the Scorecard" section).

In addition to the AARP Scorecard data, U.S. Census Bureau's (n.d.) American Community Survey data were used to control for socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Controlling for confounding differences associated with demographic characteristics can produce better measures and less ambiguous estimates of the underlying variable (Bode, 1994). Further, the OAA (1965) requires states to emphasize serving older individuals with the greatest economic and social needs. Economic needs can be defined as individuals living below the FPL, and social needs include living alone or with one or more disabilities. These characteristics were anticipated to impact the results of each state's AARP Scorecard score because of the association with increased health risk or frailty; therefore, it may increase statewide demand for LTSS or the complexity states may face in successfully providing LTSS.

The mathematical relationship between plan design and AARP Scorecard score and the viability of plan design in predicting the AARP Scorecard score was non-statistically significant when analyzed without the demographic characteristics. The degree of explained variance in the dependent variable of the AARP Scorecard was increased with the addition of demographic identifying variables to the independent variable of plan design in the predictive modeling process, focusing on the percentage of older adults living below the FPL and percentage of adults with one or more disabilities. The predictive models in both cases became statistically significant by including the variables within the respective models ($p < .001$ for the one or more disabilities variable; $p = .05$ for the below FPL variable). The most pronounced effect, however, was noted in the R^2 or effect size increase. The model R^2 increased significantly in both cases when the independent variables were added to the modeling process. Adding the demographic variable of the percentage of older adults living below the FPL to the independent variable of plan design increased the degree of explained variance for the dependent variables of the AARP Scorecard in the overall predictive model from 3.2% to 14.3%.

Adding the demographic variable of the percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities to the independent variable of the plan design increased the degree of explained variance for the dependent variable of the AARP Scorecard in the overall predictive model from 3.2% to 42.9%.

The results of this state-level study are aligned with Lee et al. (2018), who found that—at a county level—robustly designed strategic plans were more likely to improve organizational performance in addressing a social issue. The results also align with previous studies, which found that organizations demonstrating comprehensive use of strategic planning artifacts are more likely to improve perceived or actual performance (Elbanna, 2012; Johnsen, 2018). The most astounding component of the results is the effect size. In previous studies focused on the relationship between strategic planning and organizational performance in the public sector, results generally found positive, though not always large effects, using linear regression methodologies (R. Andrews et al., 2006, 2012; Boyne & Gould-Williams, 2003; Bryson et al., 2018; Elbanna et al., 2016; Meier et al., 2007). The results of this study again highlight the role and importance of the effect size when considering *p* values and results, as previously supported (Cohen, 2016; Dahiru, 2008; Kline, 2004; Sullivan & Feinn, 2012). After controlling for the socio-demographic characteristics of the state, the *p* values, in combination with the effect sizes produced in this study, underscore the importance of comprehensively designing strategic plans for improving planning outcomes. Additional discussion about the demographic characteristics included in this study is presented later in this section.

Effect for Region of the United States Upon Group Diversity or Plan Design

This study explored the diversity of the stakeholder group involved in developing strategic plans, the strategic planning artifacts, and the planning outcomes. The study was modeled after Lee et al.'s (2018) study conducted at a county level. Lee et al.'s study included an initial sample of 208 county government plans in 33 states and located across all 4 regions of the United States as follows: 46 counties located in the West, 51 counties in the Midwest, 57 counties in the South, and 54 counties in the Northeast. Lee et al. did not report any analysis regarding the effect of the region on group diversity or plan design.

The U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.) divides the regions of the United States into four regions: West, Midwest, Northeast, and South. According to Duong et al. (2021), "regions of the country vary in many aspects, including population size, density, and composition of various racial groups, as well as financial resources, political affiliations, and [health] systems" (p. 989). Regional differences in political orientation, attitudes toward minority groups, occupational performance, and health result from how Americans' attitudes, values, and behaviors are geographically clustered (Rentfrow, 2010; Rentfrow et al., 2008). Given these geographic differences, this study offers new insights with the addition of the fifth and sixth research questions designed to explore the possible effect of regional differences within the United States on group diversity and organization design.

The effects of the region of the United States upon group diversity and plan design were both non-statistically significant; however, the effect of the region of the United States was considered between medium and large for both group diversity and plan design. Given the small sample size, and like the discussion presented in the previous paragraphs, the effect size produced in the results is noteworthy. It would have been interesting to see if or how the *p* values changed if all 50 states had been involved in the study, and the *n* values for each region would have been between 12 to 15. Based on this point, the study's limitations and recommendations for future research will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

Effect for Region and Demographics by Quartiles of the AARP Scorecard

As established in the previous paragraphs, regional differences across the United States include variance in population size, density, and composition of various racial groups and attitudes toward minority groups, as well as differences in financial resources, political affiliations, population health, and occupational performance. Americans are geographically clustered around attitudes, values, and behaviors (Duong et al., 2021; Rentfrow, 2010; Rentfrow et al., 2008). Known byproducts of these regional differences are disparities in population health indicators in the United States (Hongying et al., 2021; Planalp, 2021; Rachoin et al., 2021). For example, the prevalence of disability and preventable diseases in adults is higher in the South compared to the Northeast, West, or Midwest (Fanaroff et al., 2021; Graham, 2015; Okoro et al., 2018).

Additional insights were sought in this study through research questions designed to explore regional differences and the effects of data controlling for socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Lee et al. (2018) included socio-economic and other population characteristics deemed to be relevant to their study as control data. Demographic data were included in Lee et al.'s analysis because the characteristics were believed to influence the relationship between strategic plan design and planning outcomes (performance). According to Lee et al. (2018),

> One of the common issues with quantitative analyses such as this is the problem of omitted variable bias, which can affect the statistical relationship between the dependent variable …and the treatment (independent) variables. [Lee et al.] included the control variables as a means of reducing the possible source of omitted variable bias. (p. 370)

This study similarly controlled for demographic characteristics and further explored the effect of the demographic data on the AARP Scorecard scores. These research questions were included in this study to expand on the questions and findings presented in Lee et al. (2018). Research Question 7 sought to understand if there was a statistically significant effect for the region of the United States for the percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the FPL, and older adults with one or more disabilities by lower quartiles of the AARP Scorecard. Research question eight asked if there was a statistically significant effect of the difference in the percentage of older adults, older adults living alone, older adults living under the FPL, and older adults with one or more disabilities between the lower and upper quartiles of the AARP Scorecard.

The results of the analysis conducted for research question seven found that there were significant differences in the linear combination of percentages of older adults, older adults living below the FPL, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities between regions of the United States for the bottom quartiles of the AARP Scorecard. Follow-up analysis showed that statistically significant effects were observed specifically for the percentage of older adults living below the FPL and the percentage of older adults living alone. The analysis results for Research Question 8 found that the linear combination of percentages of older adults, older adults living below

the FPL, older adults living alone, and older adults with one or more disabilities significantly differed between the levels of AARP Scorecard quartiles. A statistically significant effect was observed specifically for the percentage of older adults with one or more disabilities. The statistically significant findings of these two research questions underscore the effect that region and socio-demographic characteristics may have on quantitative analysis, but, like other results of this study, the effect size is truly remarkable. The large effect sizes are noteworthy. The implications of these findings and recommendations for future research are discussed in the following sections.

Limitations

This study had a defined scope and inherent limitations. The section discusses the general limitations of the study. The section shows the specific limitations related to measuring and analyzing diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and performance.

General Limitations

One of the primary limitations of the study was the limited sample size. Although the study sought to capture the total population (all 50 states), there was still a maximum number of participants, making the ceiling for the study 50. This total number of participants was small, although it was deemed sufficient to achieve statistically significant results potentially.

Additionally, State Plans were developed by SUAs using instructions provided by Administration for Community Living (n.d.-a), which specified minimum standards for required elements and content. Although each state was provided the same guidance, the development of the plans was open to interpretation by the state agency; therefore, the content of the plans was variable. This variability of the plans was accepted and acknowledged assumption for this study. Chapter Three- Methodology discussed more information about the variability of the plans.

Further, the study only focused on the strategic planning aspect of strategic management. It did not include an investigation of the implementation efforts, the rigor applied during implementation, or the adjustments made to the plan during the implementation period, which may or may not have contributed to the success or failure

of the SUA in addressing aging issues. Still, there are clear programmatic benefits of planning efforts, regardless of an organizational entity's ability to move forward strategically, so the act of strategic planning alone is, at a minimum, a prerequisite determinant of implementation success (Bryson & Alston, 2011).

Limitations Related to Diversified Collaboration

One of the primary limitations of diversified collaboration was how diversity was measured. First, the planning participants' demographic diversity (e.g., race, gender, age) was not a part of evaluating diversified collaboration (group diversity). Demographic information about the individuals participating in the planning efforts was not reported in the State Plans and could not be included; however, as Chapter Two – Literature Review established, demographic differences are a fundamental aspect of diversity. Any benefit achieved from demographic diversity or shortfalls from a lack of demographic diversity within the states would not have been captured in this study.

Next, this study was limited to the information presented in the State Plans, which was self-reported and variable information. It may not have been a full representation of all the planning efforts or stakeholders that contributed to the plan's development. Additionally, the scoring methodology for group diversity meant that a state would receive only one point for having a certain type of stakeholder group represented but may have had additional diversity within the defined categories. For example, if State A engaged one other state agency during planning, then State A received 1 point for the "Other State Public Agency" category. Similarly, if State B engaged five other state agencies during planning, then State B still only received 1 point for the "Other State Public Agency category, although their planning efforts in that category were more diverse. As another example, if State X received 10 public comments and State Y received 1,000 public comments, they scored equally (1 point) in the External Public Comment category because they both achieved representation from that stakeholder type. Still, the feedback that State Y received would likely be more diverse and comprehensive than that of State X. The scoring methodology for this study was established to examine the lack of specific types of stakeholder groups during plan development. However, additional stratification and depth of diversity remained unmeasured in many states.

One of the final limitations of this study related to diversified collaboration involves the unique challenges associated with collaboration and diversity. Participation in a broad stakeholder group may not always make sense, and the importance of stakeholder inclusion may vary over time (Bryson & Edwards, 2017; Johnsen, 2016). Further, the level of engagement of a group of stakeholders may be shallow or elitist, meaning true collaboration and participation are unachieved (Vidyarthi et al., 2013; Vigar, 2006). When a broad group of stakeholders is involved, it can be challenging to find the intersection of common goals and consensus on the best avenue to reach those goals in the face of competing priorities (Nelson et al., 2011). Public sector professionals often find these types of partnerships cumbersome, time-consuming, and frustrating (Boyd & Peters, 2009). Facilitators who can provide a sense of neutrality will be more likely to elicit candid discussions about planning issues (Kimbrell et al., 2002). However, the level or quality of stakeholder engagement and the facilitation tactics employed during plan development were outside this study's scope. Although this study found that collaboratively involving a diverse group of stakeholders may improve the plan's design, collaboration and diversity do not guarantee improvements, which may be why the *p* value between group diversity and plan design was not stronger. Lastly, collaboration-only approaches to planning may have difficulty achieving deep-seated system change, equity, and justice compared to community organizing, coalition building, and advocacy to create social movements (J. M. Bryson, personal communication, September 9, 2021). This study focused on diversified collaboration, but its association with fully resolving a public ill may be limited.

Limitations Related to Plan Design

There are limitations in this study specifically related to the variable of plan design. Despite the rigor applied using a coding agenda, categorizing the elements within the plans may still have some level of subjectivity through the researcher's judgment. Further, this study did not evaluate the quality or subject matter of the elements within the plan. Lee et al. (2018) argued that the presence of vision, mission, and value statements represented the larger picture of the desired strategic direction; that identifying strategic issues could help show how serious a related social problem is for an organization; and that goals and objectives, along with identifying organizations

responsible for implementation, would connect the big picture with actions to address the identified problems. Although Lee et al.'s argument can be similarly applied to this study, the study itself did not investigate, for example, the merits of the vision, mission, and value statements, the accuracy of the agency in identifying the most salient issues, or the applicability of the goals and objectives to either the desired strategic direction or to addressing the identified issues. This type of alignment may impact an organization's ability to implement a strategic plan with successful outcomes and organizational performance, but it was not something captured in this study.

Limitations Related to the AARP Scorecard

This study measured the performance of the state using the AARP Scorecard. Though using an objective, third-party data set may have helped reduce bias, the AARP Scorecard is not tailored to each state. For example, each state's specific issues and needs and the goals and objectives developed to address the issues and needs may differ from the categories of performance measured by the scorecard. Although the AARP Scorecard is a good general measure of performance in LTSS, states may focus more on home- and community-based service provision and aspects not captured by the scorecard. Additionally, the AARP Scorecard as a tool has its limitations described in the detailed descriptions of the indicators and data sources. These limitations may involve issues with data availability or comparability between previous years.

Finally, the AARP Scorecard was not designed specifically to measure State Plan/SUA performance specifically. It was designed to measure LTSS across the state. As such, the AARP Scorecard may not have considered the specific challenges SUAs faced during the relevant period that would have impacted their performance in LTSS. For example, during the planning period under exploration in this study, the nation was slowly healing from a national recession, and the federal budget process included sequestration cuts to aging programs. Many states noted in their State Plans that the budget cuts were a significant barrier to fully meeting all the LTSS needs of the older adult population in their state.

Implications

This study has theoretical implications for strategic planning researchers and practical implications for strategic planning practitioners.

Implications for Strategic Planning Research

The current study has implications for the field of strategic planning research. The study sought to answer multiple calls for more research in strategic planning and to help advance the study of strategic planning. Previous research has characterized strategic planning from either a process/micro-based or practice/macro-based perspective. Researchers have argued that there was a need to study outcomes at a more micro level without losing focus of the wider (macro) social factors (Bryson et al., 2009; Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). A variety of variance (practice-based) and process studies are needed to advance the field of strategic planning research (Bryson, 2010a; Bryson & Edwards, 2017). Bryson and Edwards (2017) stated that future research was needed to explore what difference it makes when strategic planning is applied to collaboration; how participation by different stakeholders makes a difference; and how various strategic plan artifacts make a difference. According to B. George et al. (2019), a need existed for more research with theoretical strength, including those that "simultaneously investigate different organizational performance dimensions using multiple data sources with stakeholder involvement as a moderator" (p. 818). This study aimed to answer these calls for more research by linking process- and practice-based approaches to research using both micro- and macro-level variables and by leveraging theories such as planned emergence (Grant, 2003), actor-network theory (Bryson et al., 2009), and collaborative public management (McGuire, 2006).

Macro-structures are interrelated with micro-practices, so researchers need to simultaneously concentrate on context and detail and be broad in their scope of the study (Balogun et al., 2003; Carter, 2013; Carter et al., 2008; Elbasha & Wright, 2017; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Focusing on multiple levels, such as individuals, groups, institutions, and practice communities, will allow for a review of performance based on different outcomes (Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). For this study, multiple types and levels of groups were explored, along with a proximate and a distal outcome. The outcomes were identified as the design of the strategic plans (proximate) and the LTSS dimension

associated with state performance (distal). This study also explored the diversity of the groups collaborating during state-level strategic plan development, the contextual design of the resulting strategic plan, and the link between the diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and organizational performance as measured by the state's success in addressing a broad social problem. As evidenced by the successful results and findings produced in the analysis and the comprehensive review of literature presented, this mixed-method study creates a framework for combining multiple aspects of strategic planning into a complex study that meets many previous recommendations for future research.

Additionally, data from the U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.) were used to control for socio-economic and demographic characteristics anticipated to impact or skew statistical relationships. Using data that controls for confounding differences in demographic characteristics may produce a resulting measure that is a "purer, more unambiguous estimate of the underlying variable" (Bode, 1994, p. 4). Additional insights were sought in this study through research questions designed to explore regional differences and the effects of data controlling for socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Lee et al. (2018) included socio-economic and other population characteristics deemed to be relevant to their study as control data. Demographic data were included in Lee et al.'s analysis because the characteristics were believed to influence the relationship between strategic plan design and planning outcomes (performance). According to Lee et al.,

> One of the common issues with quantitative analyses such as this is the problem of omitted variable bias, which can affect the statistical relationship between the dependent variable … and the treatment (independent) variables. [Lee et al.] included the control variables as a means of reducing the possible source of omitted variable bias. (p. 370)

This study similarly controlled for demographic characteristics and further explored the effect of the demographic data on the AARP Scorecard scores. These research questions were included in this study to expand on the questions and findings presented in Lee et al. The results of these research questions illustrated the effect of socio-economic or demographic characteristics, including how the factors can produce differences in measures of performance outcomes. This study highlights the importance

of identifying and employing control data using relevant, population-level socio-economic or demographic characteristics to enhance statistical analysis.

Implications for Strategic Planning Practice

This study also has practical implications for strategic planning, especially in the public sector. Considering the results produced in this study, agencies responsible for leading planning efforts may want to prepare for planning activities by reviewing a list of possible stakeholders and considering if a diverse group of representatives is invited to collaborate on the development of the plan. Planners should evaluate if they have stakeholders, including representation from cross-sector groups, different intergovernmental levels, and internal and external collaborators. This study reviewed representation from private, public, nonprofit, academic, and health care organizations; vertical and horizontal governmental organizations; internal employees; and public input and found benefits to having a diverse group of collaborators. Agencies pursuing planning activities could consider each of these stakeholder types and invite representatives from organizations within each group to participate in the development of the strategic plan. Participation by a diverse group of stakeholders may positively influence the plan's design.

Other complementary stakeholders could also be explored, including those that may be program, regional, organizational, or plan specific. For example, planning efforts focused on a specific public program or service may want to involve service providers, service recipients, and individuals involved in the program's oversight in the strategy development. Similarly, a regional planning effort may want to consider whether there is sufficient representation from the region's urban, rural, suburban, or other districts. If an organization is undertaking internal strategic planning activities, a range of staff members should be considered, including frontline staff, middle management, executives, and board members. Diverse representation of staff members in internal planning could also be considered based on lengths of employment and tenure, such as newer staff members with fresh ideas and employees who have been with the organization for a long time with significant institutional knowledge and context. Finally, group diversity based on the planning effort may need to be considered. For example, the planning group could include strategy specialists who facilitate the plan's development, representation from the

groups who will implement the plan, and representation from the groups who will evaluate or report the planning outcomes.

Beyond the implications related to diversified collaboration, this study offers additional implications. For this study, Bryson and Alston's (2011) 12 strategic plan components were used to measure the design of the strategic plans under investigation. The presence of these 12 components is commonly accepted as constituting an effective and robustly designed strategic plan. Previous research has also evaluated various plan components. Mission statements are the foundation for goals, priorities, and strategies in strategic planning (Kroll & Moynihan, 2015; Pearce & David, 1987). Mission statements and goals that are specific provide direction, positively influence and motivate public sector employees, and have been linked with improved performance (Jung & Lee, 2013; Jung & Rainey, 2011; Latham, 2004). Several study findings have supported the claim that organizations that create and implement strategies designed to achieve goals and objectives are generally expected to achieve improved performance (Bryson, 2010b; Niven, 2003; Poister, 2010; Poister, Pasha, et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2011). Beyond these previous findings, this study connected the components and the resulting quality of the plan design to organizational performance and strategic planning outcomes. Agencies undertaking planning efforts should consider the design of their plans and the components included.

Additional implications of this study are specific to the ability of strategic planning to impact a social challenge and related to the specific public sector field under investigation—aging services. Within the last 10 years, the application of strategic planning in the public sector has expanded with an enhanced focus on addressing broad social issues (Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). As public problems have become more complex, the need to understand how to best conduct strategic planning to solve these problems has become critical (Bryson et al., 2010; Vaara & Durand, 2012). The older adult population (age 65 and over) in the United States has steadily grown since 2009, and growth is projected to continue (Administration on Aging, 2021).

As the population of older adults continues to increase and live longer, the need for accessible and extended aging services also increases. Effective strategic planning in

aging services is needed to help improve agency outcomes and enable agencies to meet the needs of the current success and future population of older adults (Cameron, 2008; Campbell et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Feng, 2019; Hyer et al., 2019; Tong et al., 2021; Verghese et al., 2021). This study suggests that strategic planning in public sector aging services may benefit from diversified collaboration during plan development and plans designed to include a wealth of evidence-based components. Although SUAs receive federal guidance on the minimum expectations for the development and composition of the State Plans, these agencies should avail themselves of the wealth of additional planning resources provided by other national advocacy organizations, such as ADvancing States (n.d.-a), to create a program of strategic planning that exceeds those minimum requirements. Further, states could improve how they document the activities and individuals involved in their planning efforts to promote increased sharing of ideas, best practices, and lessons learned between states and federal oversight agencies responsible for reviewing the plans. Beyond state-level application, federal oversight agencies could consider strengthening the requirements or recommendations for state planning to include the elements of diversified collaboration and strategic plan design reviewed in this study.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results and findings of this study contribute new insights into the literature on strategic planning in the public sector; however, the study also introduces questions and opportunities for future research to further confirm and expand on the insights. Some recommendations for future research are offered in the areas of diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, organization performance, and public sector aging services.

Opportunities for Future Research on Diversified Collaboration

Future research could expand on the research framework used in this study. For example, a future study could design a mechanism to weigh the breadth and depth of the various stakeholder categories. The aim would be to account for a variety of stakeholders in one category (e.g., multiple state agencies participating in the development of the plan) or the number of stakeholders in one category (e.g., the number of public commenters giving feedback during the development of the plan). A methodology that more

comprehensively captured variety and totals could produce additional insights. Future research could also look at other influences on the components of diversified collaboration. This type of future research could include identifying a different set of complementary collaborators by operationalizing or categorizing plan contributors differently.

Additionally, previous researchers have suggested that how individuals and groups interact with the strategy process may create varying organizational outcomes (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009; Venkateswaran & Prabhu, 2010). Further analysis is needed in various contexts to understand participation, inclusion, and accountability in strategic planning (Sillince & Mueller, 2007; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). Future qualitative research could look at participation/collaboration by exploring how each group participated or is represented within each Plan (i.e., the variation in the level and type of participation from each group, how the group was engaged, etc.). Research could also explore the circumstances where it may not be advisable to include stakeholders in public-sector strategic planning (Bryson & Edwards, 2017).

Opportunities for Future Research on Strategic Plan Design

This study operationalized strategic plan design according to the components Bryson and Alston (2011) defined. However, future research could look at other influences on the design of a strategic plan, including the plan's content, visual, and graphical elements. Future research could also explore a link between the type of artifact employed and the specific contribution (or distraction) to the strategic planning process. Additionally, future qualitative research on State Plans on Aging could look at how the State Plans vary and note any variations between the State Plans that may have some influence on the other components. Future qualitative research could also look at the variations in how each component was addressed in the State Plan or by the Planners. For example, future research could include exploring how the components are described or crafted (e.g., to detect possible differences in how measurable the objectives are, how thorough the projected timeline is, etc.). Future qualitative research could also explore themes presented in the goals, objectives, strategies, and other elements.

Opportunities for Future Research on Strategic Organizational Performance

This study employed an objective, third-party data set to measure state performance in delivering LTSS. Future researchers can explore organizational performance using a more targeted approach by identifying or defining performance measures specific to the goals, objectives, and strategies documented in the plans under review. One place to look for appropriate measures could be using data to identify issues and challenges that provide direction for the strategic plan. Specific to State Plans on Aging, a federal set of baseline measures more specific to home- and community-based services could be developed to assess state performance. These measures could be based on the requirements outlined in the initial guidance for the strategic planning activities. Additionally, future research on control data and the socio-economic, demographic, or other characteristics that significantly impact organizational performance could be beneficial for neutralizing bias in studies and improving how organizational performance is measured.

Opportunities for Future Research on Strategy in Aging Services

This study raises opportunities for additional research on aging services and the effect of strategic planning on improving the services for older adults. This study focused on State Plans on Aging. As discussed in Chapter 2 – Literature Review, OAA stipulates that state planners must consider the information and issues presented in Area Plans on Aging, which are the federally required regional plans of the AAAs. Future research could be conducted on Areas Plans on Aging, allowing for a larger sample size since there are multiple AAAs in almost every state. Multi-level modeling could be employed to understand the extent to which Area Plan content is reflected in State Plan content and how the success of regional planning efforts contributes to state-level performance.

Moreover, future researchers can focus on other aspects of healthy aging besides just the availability of LTSS, including qualities such as being "Age-Friendly" or the livability of a community or state. AARP (n.d.) provides resources and measures on livability and the National Network for the Age-Friendly States and Communities (AARP Livable Communities, n.d.). Finally, additional researchers should explore how states are

implementing their State Plans and what impact implementation has on states' performance in providing aging services and supports.

Conclusion

Strategic planning is a popular management tool viewed as making a positive impact; however, current scholarly literature has indicated mixed results. Within the public sector, strategic planning is considered a beneficial activity, but there is insufficient empirical research on strategic plans in the public sector. This lack of research is surprising given the resources often dedicated to strategic planning each year. This mixed-method dissertation explored State Plans on Aging and the effect of diversified collaboration, strategic plan design, and regional and state characteristics on related outcomes and organizational performance. This study sought to provide insights that would add to the existing body of knowledge on public-sector strategic planning and would specifically help to enhance strategic planning activities aimed at improving services and support for older adults. This study found that diversified collaboration and strategic plan design can positively affect strategic planning outcomes. Given the increasing number of older adults, increases in life expectancy, and the resulting need for sufficient LTSS, researchers and practitioners should continue to seek opportunities. They can improve plans and implementations related to an aging population in the United States. This study offers some insights and calls for further action in addressing a broad social challenge.

References

AARP. (n.d.). *Long-Term Services & Supports State Scorecard*.

http://www.longtermscorecard.org/

AARP Livable Communities. (n.d.). *AARP network of age-friendly states and communities*. https://www.aarp.org/livable-communities/network-age-friendly-communities/

AARP & National Alliance for Caregiving. (2020). *Caregiving in the United States 2020*. https://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/ppi/2020/05/full-report-caregiving-in-the-united-states.doi.10.26419-2Fppi.00103.001.pdf

Ackermann, F., Eden, C., & Brown, I. (2005). *The practice of making strategy: A step-by-step guide*. SAGE.

Administration for Community Living. (n.d.-a). Abou*t ACL*. https://acl.gov/about-acl

Administration for Community Living. (n.d.-b). *Older Americans Act*. https://acl.gov/about-acl/authorizing-statutes/older-americans-act

Administration for Community Living. (n.d.-c). *Progra*m areas ove*rview*. https://acl.gov/programs

Administration for Community Living. (n.d.-d). *State Units on Aging*. https://acl.gov/programs/aging-and-disability-networks/state-units-aging

Administration for Community Living. (2019). *Administration on aging program instructions: State plan guidance letter*. https://acl.gov/about-acl/administration-aging-program-instructions

Administration on Aging. (2021). *2020 Profile of older Americans*. https://acl.gov/sites/default/files/Aging%20and%20Disability%20in%20America/2020ProfileOlderAmericans.Final_.pdf

ADvancing States. (n.d.-a). *About ADvancing States: ADvancin*g S*tates* m*ission*. http://www.advancingstates.org/about-advancing-states

ADvancing States. (n.d.-b). *Tools for planning: Developing a State Plan on Aging*. http://www.advancingstates.org/initiatives/aging-policy-and-programs/tools-planning

Alam, Q., Kabir, M. H., & Chaudhri, V. (2014). Managing infrastructure projects in
    Australia: A shift from a contractual to a collaborative public management
    strategy. *Administration & Society*, *46*(4), 422–449.
    https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399712459728

Alberg, J., Wilson, K., & Roush, J. (2006). Statewide collaboration in the delivery of
    EHDI services. *The Volta Review*, *106*(3), 259–270.
    https://www.proquest.com/openview/4938e94b3d42c4f48453f4fdd65a54d7/1?pq-
    origsite=gscholar&cbl=41448

Albrechts, L., & Balducci, A. (2013). Practicing strategic planning: In search of critical
    features to explain the strategic character of plans. *DisP – the Planning Review*,
    49(3), 16–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2013.859001

Aldrich, H. E., & Pfeffer, J. (1976). Environments of organizations. *Annual Review of
    Sociology*, *2*, Article 78. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.000455

Alford, J., & Greve, C. (2017). Strategy in the public and private sectors: Similarities,
    differences and changes. *Administrative Sciences (2076-3387)*, *7*(4), Article 35.
    https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci7040035

Allison, M., & Kaye, J. (2005). *Strategic planning or nonprofit organizations: A
    practical guide and workbook*. Wiley.

Amason, A. C. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict
    on strategic decision making: Resolving a paradox for top management teams.
    Academy of Management Journal, *39*(1), 123–148.
    https://doi.org/10.5465/256633

Ammons, D. N., & Rivenbark, W. C. (2008). Factors influencing the use of performance
    data to improve municipal services: Evidence from the North Carolina
    benchmarking project. *Public Administration Review*, *68*(2), 304–318.
    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00864.x

Andersen, S. C. (2008). The impact of public management reforms on student
    performance in Danish schools. *Public Administration*, *86*(2), 541–558.
    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.00717.x

Andersen, T. J. (2000). Strategic planning, autonomous actions and corporate performance. *Long Range Planning*, *33*(2), 184–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(00)00028-5

Andersen, T. J. (2004). Integrating decentralized strategy making and strategic planning processes in dynamic environments. *Journal of Management Studies*, *41*, 1271–1299. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00475.x

Andersen, T. J., & Nielsen, B. B. (2009). Adaptive strategy making: The effects of emergent and intended strategy modes. *European Management Review*, *6*(2), 94–106. https://doi.org/10.1057/emr.2009.7

Andrews, K. R. (1980). *The concept of corporate strategy*. Irwin.

Andrews, K. R. (1997). The concept of corporate strategy. In N. J. Foss (Ed.), *Resources firms and strategies: A reader in the resource-based perspective*. Oxford University Press.

Andrews, R., Boyne, G., Law, J., & Walker, R. (2009). Strategy formulation, strategy content and performance. *Public Management Review*, *11*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030802489989

Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., Law, J., & Walker, R. M. (2012). *Strategic management and public service performance*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2006). Strategy content and organizational performance: An empirical analysis. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(1), 52–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00555.x

Ansoff, H. I. (1957). Strategies for diversification. *Harvard Business Review*, *35*(5), 113–124. https://archive.org/details/strategiesfordiversificationansoff1957hbr

Ansoff, H. I. (1991). Critique of Henry Mintzberg, "The Design School—Reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management." *Strategic Management Journal*, *12*(6), 449–461. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250120605

Ansoff, H. I. (1994). Comment on Henry Mintzberg's rethinking strategic planning. *Long Range Planning*, *27*(3), 31–32. https://www.sid.ir/en/Journal/ViewPaper.aspx?ID=159728

Arend, R. J., Zhao, Y. L., Song, M., & Im, S. (2017). Strategic planning as a complex and enabling managerial tool. *Strategic Management Journal*, *38*(8), 1741–1752. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2420

Armstrong, J. S. (1982). The value of formal planning for strategic decisions: Review of empirical research. *Strategic Management Journal*, *3*(3), 197–211. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250030303

Atkinson, M. M. (2011). Lindblom's lament: Incrementalism and the persistent pull of the status quo. *Policy and Society 30*(1), 9–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2010.12.002

Atuahene-Gima, K., & Li, H. (2004). Strategic decision comprehensiveness and new product development outcomes in new technology ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*(4), 583–597. https://doi.org/10.5465/20159603

Avolio, B. J., Walumba, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 421–449. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(8), 951–968. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.283

Bachiochi, P. D., R'gelberg, S. G., O'Connor, M. S., & Elder, A. E. (2000). The qualities of an effective team leader. *Organization Development Journal*, *18*(1), 11–28. https://www.proquest.com/openview/e14a5bfaf8293f11836dc70cff7c867b/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=36482

Bachmann, J.-T., Engelen, A., & Schwens, C. (2016). Toward a better understanding of the association between strategic planning and entrepreneurial orientation – The moderating role of national culture. *Journal of International Management*, *22*(4), 297–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2016.03.002

Balogun, J., Huff, A. S., & Johnson, P. (2003). Three responses to the methodological challenges of studying strategizing. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(1), 197–224. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.t01-1-00009

Barron, B. G., & Henderson, M. V. (1995). Strategic leadership: A theoretical and operational definition. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *22*(2), Article 178. https://www.proquest.com/openview/fa07cd097a5b4206e985476884280b83/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2029838

Barwise, P., & Papadakis, V. (Eds.). (1998). *Strategic decisions*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Barzelay, M., & Campbell, C. (2003). *Preparing for the future: Strategic planning in the U.S. Air Force*. Brookings Institution Press.

Barzelay, M., & Jacobsen, A. S. (2009). Theorizing implementation of public management policy reforms: A case study of strategic planning and programming in the European Commission. *Governance*, *22*(2), 319–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2009.01437.x

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.

Beck, J. T., & Bozeman, B. (2007). Public values: An inventory. *Administration and Society*, *39*(3), 354–381. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0095399707300703

Behn, R. D. (2003). Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. *Public Administration Review*, *63*(5), 586–606. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00322

Bendor, J. (2015). Incrementalism: Dead yet flourishing. *Public Administration Review*, *75*(2), 194–205. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12333

Berardo, R., Heikkila, T., & Gerlak, A. K. (2014). Interorganizational engagement in collaborative environmental management: Evidence from the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, *24*(3), 697–719. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu003

Bernstein, D. J. (2001). Local government measurement use to focus on performance and results. *Evaluation and Program Planning 24*(1), 95–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7189(00)00050-1

Berry, F. S., & Wechsler, B. (1995). State agencies' experience with strategic planning: Findings from a national survey. *Public Administration Review*, *55*(2), Article 159. https://doi.org/10.2307/977181

Berry, M. (1998). Strategic planning in small high tech companies. *Long Range Planning*, *31*(3), 455–466. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(98)80012-5

Blackerby, P. (1994). History of strategic planning. *Armed Forces Comptroller*, *39*(1), 23–24. http://blackerbyassoc.com/history.html

Bode, R. K. (1994). *Controlling for demographic characteristics in person measures using a many-faceted Rasch model*. American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans.

Borins, S. (2014). *The persistence of innovation in government: A guide for innovative public servants*. IBM Center for the Business of Government. https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/The%20Persistence%20of%20Innovation%20in%20Government.pdf

Bossidy, L., & Charan, R. (2011). *Execution: The discipline of getting things done*. Random House.

Bovaird, T. (2008). Emergent strategic management and planning mechanisms in complex-adaptive systems - The case of the U.K. Best Value initiative. *Public Management Review*, *10*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030802002741

Bovaird, T., Flemig, S., Loeffler, E., & Osborne, S. P. (2017). Debate: Co-production of public services and outcomes. *Public Money & Management*, *37*(5), 363–364. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2017.1294866

Bowman, H. W. (2017). Toward a theory of membership association finance. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *46*(4), 772–793. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0899764016685860

Boyd, B. K. (1991). Strategic planning and financial performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management Studies*, *28*(4), 353–374. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1991.tb00286.x

Boyd, R. A., & Peters, M. (2009). *Using MAPP to connect communities: One county's story* (EJ897772). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ897772.pdf

Boyne, G. A. (2001). Planning, performance and public services. *Public Administration*, *79*(1), Article 73. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9299.00246

Boyne, G. A., & Chen, A. A. (2007). Performance targets and public service improvement. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, *17*(3), 455–477. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mul007

Boyne, G. A., & Gould-Williams, J. (2003). Planning and performance in public organizations: An empirical analysis. *Public Management Review 5*(1), 115–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/146166702200002889

Boyne, G. A., Martin, S., & Walker, R. (2004). Explicit reforms, implicit theories and public service improvement. *Public Management Review*, *6*(2), 189–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/1471903042000189092

Boyne, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2004). Strategy content and public service organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *14*, 231–252. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muh015

Bracker, J. S., Keats, B. W., & Pearson, J. N. (1988). Planning and financial performance among small firms in a growth industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, *9*(6), 591–603. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250090606

Bragg, E. J., & Hansen, J. C. (2015). Ensuring care for aging baby boomers: Solutions at hand. *Generations*, *39*(2), 91–98. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26556130

Brews, P. J., & Hunt, M. R. (1999). Learning to plan and planning to learn: Resolving the planning school/learning school debate. S*trategic Management Journal*, *20*(10), 889–913. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199910)20:10<889::AID-SMJ60>3.0.CO;2-F

Bronstein, L. R. (2003). A model for interdisciplinary collaboration. *Social Work*, *48*(3), 297–306. https://doi.org/sw/48.3.297

Brown, S. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1997). The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *42*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393807

Brunsson, N. (1982). The irrationality of action and action rationality: Decisions, ideologies and organizational actions. *Journal of Management Studies*, *19*, 29–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1982.tb00058.x

Bryson, J. M. (2004). What to do when stakeholders matter. *Public Management Review*, *6*(1), 21–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030410001675722

Bryson, J. M. (2010a). The future of public and nonprofit strategic planning in the United States. *Public Administration Review*, *70*, s255–s267. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02285.x

Bryson, J. M. (2010b). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (Vol. 4). Jossey-Bass.

Bryson, J. M., & Alston, F. K. (2011). *Creating your strategic plan: A workbook for public and nonprofit organizations* (3rd ed.). Wiley & Sons.

Bryson, J. M., Barberg, B., Crosby, B. C., & Patton, M. Q. (2021). Leading social transformations: Creating public value and advancing the common good. *Journal of Change Management*, *21*(2), 180–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2021.1917492

Bryson, J. M., Berry, F. S., & Yang, K. (2010). The state of public strategic management research: A selective literature review and set of future directions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, *40*(5), 495–521. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010370361

Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (2006). Leadership for the common good. In S. Sohuman (Ed.), *Creating a culture of collaboration* (pp. 367–396). Wiley.

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. K. (2009). Understanding strategic planning and the formulation and implementation of strategic plans as a way of knowing: The contributions of actor-network theory. *International Public Management Journal*, *12*(2), 172–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967490902873473

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: Needed and challenging. *Public Administration Review*, *75*(5), 647–663. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12432

Bryson, J. M., & Edwards, L. H. (2017). Strategic planning in the public sector. In R. Aldag (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management*. Oxford University Press.

Bryson, J. M., Edwards, L. H., & Van Slyke, D. M. (2018). Getting strategic about strategic planning research. *Public Management Review*, *20*(3), 317–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285111

Bryson, J. M., & Roering, W. D. (1987). Applying private-sector strategic planning in the public sector. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *53*(1), 9–22. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351179522-17

Buffel, T., Verté, D., De Donder, L., De Witte, N., Dury, S., Vanwing, T., & Bolsenbroek, A. (2012). Theorizing the relationship between older people and their immediate social living environment. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *31*(1), 13–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2012.636577

Burby, R. J. (2003). Making plans that matter: Citizen involvement and government action. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *69*(1), Article 33. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360308976292

By, R., Diefenbach, T., & Klarner, P. (2008). Getting organizational change right in public services: The case of European higher education. *Journal of Change Management*, *8*(1), 21–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010801937457

Cameron, D. J. (2008, February). Postacute strategic planning: preparing for an aging population: is your hospital prepared to offer patients high-quality, cost-effective postacute options? A postacute strategic plan can prepare your organization to serve an aging population. *Healthcare Financial Management*, *62*(2), 104–112. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18309601/

Camillus, J. C. (1982). Reconciling logical incrementalism and synoptic formalism--An integrated approach to designing strategic planning processes. *Strategic Management Journal*, *3*(3), 277–283. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250030309

Campbell, M., Stewart, T., Brunkert, T., Campbell-Enns, H., Gruneir, A., Halas, G., Hoben, M., Scott, E., Wagg, A., & Doupe, M. (2021). Prioritizing supports and services to help older adults age in place: A Delphi study comparing the perspectives of family/friend care partners and healthcare stakeholders. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(11), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0259387

Carter, C. (2013). The age of strategy: Strategy, organizations and society. *Business History*, *55*(7), 1047–1057. https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2013.838030

Carter, C., Clegg, S. R., & Kornberger, M. (2008). So! Apbox: Editorial essays: Strategy as practice? *Strategic Organization*, *6*(1), 83–99. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1476127007087154

Cepiku, D., Giordano, F., & Savignon, A. B. (2018). Does strategy rhyme with austerity? *Public Management Review*, *20*(3), 421–443. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285116

Chaffee, E. E. (1985). Three models of strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(1), 89–98. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277354

Chakraborty, A., Kaza, N., Knaap, G.-J., & Deal, B. (2011). Robust plans and contingent plans. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *77*(3), 251–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2011.582394

Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of the industrial empire*. The M.I.T Press.

Chen, C., Lei, D., Yeh, T., & Cheng, J. (2021). A study on critical factors in the service innovation of local medical care for senior citizens. *Revista de Cercetare Si Interventie Soci*ala, 74, 138–148. https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.74.9

Chief Financial Officer's Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-576, 104 Stat. 2838 (1990). https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/house-bill/5687/text

Christens, B. D., & Inzeo, P. T. (2015). Widening the view: Situating collective impact among frameworks for community-led change. *Community Development*, *46*(4), 420–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2015.1061680

Chu, W., Chang, S., Ho, H., & Lin, H. (2019). The relationship between depression and frailty in community☐dwelling older people: A systematic review and meta☐ analysis of 84,351 older adults. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *51*(5), 547–559. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12501

Chun, Y. H., & Rainey, H. G. (2005). Goal ambiguity and organizational performance in U.S. federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *15*(4), 529–557. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui030

Clary, P. A. (2021). Convening leadership on the commons: Initiating stakeholder networks to solve complex global issues. In D. P. Singh, R. J. Thompson, & K. A. Curran (Eds.), *Reimagining leadership on the commons: Shifting the paradigm for a more ethical, equitable, and just world* (pp. 191–203). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2058-880120210000001011

Coberly, S. (1994). *Making the business connection: Strategic planning for public/private partnerships: A guide for the aging network*. Washington Business Group on Health.

Cohen, J. (2016). *Things I have learned (so far)*. American Psychological Association.

Conlon, M., Tew, J., Solai, L. K., Gopalan, P., Azzam, P., & Karp, J. F. (2020). Care transitions in the psychiatric hospital: Focus on older adults. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *28*(3), 368–377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2019.07.006

Cook, M., Harrison, T. M., Zhang, J., Puron-Cid, G., & Gil-Garcia, J. R. (2015). Using public value thinking for government IT planning and decision making: A case study. *Information Polity: The International Journal of Government & Democracy in the Information Age*, *20*(2/3), 183–197. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-150359

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative*, *quantitative*, *and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds)., *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 209–240). Sage.

Crittenden, W. F., & Crittenden, V. L. (2000). Relationships between organizational characteristics and strategic planning processes in nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Management Issues*, *12*(2), 150–168. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604302

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2005). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world* (Vol. 264). Wiley & Sons.

Dahiru, T. (2008). *P*-value, a true test of statistical significance? A cautionary note. *Annals of Ibadan Postgraduate Medicine*, *6*(1), 21–26. https://doi.org/10.4314/aipm.v6i1.64038

D'Amour, D., Ferrada-Videla, M., Rodriguez, L. S. M., & Beaulieu, M.-D. (2005). The conceptual basis for interprofessional collaboration: Core concepts and theoretical frameworks. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *19*(Suppl1), 116–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820500082529

Daryani, S. M., Ali, S., & Asli-zadeh, A. (2012). Organizational theory, systemic thinking and system management. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, *1*(2), 71–79. https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2012.60221

Davis, G. F., & Cobb, J. A. (2010). Resource dependence theory: Past and future. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, *28*, 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X(2010)0000028006

Dean, J. W., Jr., & Sharfman, M. P. (1996). Does decision process matter? A study of strategic decision-making effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(2), 368–396. https://doi.org/10.5465/256784

De Andreis, F. (2019). The principles behind a strategic plan. *Open Journal of Applied Sciences*, *9*(4), 240–245. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojapps.2019.94020

De Baerdemaeker, J., & Bruggeman, W. (2015). The impact of participation in strategic planning on managers' creation of budgetary slack: The mediating role of autonomous motivation and affective organisational commitment. *Management Accounting Research*, *29*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2015.06.002

Delgado, R. I., Langabeer, J. R., II., & Sullivan, M. E. (2009). Strategic performance evaluation in cancer centers. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, *54*(6), 369–382. https://doi.org/10.1097/00115514-200911000-00005

Delmar, F., & Shane, S. (2003). Does business planning facilitate the development of new ventures? *Strategic Management Journal*, *24*(12), 1165–1185. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.349

Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *26*(8), 600–615. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730510633692

Dennis, R. S., & Winston, B. E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *24*(8), 455–459. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730310505885

Dibrell, C., Craig, J. B., & Neubaum, D. O. (2014). Linking the formal strategic planning process, planning flexibility, and innovativeness to firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(9), 2000–2007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.011

Downs, A., Durant, R., & Carr, A. N. (2003). Emergent strategy development for organizations. *Emergence*, *5*(2), 5–28. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327000EM050204

Drath, W. H., McCauley, C. D., Palus, C. J., Van Velsor, E., O'Connor, P. M. G., & McGuire, J. B. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(6), 635–653. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.09.003

Drucker, P. F. (1973). Managing the public service institution. *The Public Interest*, *33*, Article 43. https://www.proquest.com/openview/028fba017ef2b20c33767d9119ff0d9f/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1817076

Drucker, P. F. (2017). *Concept of the corporation*. Routledge. (Original work published 1946)

Duong, W. Q., Grigorian, A., Farzaneh, C., Nahmias, J., Chin, T., Schubl, S., Dolich, M., & Lekawa, M. (2021). Racial and sex disparities in trauma outcomes based on geographical region. *American Surgeon*, *87*(6), 988–993. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003134820960063

Dyer, W. G., Dyer, J. H., & Dyer, W. G. (2013). *Team building: Proven strategies for improving team performance* (5th ed.). Wiley & Sons.

Eadie, D. C. (1983). Putting a powerful tool to practical use: The application of strategic planning in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, *43*(5), 447–452. https://doi.org/10.2307/975852

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Sull, D. N. (2001). Strategy as simple rules. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*(1), 106–116. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11189455/

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Tabrizi, B. N. (1995). Accelerating adaptive processes: Product innovation in the global computer industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *40*(1), 84–110. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393701

Elbanna, S. (2008). Planning and participation as determinants of strategic planning effectiveness: Evidence from the Arabic context. *Management Decision*, *46*(5), 779–796. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740810873761

Elbanna, S. (2012). Slack, planning and organizational performance: Evidence from the Arab Middle East. *European Management Review*, *9*(2), 99–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-4762.2012.01028.x

Elbanna, S., Andrews, R., & Pollanen, R. (2016). Strategic planning and implementation success in public service organizations: Evidence from Canada. *Public Management Review*, *18*(7), 1017–1042. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1051576

Elbanna, S., Thanos, I., & Colak, M. (2014). An exploratory study of the determinants of the quality of strategic decision implementation in Turkish industrial firms. *Journal of General Management*, *40*(2), 27–46. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F030630701404000203

Elbasha, T., & Wright, A. (2017). Reconciling structure and agency in strategy-as-practice research: Towards a strong-structuration theory approach. *Management*, *20*(3), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.3917/mana.202.0107

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2020). Getting serious about diversity: Enough already with the business case. *Harvard Business Review*, *98*(6), 114–122. https://hbr.org/2020/11/getting-serious-about-diversity-enough-already-with-the-business-case

Engelbrecht, A. S., Kemp, J., & Mahembe, B. (2018). The effect of altruism and integrity on ethical leadership and organisational justice. *Management Dynamics; Stellenbosch*, *27*(4), 2–11. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v15i0.781

Eriksson, E., Andersson, T., Hellström, A., Gadolin, C., & Lifvergren, S. (2020). Collaborative public management: Coordinated value propositions among public service organizations. *Public Management Review*, *22*(6), 791–812. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1604793

Eyun-Jung, K., & Moonhee, C. (2021). What are the predictors of nonprofit association members' supportive behaviors? *Journal of Philanthropy & Marketing*, *26*(2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1693

Fadol, Y., Barhem, B., & Elbanna, S. (2015). The mediating role of the extensiveness of strategic planning on the relationship between slack resources and organizational performance. *Management Decision*, *53*(5), 1023–1044. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2014-0563

Falshaw, J. R., Glaister, K. W., & Tatoglu, E. (2006). Evidence on formal strategic planning and company performance. *Management Decision*, *44*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740610641436

Family Caregiver Alliance. (2019). *Caregiver statistics: Demographics*. https://www.caregiver.org/caregiver-statistics-demographics

Fanaroff, A. C., Yang, L., Nathan, A. S., Khatana, S. A. M., Julien, H., Wang, T. Y., Armstrong, E. J., Treat-Jacobson, D., Glaser, J. D., Wang, G., Damrauer, S. M., Giri, J., Groeneveld, P. W., & Yang, L. (2021). Geographic and socioeconomic disparities in major lower extremity amputation rates in metropolitan areas. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, *10*(17), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.121.021456

Feldman, M. S., & March, J. G. (1981). Information in organizations as signal and symbol. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *26*(2), 171–186. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392467

Feng, Z. (2019). Global convergence: Aging and long-term care policy challenges in the developing world. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, *31*(4), 291–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2019.1626205

Ferlie, E., & Ongaro, E. (2015). *Strategic management in public sector organizations: Concepts, schools, and contemporary issues*. Routledge.

Fernandes, M. E., Lopes, A. S., & Sargento, A. L. (2021). Improving stakeholder engagement in local strategic planning – Experience sharing based on Portuguese examples. *Policy Studies*, *42*(4), 381–396. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2019.1634186

Fernández, L. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2006). Theory to practice. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(2), 1–25. https://www.pcne.org/upload/files/269_Implementation_Practice_Murillo.pdf

Fisher, M., Baum, F. E., MacDougall, C., Newman, L., McDermott, D., & Phillips, C. (2017). Intersectoral action on SDH and equity in Australian health policy. *Health Promotion International*, *32*(6), 953–963. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daw035

Fitzgerald-Murphy, M., & Kelly, C. (2019). Questioning "choice": A multinational metasynthesis of research on directly funded home☐care programs for older people. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, *27*(3), e37–e56. https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12646

Forbes, D. P. (2007). Reconsidering the strategic implications of decision comprehensiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(2), 361–376. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.24349585

Forrer, J., Kee, J. J., & Boyer, E. (2014). *Governing cross-sector collaboration*. Wiley & Sons.

Fraser, J. C., & Kick, E. L. (2007). The role of public, private, non-profit and community sectors in shaping mixed-income housing outcomes in the US. *Urban Studies*, *44*(12), 2357–2377. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980701540952

Fredrickson, J. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (1984). Strategic decision processes: Comprehensiveness and performance in an industry with an unstable environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *27*(2), 399–423. https://doi.org/10.2307/255932

Freedman, L. (2013). *Strategy: A history*. Oxford University Press.

Frohman, A. L. (1985). Putting technology into strategic planning. *California Management Review*, *27*(2), 48–59. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165129

Fudickar, R., Hottenrott, H., & Lawson, C. (2018). What's the price of academic consulting? Effects of public and private sector consulting on academic research. *Industrial & Corporate Change*, *27*(4), 699–722. https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dty007

Furrer, O., Thomas, H., & Goussevskaia, A. (2008). The structure and evolution of the strategic management field: A content analysis of 26 years of strategic management research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *10*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00217.x

Galbraith, J. R. (2014). *Designing organizations: Strategy*, *structure*, *and process at the business unit and enterprise levels*. Jossey-Bass.

Galinsky, A. D., Todd, A. R., Homan, A. C., Phillips, K. W., Apfelbaum, E. P., Sasaki, S. J., Richeson, J. A., Olayon, J. B., & Maddux, W. W. (2015). Maximizing the gains and minimizing the pains of diversity: A policy perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *10*(6), 742–748. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615598513

Genworth. (2019). *Cost of Care Survey 2019: Median cost data tables*. https://pro.genworth.com/riiproweb/productinfo/pdf/282102.pdf

George, B., & Desmidt, S. (2018). Strategic-decision quality in public organizations: An information processing perspective. *Administration & Society*, *50*(1), 131–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399716647153

George, B., Desmidt, S., Cools, E., & Prinzie, A. (2018). Cognitive styles, user acceptance and commitment to strategic plans in public organizations: Sn empirical analysis. *Public Management Review*, *20*(3), 340–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285112

George, B., Desmidt, S., & De Moyer, J. (2016). Strategic decision quality in Flemish municipalities. *Public Money & Management*, *36*(5), 317–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2016.1194073

George, B., Walker, R. M., & Monster, J. (2019). Does strategic planning improve organizational performance? A meta☐analysis. *Public Administration Review*, *79*(6), 810–819. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13104

George, T., & Seidman, E. (2015). Is the homeownership safety net unraveling for seniors. *Urban Institute*. www.urban.org/urban-wire/homeownership-safety-net-unraveling-seniors

George, W. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. Jossey-Bass.

Giles-Corti, B., & Whitzman, C. (2012). Active living research: partnerships that count. *Health & Place*, *18*(1), 118–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.09.010

Giraudeau, M. (2008). The drafts of strategy: Opening up plans and their uses. *Long Range Planning*, *41*(3), 291–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2008.03.001

Glaister, K. W., Dincer, O., Tatoglu, E., Demirbag, M., & Zaim, S. (2008). A causal analysis of formal strategic planning and firm performance: Evidence from an emerging country. *Management Decision*, *46*(3), 365–391. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740810863843

Gläser-Zikuda, M., Hagenauer, G., & Stephan, M. (2020). The potential of qualitative content analysis for empirical educational research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *21*(1), 449–468. https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-21.1.3443

Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-62, 107 Stat. 285 (1993). https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/senate-bill/20/text

Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-352, 124 Stat. 3866 (2011). https://www.congress.gov/bill/111th-congress/house-bill/2142/text

Graham, G. (2015). Disparities in cardiovascular disease risk in the United States. *Current Cardiology Reviews*, *11*(3), 238–245. https://doi.org/10.2174/1573403x11666141122220003

Grant, A. K. (2020). Patterns of cross-sector collaboration in local health departments: A cluster analysis. *Health Promotion Practice*, *23*(1), 128–136. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839920972982

Grant, R. M. (2003). Strategic planning in a turbulent environment: Evidence from the oil majors. *Strategic Management Journal*, *24*, 491–517. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.314

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th anniversary ed.). Paulist Press.

Greve, C. (2015). Ideas in public management reform for the 2010s. Digitalization, value creation and involvement. *Public Organization Review*, *15*(1), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-013-0253-8

Guerard, J. B., Jr., Bean, A. S., & Stone, B. K. (1990). Goal setting for effective corporate planning. *Management Science*, *36*(3), 359–367. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.36.3.359

Hall, P. (2005). Interprofessional teamwork: Professional cultures as barriers. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *19*, 188–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820500081745

Hambrick, D. C. (2004). The disintegration of strategic management: It's time to consolidate our gains. *Strategic Organization*, *2*(1), 91–98. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127004040915

Hambrick, D. C., & Cannella, J. A. A. (1989). Strategy implementation as substance and selling. *Academy of Management Executive*, *3*(4), 278–285. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1989.427740

Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1994). *Competing for the future*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Hansen, J. R., & Ferlie, E. (2016). Applying strategic management theories in public sector organizations: Developing a typology. *Public Management Review*, *18*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.957339

Harris, J. (1993). *Innovations for federal service: A study of innovative technologies for federal government services to older Americans and consumers* (ED382154). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED382154

Harris, M. (2010). *Interdisciplinary strategy and collaboration: A case study of American research universities* (EJ886790). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ886790

Harris, P., Haigh, F., Sainsbury, P., & Wise, M. (2012). Influencing land use planning: making the most of opportunities to work upstream. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, *36*(1), 5–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-6405.2012.00822.x

Hart, S., & Banbury, C. (1994). How strategy-making processes can make a difference. *Strategic Management Journal*, *15*(4), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250150402

Hatchuel, A., & Segrestin, B. (2019). A century old and still visionary: Fayol's innovative theory of management. *European Management Review*, *16*(2), 399–412. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12292

Hatry, H. P. (2002). Performance measurement: Fashions and fallacies. *Public Performance and Management Review*, *25*(4), 352–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2002.11643671

Henneman, E. A., Lee, J. L., & Cohen, J. I. (1995). Collaboration: a concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *21*(1), 103–109. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1995.21010103.x

Heracleous, L., & Jacobs, C. D. (2008). Crafting strategy: The role of embodied metaphors. *Long Range Planning*, *41*(3), 309–325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2008.02.011

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *10*(2), 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1745691614568352

Hongying, D., Tamrakar, N., Rathnayake, N., & Samson, K. (2021). Geographical distribution and social determinants of Tobacco 21 policy adoption and retail inspections in the United States, 2015-2019. *Tobacco Induced Diseases*, *19*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.18332/tid/140148

Honig, B., & Karlsson, T. (2004). Institutional forces and the written business plan. *Journal of Management*, *30*(1), 29–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2002.11.002

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, *69*, 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x

Hopkins, W. E., & Hopkins, S. A. (1997). Strategic planning-financial performance relationships in banks: A causal examination. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(8), 635–652. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199709)18:8%3C635::AID-SMJ904%3E3.0.CO;2-%23

Horwath, R. (2006). *The evolution of business strategy*. Strategic Thinking Institute. https://www.strategyskills.com/Articles/Documents/evolution.pdf

Hough, J. R., & White, M. A. (2003). Environmental dynamism and strategic decision-making rationality: An examination at the decision level. *Strategic Management Journal*, *24*(5), 481–489. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.303

House, R. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 324–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90024-7

Hu, J., Fitzgerald, S. M., Owen, A. J., Ryan, J., Joyce, J., Chowdhury, E., Reid, C. M., Britt, C., Woods, R. L., McNeil, J. J., & Freak, P. R. (2021). Social isolation, social support, loneliness and cardiovascular disease risk factors: A cross☐ sectional study among older adults. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *36*(11), 1795–1809. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.5601

Huff, A. S., Neyer, A. K., & Möslein, K. (2010). Broader methods to support new insights into strategizing. In D. Golsorkhi, L. Rouleau, D. Seidl, & E. Vaara (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of strategy as practice* (pp. 201–216). Cambridge University Press.

Hutzschenreuter, T., & Kleindienst, I. (2006). Strategy-process research: What have we learned and what is still to be explored. *Journal of Management*, *32*(5), 673–720. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306291485

Hyer, K., MacDonald, G., Black, K., Badana, A., Murphy, N. S., Scott, P., & Haley, W. E. (2019). Preparing for Florida's older adult population growth with user-friendly demographic maps. *Florida Public Heal*th Review, 14(4). https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/fphr/vol14/iss1/4

Iasbech, P. A. B., & Lavarda, R. A. B. (2018). Strategy and practices. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *31*(3), 347–371. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-12-2016-0207

Jarzabkowski, P. (2004). Strategy as practice: Recursiveness, adaptation and practices-in-use. *Organization Studies*, *24*(3), 489–520. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0170840604040675

Jarzabkowski, P., & Balogun, J. (2009). The practice and process of delivering integration through strategic planning. *Journal of Management Studies (Wiley-Blackwell)*, *46*(8), 1255–1288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00853.x

Jarzabkowski, P., & Fenton, E. (2006). Strategizing and organizing in pluralistic contexts. *Long Range Planning: International Journal of Strategic Management*, *39*(6), 631–648. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2006.11.002

Jarzabkowski, P., & Spee, P. A. (2009). Strategy-as-practice: A review and future directions for the field. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *11*(1), 69–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2008.00250.x

Jimenez, B. S. (2013). Strategic planning and the fiscal performance of city governments during the Great Recession. *American Review of Public Administration*, *43*(5), 581–601. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012451051

Johnsen, Å. (2016). Strategic planning and management in local government in Norway: Status after three decades. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *39*(4), 333–365. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.12077

Johnsen, Å. (2018). Impacts of strategic planning and management in municipal government: An analysis of subjective survey and objective production and efficiency measures in Norway. *Public Management Review*, *20*(3), 397–420. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285115

Johnson, G., Melin, L., & Whittington, R. (2003). Micro strategy and strategizing: Towards an activity-based view. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.t01-2-00002

Johnson, R. W. (2020). Financial challenges at older ages-and the implications for housing options. *Generations*, *44*(2), 1–11. https://generations.asaging.org/class-race-housing-challenges-fiscal-challenges

Joyce, P. (2017). *Strategic leadership in the public services* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Jung, C., & Lee, G. (2013). Goals, strategic planning, and performance in government agencies. *Public Management Review*, *15*(6), 787–815. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2012.677212

Jung, C. S., & Rainey, H. G. (2011). Organizational goal characteristics and public duty Motivation in U.S. federal agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *31*(1), 28–47. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0734371X10394404

Kaissi, A. A., & Begun, J. W. (2008). Strategic planning processes and hospital financial performance. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, *53*(3), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1097/00115514-200805000-00011

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, *9*(1), 36–41. https://senate.humboldt.edu/sites/default/files/senate/Chair%20Written%20Report%201-23-2018.pdf

Kansteiner, K., & König, S. (2020). The role(s) of qualitative content analysis in mixed methods research designs. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *21*(1), 221–242. https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-21.1.3412

Kaplan, R. S. (2011). Strategy and PowerPoint: An inquiry into the epistemic culture and machinery of strategy making. *Organization Science*, *22*(2), 320–346. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0531

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2001). *The strategy-focused organization*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interaction design*. The MIT Press.

Kelly, J. M. (2003). Citizen satisfaction and administrative performance measures. *Urban Affairs Review*, *38*(6), 855–866. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1078087403038006005

Kent, J., & Thompson, S. (2012). Health and the built environment: Exploring foundations for a new interdisciplinary profession. *Journal of Environmental & Public Health*, 1, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/958175

Keren, G., & de Bruin, W. B. (2003). *On the assessment of decision quality: Considerations regarding utility, conflict and accountability*. Wiley.

Ketokivi, M., & Castañer, X. (2004). Strategic planning as an integrative device. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *49*(3), 337–365. https://doi.org/10.2307/4131439

Kimbrell, J. D., Witmer, A., & Flaherty, P. (2002). The Louisiana Public Health Institute: A cross-sector approach for improving the public's health. *Journal of Public Health Management & Practice*, *8*(1), 68–74. https://doi.org/10.1097/00124784-200201000-00014

Kline, R. B. (2004). *Beyond significance testing: Reforming data analysis methods in behavioral research*. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10693-000

Knutsson, H., Mattisson, O., Ramberg, U., & Tagesson, T. (2008). Do strategy and management matter in municipal organisations? *Financial Accountability & Management*, *24*(3), 295–319. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0408.2008.00454.x

Koontz, T. M., & Newig, J. (2014). From planning to implementation: Top-down and bottom-up approaches for collaborative watershed management. *Policy Studies Journal*, *42*(3), 416–442. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12067

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. Free Press.

Kreuter, M. W., De Rosa, C., Howze, E. H., & Baldwin, G. T. (2004). Understanding wicked problems: A key to advancing environmental health promotion. *Health Education & Behavior*, *31*(4), 441–454. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1090198104265597

Kroll, A., & Moynihan, D. P. (2015). Creating public value using performance information. In J. M. Bryson, B. Crosby, & L. Bloomberg (Eds)., *Public Value and Public Administration* (pp. 189–203). Georgetown University Press.

Kudla, R. J. (1980). The effects of strategic planning on common stock returns. *Academy of Management Journal*, *23*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.2307/255493

Kuwada, K. (1998). Strategic learning: The continuous side of discontinuous strategic change. *Organization Science*, *9*(6), 719–736. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.9.6.719

Lambdin, C. (2012). Significance tests as sorcery: Science is empirical—significance tests are not. *Theory & Psychology*, *22*(1), 67–90. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0959354311429854

Larson, E. (2017, September 21). New research: Diversity + inclusion = better decision making at work. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/eriklarson/2017/09/21/new-research-diversity-inclusion-better-decision-making-at-work/?sh=16cc66c44cbf

Latham, G. P. (2004). The motivational benefits of goal-setting. *Academy of Management Executive*, *18*(4), 126–129. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2004.15268727

Lavee, E., Cohen, N., & Nouman, H. (2018). Reinforcing public responsibility? Influences and practices in street☐level bureaucrats' engagement in policy design. *Public Administration*, *96*(2), 333–348. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12402

Lawrence, R. J. (2010). Beyond disciplinary confinement to imaginative transdisciplinarity. In J. Harris, V. A. Brown, & J. Russell (Eds.), *Tackling wicked problems* (pp. 34–48). Routledge.

Leach, R. (1997). Incrementalism and rationalism in local government reorganisation 1957-1996. *Public Policy and Administration, 12*(3), 59–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/095207679701200305

Lee, D., McGuire, M., & Kim, J. H. (2018). Collaboration, strategic plans, and government performance: The case of efforts to reduce homelessness. *Public Management Review*, *20*(3), 360–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285113

Lemak, C. H., & Goodrick, E. (2003). Strategy as simple rules: Understanding success in a rural clinic. *Health Care Management Review*, *28*(2), 179–188. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004010-200304000-00008

Liedtka, J. (2000). Strategic planning as a contributor to strategic change: A generative model. *European Management Journal*, *18*(2), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(99)00091-2

Lindblom, C. E. (1979). Still muddling, not yet through. *Public Administration Review*, *39*(6), 517–526. https://doi.org/10.2307/976178

Lindeke, L. L., & Block, D. E. (1998). Maintaining professional integrity in the midst of interdisciplinary collaboration. *Nursing Outlook*, *46*(5), 213–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0029-6554(98)90052-5

Lindeke, L. L., & Sieckert, A. M. (2005). Nurse-physician workplace collaboration. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, *10*(1), Article 5. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15727548/

Loayza, L. S., & Valenzuela, M. T. (2021). Health-related quality of life in older people with functional independence or mild dependence. *Aging & Mental Health*, *25*(12), 2213–2218. https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2020.1830943

Lopez, R. P., & Hynes, P. H. (2006). Obesity, physical activity, and the urban environment: Public health research needs. *Environmental Health: A Global Access Science Source*, *5*, 25–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-5-25

Mansourimoaied, M., Boman, K., & Causley, T. (2000). Nurses' perceptions of interdisciplinary collaboration. *Nursingconnections*, *13*(1), 21–31. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12016657/

Martin, R. L. (2014). The big lie of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, *92*(1/2), 78–84. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5543983

Mayntz, R. (2004). Mechanisms in the analysis of social macro-phenomena. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, *34*(2), 237–259. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0048393103262552

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, *1*(2). https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385

McGuire, M. (2006). Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. *Public Administration Review*, *66*, 33–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00664.x

Meier, K. J., O'Toole, L. J., Jr., Boyne, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2007). Strategic management and the performance of public organizations: Testing venerable ideas against recent theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, *17*(3), 357–377. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mul017

Meissner, P. (2014). A process-based perspective on strategic planning: The role of alternative generation and information integration. *Business Research*, *7*(1), 105–124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-014-0005-9

Mendoza, J. A., Salmon, J., Sallis, J. F., Mendoza, J. A., Salmon, J., & Sallis, J. F. (2012). Partnerships for progress in active living: From research to action. *Health & Place*, *18*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.09.012

Mick, S. S., Morlock, L. L., Salkever, D., de Lissovoy, G., Malitz, F., Wise, C. G., & Jones, A. (1994). Strategic activity and financial performance of U.S. rural hospitals: A national study, 1983 to 1988. *The Journal of Rural Health*, *10*(3), 150–167. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-0361.1994.tb00225.x

Miller, C. C., & Cardinal, L. B. (1994). Strategic planning and firm performance: A synthesis of more than two decades of research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(6), 1649–1665. https://doi.org/10.2307/256804

Miller, S., Wilson, D., & Hickson, D. (2004). Beyond planning: Strategies for successfully implementing strategic decisions. *Long Range Planning: International Journal of Strategic Management*, *37*(3), 201–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2004.03.003

Miner, A. S., Bassoff, P., & Moorman, C. (2001). Organizational improvisation and learning: A field study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*(2), 304–337. https://doi.org/10.2307%2F2667089

Mintzberg, H. (1987). Crafting strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, *65*(4), 66–75. https://hbr.org/1987/07/crafting-strategy

Mintzberg, H. (1994). The fall and rise of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, *72*(1), 107–114. https://hbr.org/1994/01/the-fall-and-rise-of-strategic-planning

Mintzberg, H. (2000). Response to Constantinos Markide's commentary. *Academy of Management Executive*, *14*(3), 41–42. https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.2000.26206672

Mintzberg, H., & Lampel, J. (1999). Reflecting on the strategy process. *Sloan Management Review*, *40*(3), 21–30. https://www.proquest.com/openview/cc43725352489aa60a51dfb3f8c9f801/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=26142

Mitchell, P. H., & Crittensen, R. A. (2000). Interdisciplinary collaboration: Old ideas with new urgency. *Washington Public Health*, *Fall Issue*, 1-3.

Mizrahi, T., & Abramson, J. S. (2000). Collaboration between social workers and physicians: Perspectives on a shared case. *Social Work in Health Care*, *31*(3), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1300/J010v31n03_01

Montgomery, C. A. (2008). Putting leadership back into strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, *86*(1), 54–60. https://hbr.org/2008/01/putting-leadership-back-into-strategy

Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1998). The convergence of planning and execution: Improvisation in new product development. *Journal of Marketing*, *62*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299806200301

Moynihan, D. P. (2008). *The dynamics of performance management: Constructing information and reform*. Georgetown University Press.

Moynihan, D. P., & Hawes, D. P. (2012). Responsiveness to reform values: The influence of the environment on performance information use. *Public Administration Review*, *72*(s1), S95–S105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02653.x

Mulgan, G. (2009). *The art of public strategy: Mobilizing power and knowledge for the common good*. Oxford University Press.

Nartisa, I., Putans, R., & Muravska, T. (2012). Strategic planning and management in public and private sector organizations in Europe: Comparative analysis and opportunities for improvement. *European Integration Studies*, *6*, 240–248. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.eis.0.6.1538

National Opinion Research Center. (2018). *Lon*g-term care poll. https://www.longtermcarepoll.org

Nelson, L., Houston, K. T., Hoffman, J., & Bradham, T. S. (2011). Interdisciplinary collaboration in EHDI programs. *Volta Review*, *111*(2), 267–279. https://doi.org/10.17955/tvr.111.2.m.665

Nicolini, D., Mengis, J., & Swan, J. (2012). Understanding the role of objects in cross-disciplinary collaboration. *Organization Science*, *23*(3), 612–629. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1110.0664

Niven, P. R. (2003, April 22). Adapting the Balanced Scorecard to fit the public and nonprofit sectors. In *Balanced Scorecard step-by-step for government and nonprofit agencies* (2nd ed., Chapter 2). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119197287.ch2

Nunn, R., Parsons, J., & Shambaugh, J. (2020, March). *A dozen facts about the economics of the U.S. health-care system*. The Hamilton Project. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/HealthCare_Facts_WEB_FINAL.pdf

Nutt, P. C., & Backoff, R. W. (1993). Transforming public organizations with strategic management and strategic leadership. *Journal of Management*, *19*(2), Article 299. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639301900206

Obeng, K., & Ugboro, I. (2008). Effective strategic planning in public transit systems. *Transportation Research: Part E*, *44*(3), 420–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2006.10.008

Ocasio, W., & Joseph, J. (2008). Rise and fall - or transformation? The evolution of strategic planning at the General Electric Company, 1940–2006. *Long Range Planning*, *41*(3), 248–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2008.02.010

Okoro, C. A., Hollis, N. D., Cyrus, A. C., & Griffin-Blake, S. (2018). Prevalence of disabilities and health care access by disability status and type among adults—United States, 2016. *Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report*, *67*(32), 882–887. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6732a3

The Older Americans Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89–73, 79 Stat. 218 (1965).

O'Leary, R., & Vij, N. (2012). Collaborative public management: Where have we been and where are we going? *American Review of Public Administration*, *42*(5), 507–522. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012445780

Olsen, J. B., & Eadie, D. C. (1984). *The game plan: Governance with foresight*. Council on State Planning Agencies.

Orlikowski, W. J. (2010). The sociomateriality of organisational life: Considering technology in management research. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *34*(1), 125–141. https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bep058

Osborne, S. (2006). The new public governance? *Public Management Review*, *8*, 377–388. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030600853022

O'Shannassy, T. (2003). Modern strategic management: Balancing strategic thinking and strategic planning for internal and external stakeholders. *Singapore Management Review*, *25*(1), 53–67. https://researchrepository.rmit.edu.au/esploro/outputs/journalArticle/Modern-strategic-management-balancing-strategic-thinking-and-strategic-planning-for-internal-and-external-stakeholders/9921858950801341

O'Toole, L. J., Jr., & Meier, K. J. (2015). Public management, context, and performance: In quest of a more general theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *25*(1), 237–256. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu011

Ouakouak, M. L., & Ouedraogo, N. (2013). The mediating role of employee strategic alignment in the relationship between rational strategic planning and firm performance: A European study. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *30*(3), 143–158. https://doi.org/10.1002/CJAS.1259

Pal, L. A. (2011). Assessing incrementalism: Formative assumptions, contemporary realities. *Policy and Society*, *30*(1), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2010.12.004

Papke-Shields, K. E., & Boyer-Wright, K. M. (2017). Strategic planning characteristics applied to project management. *International Journal of Project Management*, *35*(2), 169–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.015

Papke-Shields, K. E., Malhotra, M. K., & Grover, V. (2002). Strategic manufacturing planning systems and their linkage to planning system success. *Decision Sciences*, *33*(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2002.tb01634.x

Papke-Shields, K. E., Malhotra, M. K., & Grover, V. (2006). Evolution in the strategic manufacturing planning process of organizations. *Journal of Operations Management*, *24*(5), 421–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2005.11.012

Pasha, O. Q., Poister, T. H., & Edwards, L. H. (2018). Mutual relationship of strategic stances and formulation methods, and their impacts on performance in public local transit agencies. *Administration & Society*, *50*(6), 884–910. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399715587524

Patanakul, P., & Shenhar, A. J. (2012). What project strategy really is: The fundamental building block in strategic project management. *Project Management Journal*, *43*(1), 4–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20282

Patterson, K. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Publication No. 3082719) [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Publishing. https://www.proquest.com/openview/060158b52c355bdd0a31e67bc006f6f5/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Pearce, J. A., II., & David, F. (1987). Corporate mission statements: The bottom line. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *1*(2), 109–115. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1987.4275821

Pearce, J. A., II., Freeman, E. B., & Robinson, R. B., Jr. (1987). The tenuous link between formal strategic planning and financial performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 658–675. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1987.4306718

Persaud, S. (2018). Addressing social determinants of health through advocacy. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, *42*(2), 123–128. https://doi.org/10.1097/NAQ.0000000000000277

Petkovic, J., Jasinskas, E., & Jeseviciuté-Ufartiené, L. (2016). Significance of strategic planning for results of sport organization. *E+M Ekonomie a Management*, *19*(4), 56–72. https://dspace5.zcu.cz/handle/11025/22063

Petri, L. (2010). Concept analysis of interdisciplinary collaboration. *Nursing Forum*, *45*(2), 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2010.00167.x

Phillips, J., Richard, A., Mayer, K. M., Shilkaitis, M., Fogg, L. F., & Vondracek, H. (2020). Integrating the social determinants of health into nursing practice: Nurses' perspectives. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *52*(5), 497–505. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12584

Planalp, C. (2021). *Measuring state-level disparities in unhealthy days*. State Health Access Data Assistance Center. https://www.shadac.org/news/measuring-unhealthy-days-SHC

Poister, T. H. (2010). The future of strategic planning in the public sector: Linking strategic management and performance. *Public Administration Review*, *70*, s246–s254. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02284.x

Poister, T. H., Aristigueta, M. P., & Hall, J. L. (2015). *Managing and measuring performance in public and nonprofit organizations: An integrated approach*. Jossey-Bass.

Poister, T. H., Edwards, L. H., Pasha, O. Q., & Edwards, J. (2013). Strategy formulation and performance. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *36*(4), 585–615. https://doi.org/10.2753/PMR1530-9576360405

Poister, T. H., Pasha, O. Q., & Edwards, L. H. (2013). Does performance management lead to better outcomes? Evidence from the U.S. public transit industry. *Public Administration Review*, *73*(4), 625–636. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12076

Poister, T. H., Pitts, D. W., & Edwards, L. H. (2010). Strategic management research in the public sector: A review, synthesis, and future directions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, *40*(5), 522–545. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010370617

Poister, T. H., & Streib, G. (2005). Elements of strategic planning and management in municipal government: Status after two decades. *Public Administration Review*, *65*(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00429.x

Poister, T. H., & Van Slyke, D. M. (2002). Strategic management innovations in state transportation departments. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *26*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2002.11643687

Polivka, L., & Polivka-West, L. (2020). The changing role of non-profit organizations in the U.S. long term care system. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, *32*(2), 101–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2019.1642693

Porter, M. E. (1996). What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, *74*(10), 61–78. https://hbr.org/1996/11/what-is-strategy

Prange, K., Allen, J. A., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2016). Collective impact versus collaboration: Sides of the same coin or different phenomenon? *Metropolitan Universities*, *27*(1), 86–96. https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/muj/article/view/21119

PR Newswire. (2020, April 7). *Long term care market size, share & trends analysis report by service, by region and segment forecasts, 2020 - 2027*. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/long-term-care—arket-size-share--trends-analysis-report-by-service-by-region-and-segment-forecasts-2020---2027-301036618.html

Quinn, J. B. (1978). *Strategic change: Logical incrementalism* (EJ194021). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ194021

Quinn, J. B. (1980). *Strategies for change: Logical incrementalism*. Irwin.

Rachoin, J.-S., Olsen, P., Gaughan, J., & Cerceo, E. (2021). Racial differences in outcomes and utilization after cardiac arrest in the USA: A longitudinal study comparing different geographical regions in the USA from 2006-2018. *Resuscitation*, *169*, 115–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2021.10.038

Raharjo, H., & Eriksson, H. (2017). Exploring differences between private and public organizations in business excellence models. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *37*(12), 1795–1816. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-09-2015-0593

Ramanujam, V., Venkatraman, N., & Camillus, J. C. (1986). Multi-objective assessment of effectiveness of strategic planning: A discriminant analysis approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, *29*(2), 347–372. https://doi.org/10.2307/256192

Reckrey, J. M., Federman, A. D., Bollens-Lund, E., Morrison, R. S., & Ornstein, K. A. (2020). Homebound status and the critical role of caregiving support. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, *32*(6), 590–603. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2019.1628625

Reinhard, S., Houser, A., Ujvari, K., Gualtieri, C., Harrell, R., Lingamfelter, P., & Alexis, J. (2020, September 24). *Advancing Action*, *2020: A State Scorecard on long-term services and supports for older adults*, *people with physical disabilities*, *and family caregivers*. http://www.longtermscorecard.org/~/media/Microsite/Files/2020/LTSS%202020%20Short%20Report%20PDF%20923.pdf

Rentfrow, P. J. (2010). Statewide differences in personality: Toward a psychological geography of the United States. *American Psychologist*, *65*(6), 548–558. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018194

Rentfrow, P. J., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). A theory of the emergence, persistence, and expression of geographic variation in psychological characteristics. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*, 339–369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00084.x

Rhyne, L. C. (1986). The relationship of strategic planning to financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *7*(5), 423–436. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250070504

Rhyne, L. C. (1987). Contrasting planning systems in high, medium and low performance companies. *Journal of Management Studies*, *24*(4), 363–385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1987.tb00451.x

Rigby, D., & Bilodeau, B. (2018). *Management tools and trends 2018*. Bain & Company. https://www.bain.com/contentassets/f8361c5cd99e4f40bbbf83c17d6a91b9/bain_brief-management_tools_and_trends.pdf

Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*(2), 155–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01405730

Robinson, R. B., Jr., & Pearce, J. A., II. (1983). The impact of formalized strategic planning on financial performance in small organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, *4*(3), 197–207. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250040302

Rock, D., & Grant, H. (2016). Why diverse teams are smarter. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, *4*(5), 2–4. https://www.agileleanhouse.com/lib/lib/Topics/Teams/Why%20Diverse%20Teams%20Are%20Smarter.pdf

Rouleau, L. (2013). Strategy-as-practice research at a crossroads. *Management*, *16*(5), 547–365. https://doi.org/10.3917/mana.165.0574

Rudd, J. M., Greenley, G. E., Beatson, A. T., & Lings, I. N. (2008). Strategic planning and performance: Extending the debate. *Journal of Business Research*, *61*(2), 99–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.06.014

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23*(3), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730210424

Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. SAGE.

Saleh, S., Kaissi, A., Semaan, A., & Natafgi, N. M. (2013). Strategic planning processes and financial performance among hospitals in Lebanon. *International Journal of Health Planning & Management*, *28*(1), e34–e45. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2128

Salem, E., Hooberman, J., & Ramirez, D. (2005). MAPP in Chicago: A model for public health systems development and community building. *Journal of Public Health Management & Practice*, *11*(5), 393–400. https://doi.org/10.1097/00124784-200509000-00004

Salomo, S., Weise, J., & Gemünden, H. G. (2007). NPD planning activities and innovation performance: The mediating role of process management and the moderating effect of product innovativeness. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *24*(4), 285–302. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2007.00252.x

Samimi, M., Cortes, A. F., Anderson, M. H., & Herrmann, P. (2020). What is strategic leadership? Developing a framework for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *33*(3), Article 101353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101353

Samuelsson, P., & Nilsson, L. E. (2002). Self-assessment practices in large organisations. Experiences from using the EFQM excellence model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, *19*(1), 10–23. https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710210413426

Sanders, S., & Rector, B. (2021). Care management from the state perspective: Issues, challenges, and improvements. *Generations*, *45*(1), 1–9. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48631225

Sarason, Y., & Tegarden, F. (2003). The erosion of the competitive advantage of strategic planning. *Journal of Business and Management*, *9*(1), 1–21. http://gebrc.nccu.edu.tw/JBM/pdf/volume/0901/0901-1-20.pdf

Sawilowsky, S. S. (2009). New effect size rules of thumb. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, *8*(2), 597–599. https://doi.org/10.22237/jmasm/1257035100

Schendel, D., & Hofer, C. W. (Eds.). (1979). *Strategic management: A new view of business policy and planning*. Little, Brown.

Schmidle, T. P. (2012). Does the final score truly count? Performance report scorecards and the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. *Public Administration Review*, *72*(6), 926–934. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02658.x

Schwenk, C. B., & Shrader, C. B. (1993). Effects of formal strategic planning on financial performance in small firms: A meta-analysis. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, *17*(3), 53–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879301700304

Segars, A. H., Grover, V., & Teng, J. T. C. (1998). Strategic information systems planning: Planning system dimensions, internal coalignment and implications for planning effectiveness. *Decision Sciences*, *29*(2), 303–345. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.1998.tb01579.x

Seidl, D., & Whittington, R. (2014). Enlarging the strategy-as-practice research agenda: Towards taller and flatter ontologies. *Organization Studies*, *35*(10), 1407–1421. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840614541886

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Crown.

Shah, G. H., Corso, L., Sotnikov, S., & Leep, C. J. (2019). Impact of local boards of health on local health department accreditation, community health assessment, community health improvement planning, and strategic planning. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, *25*(5), 423–430. https://doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0000000000000847

Sharmila, K. (2020). Role of happiness in health of elderly. *Indian Journal of Gerontology*, *34*(4), 544–552. https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:ijg&volume=34&issue=4&article=009

Shrader, C. B., Taylor, L., & Dalton, D. R. (1984). Strategic planning and organizational performance: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Management*, *10*(2), 149–171. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638401000202

Signal, L. N., Walton, M. D., Ni Mhurchu, C., Maddison, R., Bowers, S. G., Carter, K. N., Gorton, D., Heta, C., Lanumata, T. S., McKerchar, C. W., O'Dea, D., & Pearce, J. (2013). Tackling 'wicked' health promotion problems: A New Zealand case study. *Health Promotion International*, *28*(1), 84–94. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/das006

Sila, I., & Ebrahimpour, M. (2003). Examination and comparison of the critical factors of total quality management (TQM) across countries. *International Journal of Production Research*, *41*(2), 235–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/0020754021000022212

Sillince, J., & Mueller, F. (2007). Switching strategic perspective: The reframing of accounts of responsibility. *Organization Studies*, *28*(2), 155–176. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0170840606067989

Simonet, D. V., & Tett, R. P. (2013). Five perspectives on the leadership-management relationship: A competency-based evaluation and integration. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *20*(2), 199–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812467205

Sirén, C., & Kohtamäki, M. (2016). Stretching strategic learning to the limit: The interaction between strategic planning and learning. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(2), 653–663. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.08.035

Song, M., Im, S., Bij, H. V. D., & Song, L. Z. (2011). Does strategic planning enhance or impede innovation and firm performance? *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *28*(4), 503–520. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2011.00822.x

Spee, A. P., & Jarzabkowski, P. (2009). Strategy tools as boundary objects. *Strategic Organization*, *7*(2), 223–232. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1476127009102674

Spee, A. P., & Jarzabkowski, P. A. (2011). Strategic planning as communicative process. *Organization Studies*, *32*(9), 1217–1245. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840611411387

Stephens, B., & Cummings, J. N. (2021). Knowledge creation through collaboration: The role of shared institutional affiliations and physical proximity. *Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology*, *72*(11), 1337–1353. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24491

Suarez, E., Calvo-Mora, A., & Roldán, J. L. (2016). The role of strategic planning in excellence management systems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *248*(2), 532–542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.07.008

Sullivan, G. M., & Feinn, R. (2012). Using effect size—Or why the *P* value is not enough. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *4*(3), 279–282. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-12-00156.1

Tama, J. (2015). The politics of strategy: Why government agencies conduct major strategic reviews. *Journal of Public Policy*, *37*(1), 27–54. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X15000148

Tama, J. (2018). How an agency's responsibilities and political context shape government strategic planning: Evidence from U.S. federal agency quadrennial reviews. *Public Management Review*, *20*(3), 377–396. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285114

Tecker, G. (2017, April 3). *What are associations spending to develop new strategic plans?* https://www.tecker.com/cost-to-develop-new-strategic-plan/

Terrell, S. R. (2016). *Writing a proposal for your dissertation: Guidelines and examples*. Guilford Press.

Thomas, J. B., Sussman, S. W., & Henderson, J. C. (2001). Understanding "strategic learning": Linking organizational learning, knowledge management, and sensemaking. *Organization Science*, *12*(3), 331–345. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.3.331.10105

Thompson, S., & McCue, P. (2016). Healthy planning: An evolving collaborative partnership. *Urban Policy & Research*, *34*(1), 73–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/08111146.2016.1140032

Tong, C. E., Sims-Gould, J., Lusina-Furst, S., & McKay, H. (2021). More than a meeting: Identifying the needs of the community-based seniors' services sector as providers of health promotion services. *BioMed Central Research Notes*, *14*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-021-05753-y

Ugboro, I. O., Obeng, K., & Spann, O. (2011). Strategic planning as an effective tool of strategic management in public sector organizations: Evidence from public transit organizations. *Administration & Society*, *43*(1), 87–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399710386315

U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Census regions and divisions of the United States. Geography division*. https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). American community survey [Data set]. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (n.d.). *HHS organizational chart*. https://www.hhs.gov/about/agencies/orgchart/index.html

Vaara, E., & Durand, R. (2012). How to connect strategy research with broader issues that matter? *Strategic Organization*, *10*(3), 248–255. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1476127012452827

Vaara, E., & Whittington, R. (2012). Strategy-as-practice: Taking social practices seriously. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *6*(1), 285–336. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2012.672039

Valluru, G., Yudin, J., Patterson, C. L., Kubisiak, J., Boling, P., Taler, G., De Jonge, K. E., Touzell, S., Danish, A., Ornstein, K., & Kinosian, B. (2019). Integrated home□ and community□based services improve community survival among independence at home Medicare beneficiaries without increasing Medicaid costs. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, *67*(7), 1495–1501. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.15968

Van der Heijden, K. (2005). *Scenarios: The art of strategic conversation* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Van Dooren, W., Bouckaert, G., & Halligan, J. (2010). *Performance management in the public sector*. Routledge.

Vazirani, S., Hays, R. D., Shapiro, M. F., & Cowan, M. (2005). Effect of multidisciplinary intervention on communication and collaboration among physicians and nurses. *American Journal of Critical Care*, *14*(1), 71–77. https://doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2005.14.1.71

Venkateswaran, R., & Prabhu, G. N. (2010). Taking stock of research methods in strategy-as-practice. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, *8*(2), 156–162. https://academic-publishing.org/index.php/ejbrm/article/view/1262

Verghese, J., Ayers, E., Sathyan, S., Lipton, R. B., Milman, S., Barzilai, N., & Wang, C. (2021). Trajectories of frailty in aging: Prospective cohort study. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(7), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253976

Vidyarthi, S., Hoch, C., & Basmajian, C. (2013). Making sense of India's spatial plan-making practice: Enduring approach or emergent variations. *Planning Theory and Practice*, *14*(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.750682

Vigar, G. (2006). Deliberation, participation and learning in the development of regional strategies: Transport policy making in North East England. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *7*(3), 267–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350600841446

Vilà, J., & Canales, J. I. (2008). Can strategic planning make strategy more relevant and build commitment over time? The case of RACC. *Long Range Planning*, *41*(3), 273–290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2008.02.009

Vinzant, D. H., & Vinzant, J. C. (1996). Strategy and organizational capacity: Finding a fit. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, *20*, 139–157. https://doi.org/10.2307/3380482

Wales, W., Monsen, E., & McKelvie, A. (2011). The organizational pervasiveness of entrepreneurial orientation. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, *35*(5), 895–923. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00451.x

Walker, R. M., & Andrews, R. (2015). Local government management and performance: A review of evidence. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, *25*(1), 101–133. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mut038

Walker, R. M., Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., Meier, K. J., & O'Toole, L. J. (2010). Wakeup call: Strategic management, network alarms, and performance. *Public Administration Review*, *70*(5), 731–741. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02201.x

Walker, R. M., & Boyne, G. A. (2006). Public management reform and organizational performance: An empirical assessment of the UK Labour government's public service improvement strategy. *The Journal of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management*, *25*(2), 371–393. https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20177

Walker, R. M., Damanpour, F., & Devece, C. A. (2011). Management innovation and organizational performance: The mediating effect of performance management. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, *21*(2), 367–386. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muq043

Wasserstein, R. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2016). The ASA statement on *p*-values: Context, process, and purpose. *The American Statistician*, *70*(2), 129–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2016.1154108

Watson, R., Wilson, H. N., & Macdonald, E. K. (2020). Business-nonprofit engagement in sustainability-oriented innovation: What works for whom and why? *Journal of Business Research*, *119*, 87–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.11.023

Wells, R., Lee, S.-Y. D., McClure, J., Baronner, L., & Davis, L. (2004). Strategy development in small hospitals: Stakeholder management in constrained circumstances. *Health Care Management Review*, *29*(3), 218–228. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004010-200407000-00007

Werle, F., & Seidl, D. (2015). The layered materiality of strategizing: Epistemic objects and the interplay between material artifacts in the exploration of strategic topics. *British Journal of Management*, *26*, S67–S89. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12080

Wheeland, C. M. (2003). Implementing a community-wide strategic plan. *American Review of Public Administration*, *33*(1), 46–69. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074003251251

Whittington, R. (2006). Completing the practice turn in strategy research. *Organization Studies*, *27*(5), 613–634. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606064101

Whittington, R. (2007). Strategy practice and strategy process: Family differences and the sociological eye. *Organization Studies*, *28*(10), 1575–1586. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607081557

Whittington, R. (2011). The practice turn in organization research: Towards a disciplined transdisciplinarity. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, *36*(3), 183–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2011.04.003

Whittington, R., & Cailluet, L. (2008). The crafts of strategy: Special issue introduction by the guest editors. *Long Range Planning*, *41*(3), 241–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2008.03.003

Wicks, A., & Jamieson, M. (2014). New ways for occupational scientists to tackle "wicked problems" impacting population health. *Journal of Occupational Science*, *21*(1), 81–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/14427591.2014.878208

Wiltbank, R., Dew, N., Read, S., & Sarasvathy, S. D. (2006). What to do next? The case for non-predictive strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, *27*(10), 981–998. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.555

Wolf, C., & Floyd, S. W. (2017). Strategic planning research: Toward a theory-driven
     agenda. *Journal of Management*, *43*(6), 1754–1788.
     https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313478185

Wolff, T., Minkler, M., Wolfe, S. M., Berkowitz, B., Bowen, L., Butterfoss, F. D.,
     Christens, B. D., Francisco, V. T., Himmelman, A. T., & Lee, K. S. (2016).
     Collaborating for equity and justice: Moving beyond collective impact. *Nonprofit
     Quarterly*, *23*(4), 42–53. http://clevelandnp.org/CollabEquityJustice-
     MovingBeyondNPQWinter17.pdf

Wong, P. T., & Page, D. (2003, October 16). *Servant leadership: An opponent-process
     model and the revised Servant Leadership Profile* [Regent University servant
     leadership roundtable]. Virginia Beach, VI, United States.
     http://www.drpaulwong.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Wong-Servant-
     Leadership-An-Opponent-Process-Model.pdf

Woyzbun, R. P. (n.d.). The evolution of strategic planning. *The Marketing Works*, 1-8.
     http://docplayer.net/31446226-The-evolution-of-strategic-planning.html

Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Schriesheim, C. A., & Dansereau, F. (2008). Authentic
     leadership and positive organizational behavior: A meso, multi-level perspective.
     The Leadership Quarterly, *19*(6), 693–707.
     https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.09.004

Yang, K., & Hsieh, J. Y. (2007). Managerial effectiveness of government performance
     measurement: Testing a middle□range model. *Public Administration Review*,
     67(5), 861–879. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00774.x

Yeager, S. (2005). Interdisciplinary collaboration: The heart and soul of health care.
     Critical Care Nursing Clinics of North America, *17*(2), 143–148.
     https://www.ccnursing.theclinics.com/article/S0899-5885(05)00004-3/fulltext

Zanin, F., Lusiani, M., & Bagnoli, C. (2020). The swinging role of visualization in
     strategic planning. *Journal of Management & Governance*, *24*(4), 1019–1054.
     https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-019-09499-5

Zwarenstein, M., & Bryant, W. (2000). Interventions to promote collaboration between
     nurses and doctors. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, *2*, Article
     CD000072. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000072

Appendix A – Coding Agenda

Diversified Collaboration

Category	Definition	Examples	Coding rule
Private organization	Businesses or corporations looking to maximize market share and profits (Bryson et al., 2018).	Businesses; technical professionals such as architects and builders; specific industries such as food service or media; and private sector advocacy groups such as chambers of commerce, trade unions, or economic development corporations.	Website notes profits, market share, shareholders, or has a business designation such as sole proprietorship, LLC, corporation (e.g., C, S, B corp).
Nonprofit organization	Organizations whose net earnings do not benefit shareholders and that have a tax-exempt status as defined by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) code, such as 501(c)(3) charitable and philanthropic organizations and 501(c)(6) trade and professional associations.	Foundations and philanthropies; social services organizations or campaigns; employment services; professional associations; special interest coalitions; cultural institutions; and churches or other faith-based groups.	Website notes a not-for-profit operating model. May or may not be designated by the IRS as a 501(C) organization. Other categories do not apply (such as an academic or health care organization).
Academic institution	Higher education organizations (e.g., universities and colleges) that contribute to society through knowledge generation and transfer (By et al., 2008).	Universities and colleges or their associated programs, centers, or cooperative extensions.	The organization's name or website states it is a university, college, or an associated entity. It may be private, public, or nonprofit, but the organization is only counted in this category.
Health care organization or system	Health care provider organizations or a group of entities that operate according to contractual or informal arrangements between two or more health care provider organizations (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2016).	Individuals such as doctors, nurses, social workers, health educators, nutritionists, mental health or substance abuse providers, or representatives of entities such as: hospitals, physician groups, medical groups, private practices, neighborhood health centers, health insurance companies, and pharmaceutical or medical supplies companies.	The name of the representative's organization or website states it is a health care organization or system, or the individual is listed as being a professional doctor, nurse, social worker, health educator, nutritionist, or mental health or substance abuse provider. "Providers" may be listed generically and will be accepted with the assumption that these providers are for medical services or for home- and community-based health services that are an extension of, or support, the continuum of care.

Category	Definition	Examples	Coding rule
Local public agency	Public agency often at the forefront of service delivery from a range of jurisdictions, including communities, cities, municipalities, counties, or regions (Bryson et al., 2009; Clary, 2021; Grant, 2020; Johnsen, 2016; Kimbrell et al., 2002; Poister & Streib, 2005; Walker & Andrews, 2015).	May be involved in an array of different policy areas, including education and libraries, housing, transportation, planning and development, parks and recreation, and elder care services.	The organization's name or website states its service area such as a specific community, city, municipality, county, or region; the agency is a publicly funded or governmental organization. Or an individual is listed as an elected or appointed official in a local service area, or their designee.
State public agency	Any public department, commission, council, board, committee, institution, legislative body, agency, government corporation of the state, or official of the executive, legislative or judicial branch of the government of the state (Law Insider, n.d.).	May be involved in an array of different policy areas, including public health; human and social services; court systems or legal authorities; law enforcement and emergency responders; transportation; urban planning and environmental health; housing; and parks, recreation, and sport.	The organization's name or website identifies it as state agency – either in the same state or in another state – that works in a policy area other than aging services. Or an individual is listed as a state elected or appointed official, or their designee. Representatives or groups from Native American or tribal nations working as a government-to-government entity will be coded in the state category (*Note*: It is required for a letter of intent to accompany the state plan and the letter must be signed by the head of the state unit and the governor. The governor will not be counted here if the only place they are represented is their signature on the letter of intent).
Federal public agency	Public bureau, office, agency, department or other entity of the United States Government (Law Insider, n.d.). often responsible for driving innovations within all levels of government (Bryson et al., 2018; Harris, 1993; Poister, Edwards, et al., 2013; Tama, 2015).	May be involved in an array of different policy areas, including federal health programs, taxation, finance, welfare, social security, industry and workplace relations, agriculture, and energy.	The organization's name or website identifies it as a federal agency or, an individual is listed as a federal elected or appointed official such as a U.S. legislator, or their designee.
Internal staff	Individuals inside their own organizations [the state unit on aging] assigned a defined place within the organizational hierarchy (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009).	All levels of management and frontline operations within the state unit on aging; executives, strategic planners, program staff.	Internal staff members responsible for contributing to the plan or coordinating its development are listed (*Note*: The head of the state unit will not be counted here if the only place they are

Category	Definition	Examples	Coding rule
			represented is their signature on the letter of intent).
Public Input	Individuals who do not have an allocated hierarchy, line, or role within the organization's [state unit on aging's] structure (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009).	Citizens or residents, public service recipients who are directly affected by the strategies, and small civic organizations such as neighborhood associations and block clubs.	Plan documents public comment activities related to the elements of plan design (e.g., mission statement, issue identification, goals, and strategies, etc). that were gathered through a variety of means including online or in-person public forums, interviews, focus groups, or surveys.

Plan Design

Category	Definition	Examples	Coding rule
Identified vision statement	A vision statement is "a description of what an organization will look like if it succeeds in implementing its strategies and achieves its full potential" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170).	VISION To help society and state government prepare for the aging demographics through effective leadership, advocacy, and stewardship. The vision of the agency is to help society and state government prepare for the aging demographics through effective leadership, advocacy, and stewardship.	Vision statement is labeled or narrative states the vision of the agency.
Identified mission statement	A mission statement is "a statement of organizational purpose" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 169) that "provides a reason for stakeholders to support the organization" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 151).	MISSION To promote the independence and dignity of those served through a comprehensive and coordinated system of quality services. The mission of the agency is to promote the independence and dignity of those served through a comprehensive and coordinated system of quality services.	Mission statement is labeled or narrative states the mission of the agency. If the mission is labeled as a purpose statement, that will be accepted.
Values or a values statement	An organization's values or values statement is "a description of the code of behavior (in relation to employees, other key stakeholders, and society at large) to which an organization adheres or aspires" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170).	VALUES Leadership: We set the direction for ensuring that strategies, systems, and methods for achieving excellence are created; and for building the knowledge and capabilities of our employees and others who work with our customers. The Department strives to pursue its Vision and accomplish its Mission in a manner consistent with the Values outlined below. Leadership: We set the direction for ensuring that strategies, systems, and methods for achieving excellence are created; and for building the knowledge and capabilities of our employees and others who work with our customers.	Value(s)/statement is labeled or narrative states the values of the agency. If the values are labeled as guiding principles or foundations, that will be accepted.

Category	Definition	Examples	Coding rule
Issue identification	Issues identification is defined as the identification of the set of "policy choice[s] or change challenge[s] affecting an organization's mandates, mission, product or service level and mix, clients or users, costs, financing, structure, processes, or management" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 85). Issue identification may include a SWOT analysis and consider how the components of the SWOT are related to the organization's "ability to meet its mandates, fulfill its mission, realize its vision, or create public value" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 89)	Challenges and Opportunities There are multiple challenges for Alabama to adequately fund services to reach the growing aging population. During the next four years, CDA and the State's Aging Network will continue to face several challenges tied to the growing population in need of these services, severe and ongoing fiscal constraints, and increasing federal requirements for these programs and services.	A section on issue identification is labeled or there is a SWOT or similar analysis; narrative descriptions of challenges facing the agency or older adults in the state (e.g., organization's mandates, mission, product or service level and mix, clients or users, costs, financing, structure, processes, or management); data presented to show challenges facing the agency or older adults in the state. It is not enough for the plan to say the state conducted issue identification - results need to be presented.
Goal statement(s)	Goal statements provide "a long-term organizational target or direction of development…[that] provides a basis for decisions about the nature, scope, and relative priorities of all projects and activities" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 169).	GOAL 2.0: Empower older persons and individuals with disabilities to remain in the least restrictive environment with a high quality of life through the provision of options counseling, home- and community-based services, and support for family caregivers.	Goals or goal statements are labeled or narrative states the goals of the agency including a long-term organizational targets or priorities.
Measurable objectives	A measurable objective is "a measurable target that must be met on the way to attaining a goal" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 169).	OBJECTIVE 2.2: Expand nutrition options for nutritionally insecure older adults.	Objectives are labeled or narrative states the objectives of the agency including measurable targets or activities associated with goals.
Actionable strategies	Actionable strategies are "the means by which an organization intends to accomplish a goal or objective. It summarizes a pattern across policy, programs, projects, decisions, and resources allocations" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170).	STRATEGIES: Provide nutritional counseling to older adults who have chronic illness and/or are at risk of poor nutritional health.	Strategies are labeled or narrative states the strategies of the agency including the activities or actions the agency, or its partners will take to accomplish the goals or objectives.
Identified organizations responsible for implementation	Identifying organizations responsible for implementation mean identifying the roles and responsibilities of specific groups or entities who will help enact a plan (Bryson & Alston, 2011).	"Increase training on abuse, neglect and exploitation for aging network partners." Lead: Long Term Care Ombudsman Program Support: Adult Protective Services (APS) program.	Identified organizations responsible for implementation are labeled or the narrative states the organizations who will be responsible for implementation. These organizations may or may not have assisted with the development of the plan

Category	Definition	Examples	Coding rule
		The Office of the State LTC Ombudsman will collaborate with CDSS APS staff to develop training materials to assist local county APS workers and Ombudsman representatives to enhance their abuse investigation skills.	and be included in the analysis for group diversity.
Identified partner organizations	Partner organizations are stakeholders, meaning "any person, group, or entity that can place a claim on the organization's attention, resources, or output, or that is affected by that output" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 170).	The Alabama Department of Senior Services partners with the 13 ADRCs and approximately 350 senior centers. The state unit on aging KDADS has been fortunate in establishing several, vital partnerships through the years on the state and national levels. A few examples include the Kansas Sheriffs' Association, Kansas Association of Chiefs of Police, Kansas Attorney General's Fraud and Abuse Litigation Division, Kansas County and District Attorneys Association, and Kansas Prosecutors Training and Assistance Institute.	Identified partner organizations are labeled or the narrative states the partner organizations. Partner organizations listed do not include those who are responsible for implementation or who participated during plan development. If partners are listed and are responsible for implementation, they will be counted in the organizations responsible for implementation category. If partners helped with planning, they will be analyzed for group diversity. The partners included in this category are others who did not have a specified role regarding the state plan.
Identified available resources	Available resources describe how or where to attain "the necessary resources [that] will bring life to the strategies and create real value for the organization and its stakeholders" (Bryson & Alston, 2011, p. 121).	The state will utilize and leverage a three-year federal dementia-capability grant awarded to Arizona to develop an integrated system of support for families dealing with ADRDs.	Resources are labeled or the narrative states what resources will be used, or if not currently available, how or where the resources will be attained. Resources identified can be widely applicable, or specific to a goal, strategy, or objective. A resource does not have to be listed for each goal/objective/strategy.
Specified timeline	Timelines in a strategic plan suggest when the actions will be taken and what the expected milestones are during implementation (Bryson & Alston, 2011).	Start: SFY 2017 End: SFY 2018 Target Date: February 2018 and ongoing Quarterly/Yearly	Timeline is labeled or the narrative states when the actions will be taken and what the expected milestones are during implementation. A timeline does not have to be listed for every goal/objective/strategy.
Explicitly identified intended outcomes	Intended outcomes are the ideal end results, consequences, or benefits for stakeholders, or the larger meanings	OUTCOMES: Each year ADRC contacts will increase by 10%. Expected impacts are that consumers and families will have more access to information and	Outcomes are labeled or the narrative states the outcomes including ideal end results, consequences, or benefits for stakeholders, or the larger meanings

Category	Definition	Examples	Coding rule
	associated with strategic outputs (Bryson & Alston, 2011).	services to make informed choices for their long-term care. The desired outcome is to extend and enhance beneficiary outreach in rural areas by establishing additional counseling and enrollment sites and increasing the distribution of information.	associated with strategic outputs. If the outcomes are listed or stated as performance measures, they will be accepted.

Appendix B – Content Analysis Findings: Group Diversity

Group Diversity

	Private organization	Nonprofit organization	Academic institution	Health care organization or system	Local public agency	State public agency	Federal public agency	Internal staff	Public input	Total
AL	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	7
AK	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
AZ		1	1	1	1	1			1	6
AR		1		1		1		1	1	5
CA		1	1	1	1				1	5
CO		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	7
CT		1		1	1	1		1	1	6
DE		1			1	1		1	1	5
FL		1	1	1		1		1		5
GA		1			1			1	1	4
HI		1		1	1	1		1	1	6
ID	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	8
IL	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	8
IN		1			1	1		1	1	5
IA		1		1			1	1	1	5
KS		1		1	1	1		1	1	6
KY		1		1	1				1	4
LA		1		1	1	1		1	1	6
ME		1		1	1	1			1	5
MD	1	1		1		1			1	5
MA		1		1				1	1	4
MI		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
MS		1		1				1	1	4

	Private organization	Nonprofit organization	Academic institution	Health care organization or system	Local public agency	State public agency	Federal public agency	Internal staff	Public input	Total
NE		1						1	1	3
NV		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	7
NH	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	7
NY		1				1		1	1	4
NC	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	8
OH	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	7
OK		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	7
OR	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	8
PA		1		1	1	1		1	1	6
SC		1		1	1		1	1	1	6
SD		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	7
TN		1			1	1			1	4
UT		1			1	1		1	1	5
VT		1		1	1			1	1	5
VA		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	7
WA		1		1	1	1		1	1	6
WI	1	1						1	1	4
WY				1	1				1	3
Total	10	40	12	33	31	30	8	33	40	237

Appendix C – Content Analysis Findings: Plan Design

Plan Design

	Vision	Mission	Value	Issues	Goal	Objectives	Strategies	Orgs. resp. for imp.	Identified partner orgs.	Resources	Timeline	Intended outcomes	Total
AL	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1			1	9
AK	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	9
AZ		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
AR		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	9
CA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
CO	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	10
CT	1	1			1	1	1		1		1	1	8
DE	1	1		1	1	1	1		1			1	8
FL	1	1		1	1	1	1		1			1	8
GA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
HI		1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	9
ID	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
IL		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	9
IN	1	1		1	1	1	1		1				7
IA				1	1	1	1		1			1	6
KS	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
KY	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
LA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1			1	9
ME	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	10
MD	1	1		1	1	1	1		1			1	8
MA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	10
MI	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
MS		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10

	Vision	Mission	Value	Issues	Goal	Objectives	Strategies	Orgs. resp. for imp.	Identified partner orgs.	Resources	Timeline	Intended outcomes	Total
NE		1		1		1	1		1			1	6
NV	1	1		1	1	1	1		1		1	1	9
NH		1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
NY	1	1		1	1	1	1		1		1	1	9
NC	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
OH	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	10
OK		1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	9
OR	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
PA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1			1	9
SC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1			1	9
SD	1			1	1	1	1		1			1	7
TN		1		1	1	1			1		1	1	7
UT	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	10
VT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
VA	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	9
WA		1		1	1	1			1	1	1	1	8
WI				1	1			1	1		1		5
WY		1		1	1	1	1		1			1	7
Tot	28	36	12	37	39	40	37	20	41	19	25	39	373