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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Society has changed drastically in recent years and technology has altered almost every feature of human life. A set of powerful social, economic, and political trends has created new demands and problems in society that necessitate fundamental reformation of ideas and concepts. The emergence of these social, economic, and political forces which are shaping society as a whole are also causing educational systems to change. Education must mirror these changes and achieve responsiveness through the adaptation of a new system of organization and administration.

Education has been changed and created changes. Vocational education has undergone extensive development in response to changing social and economic needs. The joint vocational school represents a part of that development. This study focuses on the joint vocational school (hereafter referred to as JVS), and considers the emergence of this mechanism for the delivery of public vocational education as a significant school system adjustment in response to social and economic forces.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 referred to the establishment of such schools as a way of expanding and
improving vocational education. The Act mandated that vocational education must be made accessible to a wide segment of the population across broad geographic areas through a wide variety of occupational training programs. Most states enacted a number of pieces of legislation that address the quality and accessibility of vocational education in their states. The standards for vocational education of the State of Ohio (1969) require that "each school district must provide through an approved plan a minimum of 12 different vocational education job training offerings and 20 classes of vocational education..." At this time, however, these requirements could not be met through traditional educational patterns in which the limited resources were scattered throughout smaller school districts.

Student enrollment for vocational programs and financial resources in most local school districts were not sufficient to support the extensive development of vocational programs in each individual district. But pooling students and resources from many neighboring school districts made it possible to establish a jointly financed and operated vocational school that could serve the people of participating communities.

The development of the joint vocational school concept has been inspired by economic incentives identical to the evolvement of the joint venture concept in business and
industry. Boyle (1968) pointed out that a joint venture is the creation of a new organizational entity by two or more organizations that is jointly owned and controlled by the parent organizations. Pate (1969) argued that the establishment of a joint venture is for the purpose of spreading risk and combining and accumulating capital and facilities for undertaking programs that are too expensive for an individual company.

Vocational education generally is expensive. In comparison to general education, it requires large facilities, expensive equipment, and a relatively large number of personnel to train relatively small numbers of persons.

Institutions and organizations that are based on an interorganizational, collaborative arrangement have proliferated in recent years—particularly in the social service areas. The growing interest in cooperation and shared resources is a direct result of the increased demand for services and funding limitations. However, it should be considered that such new arrangements are complex and problematic in nature, and that their management has rarely been examined.

It seems that such arrangements might be seen more challenging in an educational setting with respect to the nature of the educational system. As Weick (1976) stated, the American educational system is a "loosely coupled one."
The system generally consists of components that are loosely linked in such a way that each has a degree of autonomy and discretion that limits the amount of control and influence of one level over another. When, for any reason, we create a network of such components that interact with each other directly and in a coordinated way, the coordination issue becomes very complex and critical. Accordingly, the situation requires the development of new knowledge and skill to construct a better, more effective network.

There is a shortage of systematic, theoretical, and practical knowledge for identifying and analyzing the properties of interorganizational relationships. The collaborative arrangement of the JVS and their home schools requires more inquiry in order to improve the conceptualization and measurement of the interorganizational relationships existing among these institutions. There is also a need to find out how effective the network is in the delivery of educational services to target populations and what the critical issues in the interorganizational relationships are among the joint vocational schools and home schools.

**Need for the Study**

In the past, sociologists and organizational theorists have focused their inquiries primarily on single organizations. Consequently, the models of management and change have been designed for single organizations. The
conceptualization of organizations as "open", adaptive systems (Katz and Kahn 1966) and the increase of interdependence among organizations support the view that studying an organization without attending to the complex social texture in which it functions does not provide adequate knowledge of the organization's performance. Thus, the study of organizations should move beyond a single organization and encompass other organizations that comprise the most crucial components of the task environment.

The joint vocational school has a unique arrangement whose effectiveness, to a great extent, depends on the behavior of home schools as the providers of required resources. Thus any attempt to understand this delivery mechanism should eventually consider the interorganizational relationships (IOR) in which the joint vocational school concept is embedded. To date, only limited studies have been undertaken in the area of the joint vocational school with reference to interorganizational relationships. In addition, it seems that none of these studies have attempted to view the issue from a global perspective. This study was unique in that it studied the joint vocational schools and home school's relationships in a more comprehensive manner.

**Purpose of the Study**

The major purposes of this study were to develop a general understanding of the joint vocational school-home school relationship, to determine the extent of
compatibility between the JVS and home school administrators' perceptions regarding the existing relationship among themselves, and to determine the impact of selected factors on this relationship.

**Research Hypotheses**

The following research hypotheses were formulated on the basis of selected factors that were expected to have main effects on the quality of the joint vocational school-home schools relationship. All hypotheses are stated in null form. These fourteen hypotheses were divided into nine subsets of hypotheses related to the variables of the study.

**Evaluation**

1. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the appropriateness of the joint vocational school as a system for the delivery of vocational education.

**Domain**

2. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the joint vocational school domain.
Dependence

3. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of the dependence of their schools on each other.

Power

4. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of power that each party has over decisions made within the network.

5. There is no relationship between the extent of power that a joint vocational school might possess over decisions made within the network and the following variables:
   a. the number of school districts
   b. the extent of community support
   c. the extent of JVS board of education support

Environment

6. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of control that each party has over external factors that might affect the achievement of the joint vocational school's goals.

7. There is no relationship between the extent of a joint vocational school's control over the external environment and the following variables:
a. number of school districts
b. community support
c. the JVS board of education support
d. competition

Conflict

8. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of existing conflict within their relationships.

9. There is no relationship between the extent of conflict perceived by the home schools' administrators and the following variables:
   a. positive evaluation
   b. domain consensus
   c. quality of communication
   d. extent of the establishment of procedures

Competition

10. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of existing competition within their relationships for securing students.

11. There is no relationship between the extent of competition perceived by both groups of schools and the extent of perceived dependence on each other.
Cooperation

12. There is no difference between the two subgroups of home schools (dichotomized based on the following characteristics) regarding their perceived cooperation with their joint vocational school.
   a. has high enrollment/low enrollment
   b. has long distance/short distance from the JVS
   c. provides vocational education/does not provide
   d. provides academic education/does not provide

13. There is no difference in the extent of cooperation of the two subgroups of home schools (dichotomized based on the following characteristics) with their joint vocational school as stated by the joint vocational schools' administrators.
   a. has high enrollment/low enrollment
   b. has long distance/short distance from the JVS
   c. provides vocational education/does not provide
   d. provides academic education/does not provide

Coordination

14. There is no relationship between JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the level at which the joint activities were coordinated and the following variables:
   a. quality of communication
   b. extent of the establishment of procedures
   c. extent of power contradiction
d. extent of competition

Research Questions

Communication

1. What are (1) the methods that were used by schools for contacting each other, (2) the frequency of use of those methods, and (3) the purpose of the contacts?

Board of Education

2. From the JVS viewpoint, to what extent was the board supportive to the JVS's attempts to fulfill its mission, and be effective in different areas?

Delimitations

1. The study in no way attempted to determine or compare the effectiveness of the management of the schools or the efficiency of the schools. However, the study did attend to the effectiveness of the relationships and organizational properties of each school that might have directly related to this effectiveness.

2. Each school under study might interact with many other strategic constituencies. This study did not attempt in any way to investigate these relationships except on rare occasions when such
interactions had a direct impact on the relationships under investigation.

3. The study did not cover all major dimensions of the interorganizational relationships among the JVS and the home schools. Instead, it attempted to examine those limited aspects of these relationships that were explicitly reflected in the stated hypotheses.

4. There were several individuals who might have been involved in the relationships between the schools under study, but only the superintendents/directors of the joint vocational schools and the principals of high schools were selected as respondents.

Limitations

Findings of this study have limited generalizibility because the study was conducted only in one state.

In designing the survey instrument, an attempt was made to decrease the amount of subjectivity of the data through the collection of some factual data. However, the objectivity of perceptual data in the research field could be debated.

Significance of the Study

This study may be of interest to state and local administrators and school personnel in improving the planning for the establishment of such collaborative arrangements and in improving the interorganizational
arrangements and in improving the interorganizational relationships among the institutions involved. The state and local agencies, along with the JVS and home schools, can use the findings in assessing and/or reassessing the current interorganizational relationships. An understanding of what presently is being done and of the way it is being perceived by people who are directly involved can serve as a basis for developing new policies and changing and adjusting the governing structure to better meet the needs of the communities.

Vocational education will change in the future through the influence of forces and factors external to the discipline itself. This will be necessary to meet the need of more and diverse clientele. Due to the scarcity of resources, the discipline will be asked to collaborate more with business and industry and with other subsystems of the educational system in order to deliver effectively the training to the target population. Therefore, during the development of interorganizational relationships among different agencies and organizations, the findings of this study should be helpful to all groups and organizations that are presently working together or planning to work together with the aim of serving more people in a more effective way.
Definitions

Competition

Competition is the state under which joint vocational schools and home schools vie for a common pool of resources (students and funds).

Conflict

Conflict is defined as the state of disagreement or dispute among participating members of a network regarding the nature and the value of the tasks confronted by the schools and the appropriate approaches to those tasks.

Domain Consensus

Domain consensus is a set of expectations, both for members of the JVS and the home schools, about what the JVS will and will not do. In this study, domain consensus implies the degree of agreement that each party has on the involvement of the JVS in the provision of academic education.

Environmental Complexity-Simplicity

Environmental complexity-simplicity is the degree to which the factors in the external and internal environment of the schools are few in number and are similar to one another in that they are located in a few components.
Environmental Dynamism-Stability

Environmental dynamism-stability is the degree to which the factors of the external and internal environment of the schools remain basically the same over time or are in continual process of change.

Environmental Uncertainty

Environmental uncertainty is the lack of information about future events, so that the alternatives and their outcomes are unpredictable (Hickson et al. 1971).

Established Procedures

Established procedures are the extent to which the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures that govern the interorganizational relationships among the JVS and home schools are established and documented.

Home Schools (Feeder Schools)

Home schools are high schools that most often comprise grades 9 to 12. They send their vocational education students to the JVS for vocational training on a part-time basis. The academic components of these students' education are provided either by the home school or by the JVS. However, the students graduate from their own home schools. High school, feeder school, and home school terms will be used interchangeably throughout the study.
Joint Venture

A joint venture is a new organizational entity created by two or more organizations that is jointly owned and controlled by the parent organizations.

Joint Vocational School (Area Vocational School)

A joint vocational school is a specialized educational center at the secondary level comprising grades 11 and 12. It is established, financed, and jointly operated by several school districts for the purpose of providing mainly vocational training to students sent by participating school districts (home schools) on a part-time basis. ("JVS" as an abbreviation of "joint vocational school" will be used in a singular and plural form depending upon the context.)

JVS Independent Board of Education

A JVS board of education is a legal entity composed of members representing their participating school district's boards of education. It is created to function as a controlling, coordinating, and policymaking device for the JVS.

Network

A network is a totality of all the units connected by a certain type of relationship. In this study, network refers to one joint vocational school and its participating home schools.
Organizational Domain

Organizational domain consists of the specific goals that the organization wishes to pursue and the functions that it undertakes in order to implement its goals (Levine and White 1961). In this study, the JVS domain is defined in terms of (1) the educational services they offer, (2) the population they serve, and (3) the geographical areas they cover.

Organization-Set and Focal Organization

A set of home schools that interact with the JVS is treated as an organization-set. A joint vocational school is considered as a focal organization.

Perception

Perception is the process of becoming aware of objects, qualities or relationships by way of sense organs. While sensory content is always present in perception, what is perceived is "...the result of complex patterns of stimulation plus past experience and present attitudes" (Hilgard et al. 1975).

Positive Evaluation

Positive evaluation is the judgement of home schools and joint vocational schools on the value of the JVS as a system for the delivery of vocational education.
**Power**

Power is the extent to which one organization (or individual) affects another (Hal et al. 1977).

**School District**

A school district is a geographical area that has been designated as a local school unit to be governed by a local school board. A school district has taxing authority for the purpose of supporting public education.

**Task Environment**

Task environment is that part of the schools' external environment that is relevant or potentially relevant to the schools' goal setting and goal attainment.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on organizational theories (with specific focus on interorganizational relationships) and the literature on vocational education were reviewed in an attempt to identify concepts that may provide a theoretical framework for studying and analyzing the interorganizational relationships between joint vocational schools and home schools.

The majority of research and literature on interorganizational relationships, as Hall and Clark (1975) pointed out, have been developed from the broader field of organizational sociology. Many studies undertaken in both the private and public sectors were mostly attempted in social service areas such as health and manpower training.

To date, only very limited research has been done with reference to interorganizational relationships in the joint vocational school context. Some researchers have made an effort to study a single aspect of the JVS-home school relationships. Adams (1979) studied the problem of financing the operations of area vocational centers. His findings indicated that state and local funds were prime sources of support for these schools.
Anderson (1978) investigated differences in the degree of local-level decision-making authority among area vocational schools, and the state and locally controlled community colleges. He concluded that the area vocational schools and the locally controlled community colleges enjoy more decision-making authority than the state-controlled community colleges.

Harold (1978) studied current and potential cooperation between area vocational schools and public schools in Iowa. Johnson (1977) researched area vocational planning. The findings from these studies indicate that there are indeed limited sources of information on planning for area vocational schools.

Ross (1980) attempted to determine the factors that were considered important in inter-school agency decision making in area vocational schools in Michigan. The results of this study indicated that local control over decision-making and financial arrangements were the two most important factors in the establishment of area vocational schools owned, operated, and/or financed by intermediate districts.

The literature indicated that the concept of inter-organizational relationships has become increasingly important and has begun to attract greater attention among those who study organizations. The literature in this field generally focuses on the character of organizational environment and the manner in which organizations relate to
their external environment and to each other. The literature in interorganizational Relationships (IOR) frequently refers to concepts such as dependency, coordination, cooperation, competition, conflict, and power. In this study, the review concentrated mainly on those concepts that have direct implication in the study. For this reason, therefore, some areas were not explored.

Appendices F and G provide valuable information needed to understand better the pattern of JVS-home school interorganizational relationships and to make better judgements about such relationships.

Interorganizational Relationships as a Field of Study

The field of interorganizational relationships is beginning to attract the attention of an increasing number of scholars in several disciplines. The increasing interest in the study of interorganizational relationships evolved as sociologists and organizational theorists began to be aware of the existence and value of forces outside the organizations that influence the structure and function of those organizations.

In conceptualizing interorganizational relationships, several approaches have been used. Until recently, the field has been dominated by the exchange model suggested by Levine and White (1962). According to the exchange perspective, relationships form when members of two or more
organizations perceive mutual benefits or gains from interacting. Individual organizational goals can be achieved better through this interaction than is possible by autonomous action. Levin and White (1962) defined exchange as "any voluntary activity between two organizations which has consequences, actual or anticipated, for the realization of their respective goals or objectives." They stated that organizations exchange because they need elements to fulfill their specific functions under the condition of resource scarcity. Aldrich (1976) labeled a similar theoretical perspective as the "resource-dependence model." Cook (1977) believed that exchange relations form among organizations because of specialization and the scarcity of resources. An exchange relation as seen by Thompson (1967) is a mechanism for reducing uncertainty and achieving a relatively predictable environment.

In his political economy model, Benson (1975) extended the basic exchange framework on the basis of Yuchtman and Seashore's (1967) model which viewed organizational effectiveness as the ability of an organization to obtain scarce and valued resources. He argued that organizations seek an adequate supply of money and authority to fulfill program requirements, maintain their domain, ensure the flow of resources, and extend and defend the organization's paradigm or method of operation. This perspective
concentrates on the network of organizations as the basic unit of analysis.

Benson stated that the nature of interorganizational relationships is governed by (a) differential power and control exercised by organizations within a network, (b) environmental forces and conditions that influence the network's relations, and (c) a superstructure of political sentiments and interactions. The model suggests that when relationships among organizations are in balance or equilibrium, there will be domain consensus, ideological consensus, positive evaluations of other organizations, and work coordination among them. The components or dimensions of organizational equilibrium tend to vary together to achieve balance. The balance could be upset, however, by inadequacies among the organizations or by external forces.

Recently Zeitz (1980) presented a dialectical model as a framework for interorganizational analysis. It is based on dialectical thought drawn from the Hegel-Marx tradition.

**Approaches to Interorganizational Study**

There are several approaches to the analysis of relational properties between organizations. Marret (1971) presented five approaches that can be considered as complementary. In the first approach, the characteristics of the given organization which affect or are affected by its interaction with other organizations are analyzed, (Aiken and Hage 1978; Guetzkow 1966; and Levine and White
1961). In the second approach, the interacting organizations are compared according to certain attributes. The third approach uses the network, not the participating organizations, as the unit of study. Although the data are obtained from interacting organizations, they are aggregated so as to reflect the relational properties or the characteristics of the connections between the organizations. The fourth approach moves the study to the context in which organizations are interacting. Warren (1967) suggested that interaction between organizations is likely to be modified by the nature of the organizational and interorganizational attributes of the larger system which affects the emergence of new interorganizational relations. The fifth approach considers other elements in the large setting that are not formal organizations, but rather social processes and conditions. Clark (1965) emphasized that political, economic, and demographic changes encourage, if not necessitate, interrelationships.

Dimensions of Interorganizational Relationships

Marrett (1971) broke interorganizational relations down into four dimensions: (1) formalization, (2) intensity, (3) reciprocity, and (4) standardization.

1. **Degree of Formalization.** Formalization is the extent to which a transaction between two organizations is given official recognition, and the extent to which a mechanism coordinates the
relationship. Aldrich (1979) referred to these two measures of formalization as "agreement formalization and structural formalization."

2. **Degree of Intensity.** Intensity refers to the amount or the size of the resources involved or committed to a relationship and the frequency of interorganizational contact which can be measured in either absolute or relative (to total frequency) terms. Aldrich (1979) stated that: "formalization and intensity are intercorrelated because formalization leads to more frequent interaction and frequent interaction is likely to induce further efforts toward formalizing relationships."

3. **Degree of Reciprocity.** Reciprocity is the degree to which there is a balance in resources exchanged and the extent to which the terms of a transaction are mutually agreed upon. Aldrich (1979) referred to these two indicators respectively as "resource reciprocity" and "definitional reciprocity."

Levine and White (1963) stated that the direction of the resource flow is variable. It may be unilateral, reciprocal, or joint (flow to a third party).

4. **Degree of Standardization.** The degree of standardization refers to the extent to which there is similarity between individual units of the
resources in a transaction and the similar or fixed procedures which are used over time in a transaction.

Constructs for Analyzing Interorganizational Relations

For analyzing interorganizational relations, two constructs, network and organization-set, are used.

Networks are viewed as constructs (Aldrich and Whetten 1981) created by researchers as a part of a strategy for analyzing interorganizational relations. Networks are not corporate bodies and do not have a collective structure. Jay (1964) defined a network as the "totality of all the units connected by a certain type of relationship." Researchers have used a wide variety of behaviors or conditions as indicators of links or relations, such as membership by an individual on the boards of directors of two organizations; interchange of personnel; resource exchanges; transactions between organizations; and so forth. Although this study focused on the interorganizational relationships between the JVS and home schools, it should be mentioned that such relationships have an impact on the relationships among the home schools themselves. In reality, all these components are linked to each other through certain relationships. Of these relationships, however, the relationship between each home school and the JVS is the most formalized and established.
The organization-set concept was proposed by Evan (1966). He took an organization or a set of organizations as a unit of analysis and traced its interactions within a network of organizations. Evan referred to that network of organizations as "organization-set" and to the organization that is the point of reference as the "focal-organization." The primary concern of Evan was with the focal organization, and the set is characterized mainly because it constrains and alters that organization. In the analysis of the given relationships, home schools are considered crucial elements of the focal organization's environment which are in the position of controlling the flow of resources to the focal organization. It can therefore be assumed that the organizations which have larger organization-sets (or in other words, serve more home schools) can gain more power or will be able to gain more control over their environment. Since students are the most important resource for JVS survival and growth, possessing a larger organization-set is seen as having the availability of more resources or alternatives for acquiring needed resources. In such a situation, it can be expected that those joint vocational schools which have a higher number of linkages should perceive less environmental uncertainty. Whetten and Aldrich (1979) stated that the larger the organization-set the greater the opportunity to obtain required resources.
If only the number of interorganizational linkages (home schools) are considered, the results may be misleading. Mindlin and Aldrich (1975) pointed out the number of suppliers is not nearly as relevant as the importance of each supplier in resource acquisition. It is anticipated that those feeder schools which contribute a larger portion to the JVS' enrollment are viewed more critically than those that contribute smaller portions. It is also anticipated that home schools with a small number of students will show more intense competition with the JVS over students.

During a time of general decline in student enrollment at the secondary level and scarcity of funds, it is likely that home schools may attempt to retain more students. Drastic change in the flow of resources to the JVS will jeopardize its effectiveness. The JVS may therefore examine different approaches in order to attract more students such as recruiting more adults to offset the decline in high school student enrollment, or putting more emphasis on public relations to increase student and parent awareness of educational opportunities.

Evan (1966) mentioned the size, diversity of organization-set, and the configuration of the network as dimensions of organization-set. Whetten and Aldrich (1979) studied the size and diversity of organization-set in manpower organizations. They also examined one more dimension, technological complexity, which refers to the
number of different services and the breadth of services offered to clients. They stated that the larger organization-set will increase the possibility for the focal organization to secure its required resources and, at the same time, to enhance its visibility and legitimacy. Joint vocational schools, through serving more school districts, penetrate into more communities and obtain more support not only in terms of students, but also in terms of voters for a levy. In their study of the United Way network, Provan et al. (1980) hypothesized that by maintaining links with important community elements, an agency will decrease its dependence and thus increase its power through association with United Way. In the same manner, by involving more school districts in the joint venture, the JVS can expand its domain along a geographic dimension in order to attract more students or provide academic programs to increase the use of its facilities.

Diversity of organization-set refers to the number of organizations with diverse functions with which the focal organization interacts. Home schools may be seen as a homogeneous organization-set. However, in some sense, it may be considered that those joint vocational schools which serve school districts of different counties or a combination of county and city possess a diversified organization-set.
Another factor that should be noticed in this respect is the adult student groups. Adult groups create an alternative supply of students for the JVS, and enable it to monitor the changes in its environment more efficiently. Thus although the JVS may not serve diverse organizations, it might be considered to serve diverse groups.

In regard to technological complexity, the joint vocational school (as originally conceived), was seen as an extension component of the home school, and its mission was only to offer vocational training. However, some joint vocational schools are now also offering academic education.

Home schools are considered both people-processing and people-changing organizations (Hasenfield 1972) because these institutions not only process students for the joint vocational school, but also contribute to these students' general education. However, when the joint vocational school provides both academic and vocational programs, home schools may change their role to merely people-processing organizations. Since joint vocational schools are not accredited institutions, the students will graduate from their own home schools no matter how the responsibilities for vocational and general education are divided.

It is worthwhile to discuss the complexity of dealing with the concepts of people-changing and people-processing organizations in regard to joint vocational schools and home schools. People-changing organizations attempt to modify
the behavior of people. If learning is considered to be a permanent change, people-changing organizations try to train or educate people through using available resources to make such change happen. On the other hand, people-processing organizations as Hasenfield (1972) stated, "shape a person's life by controlling his access to a wide range of social settings..." People-processing organizations classify their clients on the basis of some criteria or assist them in viewing themselves as belonging to a certain class or group. They are then referred to organizations that require their particular status. If home schools are viewed from this perspective, home schools can be seen as people-changing organizations with respect to the academic education and extracurricular activities they offer to students. At the same time, they are also people-processing organizations.

It seems that the home schools function with respect to processing students for the joint vocational school in some respects, however this "processing process" is different from other people-processing organizations. For instance, people-processing organizations in health and other social service areas make classifications and placements based upon more concrete and explicit criteria. However, the decision with regard to attending the vocational school or staying at the home school is largely the student and his or her parents' responsibility. If this statement is true, it can
be assumed that home schools are involved in the decision-making process only in a facilitative way.

Attempts have been made here to give an example of organizations that are both people-processing and people-changing organizations. The joint vocational school and the home schools as a network possess unique characteristics that sometimes make it difficult to apply some concepts from organizational theory to the analysis of their relationships.

**Bases for Interorganizational Relationships**

There are several bases for interorganizational relationships, or reasons why organizations interact with each other. Hall et al. (1977) referred to three bases: first is exchange as a basis for interaction, second is the mandated relationships among organizations, and third are the relationships that are voluntary, but are still standardized through some form of formal agreement.

Under the mandated basis, organizations are assembled into a network by a mandate in order to achieve individual and mutual objectives. The obvious form of mandated relations is that which is externally imposed by law or regulation. Turk (1970, 1972) studied the mandated interactions of organizations in urban areas. In his study of local employment service offices and social service organizations, Aldrich (1976) found that mandated interactions tend to be more intense, imbalanced and
associated with lower perceived cooperation. The findings of Hall et al. (1977) regarding the high prediction of coordination within a mandated relationship were contrary to Aldrich's suggestions. Hall et al. stated that their findings did not suggest that the legal mandate is the answer to coordination problems, but rather that organizations can operate within the framework of legal mandates and still achieve coordination.

In the case of joint vocational schools (as in most mandated relationships), the agencies at the federal, state, and local levels that imposed the JVS-home school relationship are themselves not directly involved in the interaction. Thus one might say that the relationship between the JVS and the home school, in practice, may move more toward a more voluntary basis when the interactions are considered at the school level.

Raelin (1980) stated that a mandated interaction is most often the result of political action by elements of society. From this perception, he presented the "legal-political network" concept as a form of mandated basis for interorganizational relations. For example, the extension and development of legal-political networks in recent years are seen as a result of the revenue-sharing forms of intergovernmental relations. So too, social legislation and federal funding in many recent cases required the participation of specific organizations.
In the fields of education and training, some examples of required cooperation can also be traced. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 authorized the establishment of training programs for unemployed and underemployed persons who could not obtain full-time jobs with their current skills or who were working below their occupational potential. The U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were jointly responsible for administration of the program.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA) mandated that the governor of each state deal directly in bringing about coordination between and among various state and local programs. In carrying out its functions, CETA required the cooperation and participation of all state agencies providing manpower training.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 did not mandate interorganizational relationships among school districts, but it did inspire interaction and cooperation through the provision of funds for constructing joint vocational schools. Several other examples of legislation and of social conditions under which a number of organizations and agencies are urged to cooperate with each other jointly to carry out a program can also be found. Clark (1965) emphasized that political, economic, and demographic changes inspire such interrelationships.
Concepts in Interorganizational Relationships

Research on interorganizational relationships has mainly focused on the most frequently encountered interagency relationships such as interdependence, cooperation, coordination, conflict, and competition. The necessary conditions for each of these relationships have also been studied by researchers. The literature on these relationships and also on the related concepts of organizational environment and organizational domain will now be reviewed.

Organizational Environment

Classical organizational theorists view organizations as relatively closed systems whose survival depends on the internal efficiency of operations. Katz and Kahn (1966) argued for the necessity of viewing organizations as open systems. The open-system perspective views organizations as adaptive systems, that are dependent on their environment for the supply of needed resources and the disposal of their products. Perrow (1970) emphasized the analytical benefits of considering the environment of the organization in addition to its internal operating characteristics.

Dill's (1958) concept of the "task environment" focused only on those parts of the organization's external environment that were relevant or potentially relevant to the organization's goal setting and goal attainment. Hall (1972) made a distinction between two types of environments:
general (which include conditions that are potentially relevant for the focal organization), and specific (which have immediate relevance for the focal organization). The latter is composed of organizations or individuals with which a focal organization is in direct interaction. Elements of the specific environment constitute the focal organization's organization-set.

This study focused on the specific environment of the joint vocational school as a focal organization and the pattern of interorganizational relationships among the JVS and the home schools as the organization-set. In this context, home schools were seen as crucial elements of the joint vocational school's environment.

In recent years, a significant number of studies have been conducted in the field of organizational-environmental relations. Many organizational theorists have attempted to trace the impact of generalized characteristics of the environment on internal organizational structure and performance (Duncan 1972; Child 1972; Burns and Stalker 1961; Woodward 1965; Harvey 1968; Hickson et al. 1969; Dill 1958; Lawrence and Lorsch 1967; Pugh et al. 1969; Emery and Trist 1965).

Others have been concerned with the problem of interaction between organizations (Evan 1966; Guetzkow 1966; Warren 1967; Levene and White 1961; Litwak and Hylton 1962; Turk 1970; Aiken and Hage 1968; Aldrich 1976).
A group of organizational theorists believe that organizations are not simply shaped by their environments but rather that organizations may manipulate the environment. In this respect, there are several strategic choices that have been suggested by Selznick (1949); Litwak and Hylton (1962); McClaulay (1963); Evan (1966); Thompson (1967); Perrow (1970); Zald (1970); Aiken and Hage (1971); Child (1972); Galbraith (1973); Miles, Snow, and Pfeffer (1974); Hirsch (1975); Staw and Szwatkowski (1975).

**Dimensions of Organizational Environment.** The dimensions of organizational environment refer to a core set of environmental attributes (Mile 1980). Several sets of environmental dimensions have been developed. Thompson (1967) viewed organizational environment as homogeneous versus heterogeneous, and stable versus shifting. Duncan (1972) used the concepts of simple versus complex and static versus dynamic. Organizational researchers have developed and used these theoretical dimensions to measure differences in organizational environments and to link these differences to organizational structure and performance.

From this perspective, the joint vocational school's environment can be perceived as more complex than dynamic when compared with the environment of the home schools—an environment that is seen as relatively more static and simple. This assumption is based on the variety of courses that the JVS offers, adults and youth that they deal with,
the number of school districts that they serve, and the connections that they have with industry and business.

**Environment and Uncertainty.** Hickson et al. (1971) defined uncertainty as "the lack of information about future events, so that alternatives and their outcomes are unpredictable." When an organization is viewed as an open system, the environment becomes both a source of constraints and contingencies and a major source of decision-making uncertainty. Emery and Trist (1965) suggested that "one of the major problems in the study of organizational change is that the environmental contexts in which organizations exist are themselves changing at an increasing rate of complexity." They also presented the "causal texture" concept, which referred to environmental relations that are not under the control of the focal organization and that contribute to a considerable extent to the uncertainty facing the organization.

By itself, the dependency of organizations on their environment is problematic. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) state that "the problem is that the environment is not dependable." Thus, the change rate in the environment is considered to be an important contributor to perceived environmental uncertainty.

It may be anticipated that joint vocational schools face more uncertain environments than do home schools not only because of the changes in the flow of students from home
schools that threaten the JVS' stability, but also because of all the uncertain forces which in some way can alter the behavior of the home school toward the JVS. In home schools, for example, the size of enrollments is a function of the size of the population in that area and the net emigration rate. Furthermore, the funding limitations that may be imposed on home schools by state or local authorities will have a direct impact on the behavior of the home school toward the JVS. For example, this situation can occur in the case that home schools need to retain more of their students in order to retain their funding from state or local agencies. Those environmental elements that compose the causal-texture (Emery and Trist 1965) of the joint vocational school are seen as sources of uncertainty that affect the interorganizational relationships among the JVS and home schools and consequently, create decision-making uncertainty for the JVS. This discussion may lead to the conclusion that the JVS may deal with more uncertain environments than do home schools and that the JVS may consequently perceive less control over its external environment than do home schools.

Organizational Domain

Another helpful sociological concept with implications for this study is organizational domain. The concept of organizational domain is closely related to the idea of task environment. Thompson (1967) defined organizational domain
as "the technology employed, population served, and services rendered by an organization." Levine and White (1961) stated that the exchange of resources among organizations is contingent upon organizational domain, which consists of the specific goals that the organization wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to implement its goals. They stated that organizational domain in the health field refers to the claims that an organization stakes out for itself in terms of (1) diseases covered, (2) population served, and (3) services rendered. The establishment of domain, as Thompson (1967) suggested, is a political problem. Control over choice of domain may range from autonomous to mandated. For example, the domain of a public sector organization is mandated by law.

The joint vocational school's domain is mandated and defined by mechanisms through which the schools are established and function. In this study, the organizational domain of the JVS was seen in terms of (1) educational services (vocational training, academic education, and so on); (2) population (school students, adults, and so on) served; and (3) geographical areas (school districts) covered. It can be expected that the domain of joint vocational schools varies to some degree. There is speculation that in the face of declining student enrollment in high schools and the need for the retraining of adults,
the proportion of different groups within a served population will change.

As stated previously, at the outset of the establishment of joint vocational schools they were seen as extensions of home schools and their mission was only to offer vocational training. However, a considerable number of joint vocational schools offer both vocational and academic instruction. Clark (1956) stated that "schools adapted their functioning to attract students, since students were the sine qua non of existence." Thus the domain of the joint vocational school, or any organization, is not a static property of the organization. It is subject to any change which is imposed by external or internal forces. Domains may be either independent or dependent variables (Meyer 1975).

Domain consensus. Thompson (1967) defined domain consensus as "a set of expectations, both for members of an organization and for others with whom they interact, about what the organization will and will not do."

Levine and White (1961) believed that once an organization's goals are accepted, domain consensus continues as long as the organization performs according to its approved goal and standards. The problem of domain conflict cannot be viewed only as the lack of congruence between the organization's behavior and its goals as such a
problem might also arise when an organization changes its goals.

Interorganizational relationships require that prior understanding regarding domain among the interacting organizations must exist. Hage (1975) pointed out that domain consensus is necessary to interagency cooperation. Benson (1975) believed that domain consensus is one dimension of relationship equilibrium among organizations.

The domain of the JVS and home schools is officially specified. However, the similarity of the services that these schools render makes them potentially subject to domain conflict. It can be hypothesized that the domain of the JVS (based on what has been defined in this study in regards to academic education) is perceived differently by JVS and home school administrators.

**Interdependence**

There are a set of interrelated concepts such as interdependence, dependence, power, and influence which have great implication for the study of interorganizational relationships. The joint vocational school arrangement provides fertile soil for interdependence. The JVS depends on the feeder schools' inputs in terms of students and funds. Home schools, in turn, are in need of specialized services from the JVS which they themselves cannot offer to their students. It is obvious that the criticality of what each party depends upon is different. Thus in this
interdependent relationship, the degree of dependency of one party upon another may vary along a highly symmetrical to highly asymmetrical continuum. Interdependence and power concepts will be discussed on the basis of their relevancy to the subject under study.

The organization as an "open-system" engages in exchanges and transactions with other organizations for survival. Thus the fate of an organization moves beyond the efficiency of its performance and becomes more dependent upon other organizations' behavior. Litwak and Hylton (1962) stated that interdependence means that "two or more organizations must take each other into account if they are to accomplish their goals."

Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) noted that "In social systems and social interactions, interdependence exists whenever one actor does not entirely control all of the conditions necessary for the achievement of an action or for obtaining the outcome desired from the action."

Interdependence has a problematic nature that can create uncertainty and thus curtail an organization's autonomy, but the organization is pushed into this situation because of its need for obtaining resources that may be less readily available through its individual efforts. Penning (1981) stated that "interdependence exists among a set of organizations if the behavior of any one organization has certain kinds of ramifications for the others." Reid (1969)
pointed out that two organizations may become interdependent if each perceives that its own goals can be achieved more effectively with the assistance or the resources of the other.

The dependence of an organization on its environment (i.e. other organizations) is a matter of degree that can be measured in terms of the extent to which the environment constrains the organizational decision-making process. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) stated that three factors are critical in determining the dependence of an organization on another: (1) the importance of the resources involved in terms of the relative magnitude of the exchange and the criticality of the resources (which refers to the ability of the organization to continue functioning in the absence of the resource), (2) the discretionary power which the interest group has over the resources allocation and use, and (3) the extent to which there are few other alternatives. Pfeffer (1972b) hypothesized that when the interdependence is asymmetrical (when one organization is less dependent than another on the exchange relationships) there will be interorganizational influence.

Hage (1975) saw joint programs where there is sharing of facilities, staff, and/or funds as a critical measure of organizational interdependence. He pointed out that organizations attempt to avoid interdependence or be
interdependent only in an area that is not critical to goal achievement.

Thomas (1957) specified competitive interdependence and facilitative interdependence. In competitive interdependence, an organization seeking to maximize its goal deprives others of doing so. This will happen when organizations depend on a common pool of resources. In facilitative interdependence, interacting organizations can simultaneously maximize their goals.

The interdependence which exists between the joint vocational school and its home schools is a case that can move from facilitative to competitive interdependence. If it is assumed that both institutions compete for students, then both cannot maximize their goals simultaneously. However, if it is argued that the existence of the JVS will attract and retain more students in the schools, then both schools will see the interdependence as facilitative.

Interdependence, like many other dimensions of interorganizational relationships, is not a static property. As has been stated before, interdependence may move over time and depends on circumstances along a continuum that ranges from facilitative to competitive.

Power

Power is seen as the coercion and determination of behavior. Most definitions of power include the element that it is the capability of one social actor to overcome
resistance in achieving desired objectives or results. Dahl (1957) defined power as "a relation among social actors in which one social actor, A, can get another social actor, B, to do something that B would not otherwise have done." Weber (1947) defined power as the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his or her will despite resistance.

Emerson's (1962) definition of power was that "the power of actor A over actor B is the amount of resistance on the part of B which can be potentially overcome by A." He wrote that "power resides implicitly in the other's dependence. The dependence of actor A upon actor B is (1) directly proportional to A's motivational investment in goals mediated by B, and (2) inversely proportional to the availability of those goals outside of the A-B relationship." Subsequently, he formally defined the power of A over B as equal to the dependence of B upon A.

Cook (1977) presented a theoretical framework focusing primarily upon power as it affects exchange relationships among organizations. He argued that organizations increase their relative power by gaining control over the flow of resources within organizational networks.

Jacobs (1974) discussed organizational control in terms of exchange relationships between organizations and their environment. He hypothesized that organizations are controlled by those who comprise or control the
organization's most problematic dependencies. In other words, the organization's power is a function of dependence on resource suppliers, and that the degree of dependence is inversely proportional to the number of suppliers available. Mindlin and Aldrich (1975) proposed that in the acquisition of resources, the number of suppliers is not nearly as relevant as the importance of each supplier.

It may be speculated that the number of school districts that participate in relationships with a joint vocational school will increase the power of the JVS within the JVS-home schools relationships. The problem in this study was that the larger school with a higher number of students is not identical to a large supplier in industry because a large school needs to retain more students and may have more power to do so. However, it should be remembered that the larger school, through the determinant number of students that it sends to the JVS or through its visibility in the community, should possess more power than the small one.

Lodahl and Gordon (1973) and Salancik and Pfeffer (1974) found that university departments that obtained more resources from external sources also obtained more resources from their parent organizations. In their study of United Funds and a number of other related agencies, Pfeffer and Leong (1977) interpreted their results as demonstrating that the dependence of an organization on an important resource supplier is lessened and its power increased by that
organization's ability to attract resources from other suppliers.

Benson (1975) proposed that resource acquisition and power in interorganizational relations are explained not only by pairwise dependencies between two organizations, but also by links maintained by the organizations to the larger environment upon which both may be dependent. Thus organizations maintaining extensive linkages to this larger environment are most likely to be powerful within their organizational network.

The joint vocational school's connections with organizations, agencies, groups, and key individuals in the community which extend its relations beyond the home schools network will gain power for the school. Joint vocational schools do not depend only on home schools. They depend on voters for passing levies and on business and industry for placing their graduates in jobs. This discussion may lead to the hypothesis that the greater the number of connections and linkages that the JVS has beyond the JVS-home schools relationships, the greater the support the JVS receive, the greater the power the JVS will have within the network.

Coordination

Coordination is considered as a means through which mutual interdependence is managed.
Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) stated that behavior in an interdependent situation is not determined by hierarchical mandate, but by agreements to behave in a certain way.

Madison et al. (1980) stated that coordination is the mutual identification and/or implementation of joint activities. Several approaches to coordination such as cooperation, joint ventures, cartels, coordinating councils, advisory boards, and board of directors, have been developed and used in business and industry.

In terms of activities (not in terms of creating a body for the purpose of coordination); Simon (1958) and Thompson (1967) mentioned three ways of coordination as (1) coordination by standardization, (2) coordination by plan, and (3) coordination by mutual adjustment. It is worth noting that in the initial stages of this study, the JVS was viewed as a joint venture—an approach to assuring coordination. Second, joint vocational schools are using diversified methods and means for coordinating mutual activities with their home schools. Besides conventional channels of communications such as letters, telephone calls, and reports, the schools maintain liaison staff and arrange joint committees at the administrator, counselor, and even teacher levels. The joint vocational school board of education (particularly when it is composed of representatives of different school districts), is also
functioning as an effective and important device for bringing about coordination among schools.

The appropriate linkages between joint vocational schools and home schools facilitate the efficient flow of information between participants with the aim of facilitating sound decision making and coordinated behavior. Within both the joint vocational school and the home schools, a considerable amount of joint planning and scheduling takes place.

All members of the JVS-home school network need to develop and follow a unified and agreed-upon calendar for the school year. By doing so, the joint vocational school becomes a common element in each home school's environment. This condition then creates some common attributes in the home schools which could not have existed otherwise.

This study focused on the extent to which the mutual activities between joint vocational school and home schools perceived coordinated and determining those factors that might have impact on coordination.

**Competition**

Competition, according to White (1974), refers to "that state when organizations in a network vie for a common pool of resources." In profit-making sectors, competition is considered desirable on the assumption that it will produce effectiveness and efficiency. In nonprofit sectors such an idea does not exist, but the decision makers in
these organizations may choose to compete for given resources. Paulson (1976) stated that perceived competition is the belief held by an organization that its goal attainment will decrease as another organization increases its goal attainment. Thompson and McEven (1958) argued that competition tends to arise among organizations which produce similar products and services for similar markets. Based on the findings of their study on conflict between pairs of organization in the field of natural resource management Molnar and Rogers (1979) stated that "organizations that shared client groups and operating sectors tended to report higher levels of conflicting responsibilities and priorities."

Evan (1966) formulated a number of hypotheses on the determinants of cooperation. According to his theory, similarity of goals and functions between the focal organization and members of its organization-set leads not to cooperation but to competition. Another hypothesis predicts that complementarity of functions between the focal organization and its organization-set results in cooperative action.

Joint vocational schools and home schools are both functioning at the same educational level and both strive for students and funds. One can expect that the competition between them must be high, but when the services of joint vocational schools are considered as complementary to those
the home schools offer, one may argue that the situation will inspire more cooperative actions than competitive actions.

It is worthwhile to state that the concept of "substitutability" of services should be considered in addition to similarity of services. It can be hypothesized that the greater the possibility of substituting one product or one service of organization A with a product or service of organization B, the higher the probability for competition and perhaps conflict between the two organizations.

In brief, the probability of competition may correlate not only with the degree of similarity of services or products that are produced by competing organizations, but also with the degree of substitutability of those services.

Some home schools offer one or two vocational programs while sending their students to a JVS for those programs that they do not offer. One might say that under such circumstances, the home school has a greater latitude for the substitution of vocational programs (those that it does not offer) for academic or home-hosted vocational programs. This discussion may lead to the hypothesis that under the situation in which a home school hosts some vocational programs, the perceived competition is higher than when a home school does not do so.
Cooperation

Guetzkow (1966) stated that "Interdependency often takes the form of cooperation." Levine and White (1961) pointed out that "...were all essential elements in infinite supply, there would be little need for organizational interaction and cooperation." Such a situation can be generalized in this study. If in each participating school district there were a sizeable number of students available for vocational programs, and if funds for constructing and running vocational schools or comprehensive schools were available, there would be no reason for the school districts to cooperate in establishing and running a joint vocational school.

Levine and White (1961) called for "domain consensus" among interacting organizations as a necessary condition for cooperation. In this study, one might say that certain conditions for cooperation such as scarcity of resources, interdependency, and relative domain consensus do exist. Even though the cooperation among the JVS and its home schools is mandated, there is still a need for a great deal of voluntary cooperation and coordination because everything cannot be legislated. Drastic change in coordination of activities may jeopardize the existence of interorganizational relationships.

Akinbode and Clark (1976) stated that some of the other conditions necessary for cooperative exchange among agencies
include absence of the propensity to complete, recognition and reward of group actions, and broad conceptualization of organization targets.

Warren (1967) suggested that interaction among organizations is likely to be modified by the nature of the organizational and interorganizational attributes of the larger system—a condition that can affect the emergence of new interorganizational relationships. Thus it may be speculated that the home schools' own attributes and other related external factors such as distance from the JVS or being represented in the joint vocational school's board might have some impact on the extent of their cooperative behavior toward the joint vocational school.

Conflict

Litwak and Hylton (1962) stated that interorganizational analysis starts out with the assumption that there is a situation of partial conflict and then investigates the forms of social interaction designed for interaction under such conditions. In their framework, interorganizational relationships were not conceptualized as a weaker form of organization, but rather as a weaker form of conflict. Zald (1962) stated that "the pattern of conflict is a function of the power balance among staff groups."

Reid (1969) pointed out that conflict may occur over input, outputs, and exchanges. Walker (1970) defines
conflict behavior as actions by one member that are inconsistent with the goals or objectives of some other member. He added that "if two members hold divergent goals (latent conflicts), and if these goals motivate their behavior, then one member will be motivated to behave in a way which is inconsistent with the goals of the other. Schmidt and Kochan (1972) replaced "divergent goals" with "incompatible goals" and treated incompatibility of goals as a prerequisite for conflict.

Molnar and Rogers (1979) investigated two types of interorganizational conflicts: (1) structural conflict as it refers to rules that govern the relationship and (2) operating conflict that occurs over interpretation and application of such principles. Schmidt and Kochan (1972) discussed three types of conflict. Type I involved interference at the point of resource attainment. In this study, this type of conflict was conceptualized in terms of hypothetical situations in which home schools are blocking the natural flow of students to joint vocational schools. In type II, the organizations' goals are incompatible, and the activities are interdependent. The blocking behavior occurs at the activity stage. Type III is characterized by incompatible goals, shared resources, and interdependent activities. The blocking occurs at both the point of resource sharing and at the activity stage.
This study focused on the levels of disagreement that characterize the JVS-home schools' interorganizational relationships and the conflicts that may reflect disputes over task expectations or role performance.

The factors or processes which may lead to conflict should be considered dynamic. In the JVS-home schools' relationships, for example, "domain inconsistence" may generate conflict. Generally speaking, academic education is an activity that is considered to be in the domain of home schools. Thus the provision of academic education by the JVS may be regarded as interference.

Conflict in this study reflects the continual process of natural adjustment. There is a belief that the establishment of policies, rules, and procedures which govern the relationship and the improvement of communication would lessen the conflict among interacting organizations. But as Gamson (1966) stated, "conflict resolutions are often based on improving communication and understanding, but obviously, communication cannot change zero sum situations which underly manifest or rancorous conflict."

Summary

The literature in the field of organizational theories and vocational education were reviewed in an attempt to identify factors or concepts that may provide a theoretical framework for studying interorganizational relationships (IOR) among joint vocational schools and home schools.
The review revealed that very limited research has been done on the joint vocational school concept and particularly on the relationship between joint vocational schools and their home schools. Regarding the interorganizational relationship in a general sense, exchange theory dominated the field. From this theory perspective, relations form when members of two or more organizations perceive mutual benefits or gain from interaction. The political economy model saw relations as governed by organizational power, environmental forces, and superstructure of political sentiments and interaction.

The literature showed five approaches for the study of interorganizational relationships: (1) analyzing the characteristics of the given organization, (2) comparing two organizations, (3) analyzing the relational properties or the characteristics of the connections between the organizations, (4) studying the context in which the organizations are interacting, and (5) considering other elements (such as social conditions) in the large setting.

Throughout the research, two concepts of "network" as the totality of all the units connected by a certain type of relationship and "organization-set" as a number of organizations which interact with the point of reference as the "focal organization" were used.
Interorganizational relationships were classified into three categories according to their bases: exchange, voluntary and mandated.

Research on IOR focused on the most frequently encountered interagency relationships as interdependence, power, cooperation, coordination conflict, and competition.

The necessary conditions for these relationships and related concept as organizational environment and organizational domain have been studied. The organizations with whom a given organization interact would consist of the most critical elements in the organization's environment. Domain consensus was considered as a main requirement for cooperation. In contrary, domain conflict may intrigue disputes and disagreement.

The literature has also indicated that interdependence exists whenever one actor does not entirely control all the conditions. Under this situation the power of an organization within a network would depend on its extent of control over the needed resources. Thus, interdependence could be an arena for cooperation or stage for conflict and competition.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the research methods used in conducting the study. It includes the following sections: (1) research setting, (2) research design, (3) sampling process, (4) instrumentation, (5) data collection, and (6) statistical analysis.

Research Setting

All the fifty joint vocational schools in the State of Ohio and the sample of 214 high schools served by these JVS were examined in this study. All schools were located in the state of Ohio. The schools comprised a system that consists of focal organizations (joint vocational schools) and organization-sets (home schools).

Although these schools are units of the larger systems such as local school districts or states, they were treated as separate organizations in the analysis.

Although each school may have interaction with other organizations in addition to those that formed this core set, these other organizations were not considered in the study. In the observational and data collection phases, two JVS and two home schools were visited. In addition, several exploratory meetings and unstructured interviews were
conducted with administrators and educators from the Division of Vocational Education in the Ohio Department of Education. Many pertinent documents from the schools and agencies were collected and reviewed.

**Research Design**

The design for this study was a combination of descriptive survey and correlational research. Data were collected for use in examining the stated hypotheses, which form the basis for a theory on the properties of JVS-home school interorganizational relationships. These hypotheses were derived from the review of literature and exploratory interviews conducted at the beginning of the study.

**Sampling Process**

The list of operating joint vocational schools \((N = 50)\) in the state of Ohio and a list of high schools \((N = 496)\) served by these joint vocational schools were obtained from the State Department of Education.

All of the fifty joint vocational schools were included in the study. In selecting the sample of home schools, however, the schools were first classified on the following bases according to their geographic location, nature of their relations with the JVS, size of enrollment, and political identity.

A. Geographic Location

1. City school districts
2. Local school districts
3. Exempted village school districts

B. Relations
1. Member in the JVS
2. Contracting with the JVS

C. Enrollment
1. High
2. Medium
3. Low

D. Political identity
1. Belonging to one county

In order to obtain a representative sample, the subjects were randomly selected from the above categories with respect to the following criteria:

1. The sample had to contain at least 50 percent of the home school population of each joint vocational school (but not less than three home schools).

2. Wherever a joint vocational school served different categories of geographic areas (city, local, or exempted village school districts), at least one school from each category had to be selected.

3. Wherever a joint vocational school served different counties, at least one school from each county had to be included in the sample.

4. Wherever a joint vocational served other school districts in addition to its own members (on the
basis of contracting), the sample had to include at least one contracting school.

5. Wherever the home schools were of different enrollment size (high, medium, and low) at least one subject from each subcategory had to be selected. Through this procedure, 285 or 57 percent of the total home schools involved with the joint vocational schools were selected.

Respondents

The superintendents of joint vocational schools and the principals of home schools were selected as the respondents in this study. Based on the instrument that was developed, the perception of the respondents was the basis for the data on the JVS-home schools' interorganizational relationships.

As Hall et al. (1977) stated, administrators of interacting organizations interact on the basis of their individual and collective definitions of the situation. This approach assumes that the perceptions of the situation become the operative data for the administrators in interaction situations.

In this study, it was assumed that school administrators are directly involved in interactions with other institutions and that they have access to the most needed information for making judgements about existing interorganizational relationships.
The study considered the school, not the administrator of that school, as the unit of analysis.

**Instrument**

Since a suitable instrument to measure the perceptions of joint vocational school superintendents and home school principals regarding the existing interorganizational relationships could not be located, it was necessary to develop one for this study. Two nearly identical questionnaires, one for superintendents and another for principals, were developed for this purpose. Some of the items incorporated in these instruments were adapted from the Hall et al. (1977) study.

For the purpose of the study, the instrument was designed and questions were modified to be compatible with the school setting. Form A (Appendix C) was used for collecting data from joint vocational schools and Form B (Appendix D) was used for home schools.

The respondents were asked to indicate the degree of significance of each factor on a six-point scale (0-5). In addition, some related data about the schools and the perceptions of the respondent were collected by the instrument.

**Validation of the Instrument**

A panel of experts was asked to judge the clarity, item construction, and relevance of each item on the instrument.
The experts reviewed the instrument and made appropriate changes in the instrument's design and content. Appendix A presents the list of participants of this panel.

**Data Collection**

Data were collected through a mail survey sent to superintendents of joint vocational schools and principals of home schools. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix B), and a self-addressed, prestamped envelope.

To increase the response rate, each questionnaire was coded for follow-up purposes. A follow-up letter (Appendix E) was mailed to nonrespondents.

Because of the limited number of the joint vocational schools available to participate in the study, a great deal of effort was made to obtain a response from each of these schools. Therefore, the follow-up letter sent to nonrespondents from the joint vocational schools was accompanied by another copy of the questionnaire. Such follow-up activities produced forty-nine completed questionnaires from the JVS. The last nonrespondent JVS was contacted by telephone. This follow-up activity raised the JVS response rate to one hundred percent. Questionnaires received from two joint vocational schools contained unanswered questions. The respondents were contacted by the telephone and their answers obtained.
Two hundred eighty-three questionnaires were mailed to home schools. Two hundred twenty-five were returned (79 percent). Eleven questionnaires were found unusable and were discarded. Thus 214 of these questionnaires were used in the study.

Table 1 presents the distribution of sample and respondents. The proportion of nonrespondents were similar for different sets of home schools. In other words, the returns appeared highly representative of the home schools.

**Statistical Methods**

For the statistical analysis of the data, the following statistical methods were used:

1. Multiple regression and correlation analysis were used to investigate the relationships of a set of variables to coordination.

2. One-way analysis of variance, T-tests, and Z-test were used to determine whether the difference between the two means of the two groups of schools or two subgroups within a specific group of schools with respect to a set of variables were greater than would be expected by chance happening alone.

Measures of central tendency and variability were used for producing number of observation mean, standard error, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum value for each variable.
## TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION, SAMPLE, AND RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JVS Home Schools (100%)</th>
<th>Participating Sample of Home Schools (57%)</th>
<th>Respondents (79%) Used</th>
<th>Discarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JVS Participating Home Schools</th>
<th>Sample of Home Schools (57%)</th>
<th>Home School Respondents (79%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used</td>
<td>Discarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables

In brief, the sets of variables that were considered in the study are as follows:

A. Communicative variables
   1. Frequency of contact
   2. Mode of contact
   3. Reason of contact
   4. Quality of communication

B. Disruptive variables
   1. Extent of conflict
   2. Extent of competition

C. Cooperative variables
   1. Extent of cooperation
   2. Extent of coordination
   3. Extent of the establishment of procedures
4. Extent of positive evaluation
5. Extent of domain consensus

D. Authoritative variables
1. Extent of power over decision-making process within the network
2. Extent of dependence on other organizations
3. Extent of community support as a source of power
4. Extent of board support as a source of power

E. Attributive variables
1. Number of students
2. Number of participating districts
3. Distance of home school from the JVS

Measurement of Variables
Whenever it was attempted to explore the relationships among variables within each group of schools (JVS or home school), the collected data of each group were treated independently.

The findings of the analysis under this procedure were utilized in comparing the two groups regarding some variables or in determining merely the relationships among variables within a group of schools.

The problem was in determining a score for the relationship through the use of scores from both groups of schools.

Paulson (1976), in the analysis of inter-organizational dyads for measuring the extent of competition, computed the
total amount of perceived competition. He assigned this amount to the dyad as the indicator of perceived competition. Based on what Hall et al. (1977) argued, such combination of the scores from diadic groups would distort important elements of the relationship. Consequently, the extent of the relationship would not be revealed. For instance, a joint vocational school might believe that the quality of communication between the JVS and home schools is very high. The home schools, on the other hand, might feel that the communication quality is very low. The combination of the scores from these two schools would yield a composite score of average. However, the same score would be obtained from two schools if both had rated the quality of communication as "average" in the first place. Based on what Hall et al. (1977) suggested, the resolution of this problem was based on the notion that each school member would act on his or her own individual and collective definitions of the situation (i.e., that if they perceived high or low quality of communication, their action would be based on such definitions). This study subscribed to this idea and the relational score for each school with respect to its relationships with other schools was used as the basis for the analysis of interorganizational relationships. Thus the data that were analyzed regarding coordination for instance, represented the total number of dyadic interorganizational relationships (N = 100).
In the present study, each of the fifty superintendents of joint vocational schools were asked to describe the quality of their relationships with home schools.

According to this procedure, the joint vocational school did not evaluate its relationship with each single home school with which it interacts. Instead the relationships with all home schools were viewed in a general manner. Thus a maximum of fifty scores were obtained for each question from the joint vocational schools.

In contrast, the home schools were given the opportunity to describe their relationships with their joint vocational school individually (N = 214). This imbalance in the number of responses was resolved by averaging the responses of all home schools that are members of a joint vocational school in order to create a single score for each question. These scores were then compared against each single score obtained from a joint vocational school. Through this process, fifty pairs or dyads (one hundred units) were developed. These then became the study's units for analysis.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Descriptive survey and correlational research procedures were employed in this study to examine a number of null hypotheses and to seek answers for some posed questions in order to provide a broad conceptualization of the joint vocational schools and their home schools' relationships. This study attempted to shed light on some factors that might have an impact upon this relationship.

This chapter contains a description of the characteristics of respondents in terms of participating schools and administrators. The findings of the study are also discussed.

Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic information collected in Part II of the instruments provided information about the schools themselves and the characteristics of the joint vocational schools' superintendents and home schools' principals. Some of these demographic data were also used as independent variables in the data analysis.
Joint Vocational Schools Characteristics

Students

Table 2 provides a summary of the number of students enrolled in the joint vocational schools. It should be noted that the minimum number of enrollees is 325 students and the maximum is 4,300 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 - 599</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 - 899</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 - 1199</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 - 1499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 - 1799</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1799</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Districts

The number of school districts that are members or contractors of the joint vocational schools is summarized in Table 3. The majority of joint vocational schools (86 percent) have less than fifteen participating home schools.
The number of participating home schools ranges from three to thirty-five.

**TABLE 3**

**SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (N = 50) BY NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3 - 6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 7 - 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 11 - 14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 15 - 18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 19 - 22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 23 - 26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Over 26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programs**

Tables 4 and 5 present a summary of the number of service areas in which the schools train their students (trade and industrial education, business and office education and so on), and the number of programs that the schools offer (electronic, secretarial, and so forth). Table 6 indicates whether or not the school provides academic education. The interesting finding was that 96 percent of the joint vocational schools provide academic education to those students who attend the JVS. This fact
**TABLE 4**

SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (N = 50) BY NUMBER OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5**

SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (N = 50) BY NUMBER OF OFFERED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6
SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (N = 50) BY THE PROVISION OF ACADEMIC EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide Academic Education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do Not Provide Academic Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indicates that in those schools, students spend the full day in joint vocational schools instead of a half of a day.

### School Age

Table 7 presents a summary of the number of years the joint vocational schools have been in operation.

### TABLE 7
SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (N = 50) BY NUMBER OF YEARS IN OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board of Education

The types of boards of education that govern the joint vocational schools are presented in Table 8. A high number of joint vocational schools (94 percent) had the type of board which was assembled particularly to serve the joint vocational schools.

TABLE 8
SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (N = 50) BY TYPE OF BOARD OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Independent*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dependent**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The JVS has its own board.
**The board of the county serves in the capacity of the JVS board.

Respondents' Characteristics

Tables 9 - 11 provide a summary of the respondents' years of being in position, their educational background, and the number of years they have been associated with vocational education.
### TABLE 9
SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS RESPONDENTS (N = 50)
BY NUMBER OF YEARS IN POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10
SUMMARY OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS RESPONDENTS (N = 50)
BY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home Schools' Characteristics

Students

Tables 12 - 14 present a summary of the total number of students enrolled in the home schools, the number of students enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades, and the number of students enrolled in the joint vocational schools.

Programs

Tables 15 - 16 indicate whether or not the home schools provided academic and/or vocational education. Regarding vocational education, it seems that the question was
### TABLE 12
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS (N = 214) BY TOTAL NUMBER
OF STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 399</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 699</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 - 999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1299</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 - 1599</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1899</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 - 2199</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2199</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS (N = 214) BY THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS
ENROLLED IN THE 11TH AND 12TH GRADES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 - 200</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 350</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 - 500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 650</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651 - 800</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS (N = 214) BY NUMBER OF THEIR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE JVS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 150</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 – 200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 – 250</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 – 300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 15
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS (N = 214) BY THE PROVISION OF ACADEMIC EDUCATION FOR THEIR STUDENTS WHO ATTEND THE JVS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide Academic Education</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do Not Provide Academic</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

interpreted differently from the way it was expected to be perceived. The provision of vocational education in this study referred to the offering of vocational programs
similar to those offered by the JVS. Home schools' respondents however understood the question as referring to vocational education in a broad sense (i.e., in terms of career education, industrial arts, and so on). For this reason, a large number of schools are seen as proclaiming that they offer vocational education. Due to this misunderstanding, the finding for this question (as depicted in Table 16) should be discounted.

TABLE 16
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS (N = 214) BY THE PROVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide Vocational Education</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do Not Provide Vocational Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Age

The age of the home schools is summarized in Table 17. From this data, joint vocational schools can be considered as relatively new educational institutions in comparison to the home schools.

Table 18 presents a summary of the home schools' distance from their joint vocational schools. As indicated by this table, about 75 percent of the home schools were
TABLE 17
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS (N = 214) BY NUMBER OF YEARS IN OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 18
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS (N = 214) BY DISTANCE FROM THEIR JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL IN MILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
located within a distance not exceeding twenty miles. In establishing a joint vocational school in one geographic area, the centrality of the joint vocational school is a determinant factor. It can be expected that some schools located in exempted village school districts are a long distance from the JVS.

Respondents' Characteristics

Tables 19 - 22 represent a summary of the home schools principals' educational background, years in position, years of educational experience, and years of association with joint vocational schools.

<p>| TABLE 19 |
| SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOL RESPONDENTS (N = 214) BY EDUCATION |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Master's Degree</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interorganizational Relationships

This section presents the findings relating to the nature of the JVS-home schools relationships. The data relating to relationships variables are analyzed and described.
TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS RESPONDENTS (N = 214) BY NUMBER
OF YEARS IN POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 21

SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOLS RESPONDENTS (N = 214) BY NUMBER
OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 22
SUMMARY OF HOME SCHOOL RESPONDENTS (N = 214) BY NUMBER OF YEARS OF ASSOCIATION WITH JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1 - 5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 6 - 10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 11 - 15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 16 - 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation (Null Hypothesis 1)

The joint vocational school is a new phenomenon or a new arrangement for the delivery of vocational education. Some educators speak in favor of it and some speak against it. The null hypothesis regarding the joint vocational school as a concept was evaluated as: there is no difference in the perception of the JVS and home schools' administrators regarding the appropriateness of the joint vocational school as a system for the delivery of vocational education. In statistical form, the $H_0$: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. (T-test approach was used.) Based on the result displayed in Table 23, the null hypothesis was rejected. The data indicate that respondents from joint vocational schools held a higher positive perception on the appropriateness of joint vocational schools than did respondents from home schools.
TABLE 23
T-TEST: COMPARING THE SCORES OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND HOME SCHOOLS ON THE EXTENT OF POSITIVE EVALUATION OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL AS A SYSTEM FOR THE DELIVERY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STDV</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JVS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home School</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

The joint vocational school was perceived as more appropriate by respondents from small home schools than large schools in terms of number of students. Table 24 indicates the negative relationship between the number of students and the extent of positive evaluation.

Domain (Null Hypotheses 2)

Two dimensions of the concept of organizational domain were of interest in this study: domain consensus and domain conflict. In this study, domain consensus referred to the respondents' mutual respect as to what the joint vocational school is doing in terms of the provision of vocational education, academic education, and adult education. The null hypothesis formulated was: there is no difference in
TABLE 24

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN HOME SCHOOLS
NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND POSITIVE EVALUATION OF THE JVS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students at 11th and 12th Grades</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students Enrolled at the JVS</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the perception of the JVS and home schools' administrators regarding the joint vocational schools' domain.

Tables 25 - 27 exhibit the results of T-tests conducted to examine the hypotheses. The hypothesis regarding vocational education was retained, but the hypotheses for adult education and academic education in particular were rejected. Generally speaking, joint vocational schools rated the appropriateness of their involvement in the three mentioned areas higher than home schools did. This study focused on academic education as a potential field for domain conflict. The data presented in Table 26 present the significant differences in the joint vocational schools and home schools respondents' perspectives on this matter.
TABLE 25

SCORES OF THE JVS AND HOME SCHOOL REGARDING THE JVS INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STDV</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JVS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home School</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at p = .05

TABLE 26

SCORES OF THE JVS AND HOME SCHOOLS REGARDING THE JVS INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROVISION OF ACADEMIC EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STDV</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JVS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home School</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05

Dependence (Null Hypothesis 3)

Perceptions of the schools' administrators were measured by asking respondents to indicate if home schools were more dependent on the JVS or vice-versa. A T-test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences in mean scores regarding the extent and direction of dependence.
The findings are presented in Table 28. The difference was not significant. Both groups believed that joint vocational schools were more dependent on home schools than vice versa.

*Not significant at $p = .05$*
Power (Null Hypothesis 4-5)

Both the joint vocational school and home school respondents were asked to indicate whether the JVS or the home schools have more influence over decisions made within the JVS-home school relationship. A T-test was conducted to examine the research hypothesis which stated that: there is no difference in the perception of the JVS and at the home schools' administrators regarding the extent of power that each party has over decisions.

On a scale point of 1 - 5, number 1 represented the beginning of the continuum (or the statement that the JVS has much greater power than the home school) the opposite statement was coded 5, which indicated that the home schools have more power than the JVS. Findings are presented in Table 29. Based on the T-test results, the null hypothesis was rejected. The interesting finding in this analysis was that the joint vocational school (with a mean response of 3.22), perceived the power of both parties either as equal or that the home schools had a greater edge. In contrast, the home schools (with a mean response of 2.84) perceived the joint vocational school as more powerful than home schools.

In the second section of the discussion of power, the relationship between the extent of joint vocational schools' power and a set of external factors was examined. The research hypothesis formulated was: there is a nonzero
TABLE 29

COMPARING THE SCORES OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND HOME SCHOOLS ON THE EXTENT OF PERCEIVED POWER THAT EACH PARTY HAS WITHIN THE RELATIONSHIPS RELATIVE TO ONE ANOTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STDV</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JVS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.22†</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home School</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .006

†The JVS' perceived that home schools have more power; and the home schools perceived, that the JVS have more power.

linear relationship between the joint vocational schools' power within the network and independent variables such as the number of participating school districts, the extent of community support, and the extent of board support. The null hypothesis posited no relationship among these variables in the population $H_0: R^2 = 0$.

Multiple regression analysis and Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted. Table 30 exhibits the findings. The data revealed low correlations among variables. The analysis supported the research statements in regard to number of school districts and board support, since the regression coefficient of these two variables were positive. In fact, these three variables explained a
TABLE 30

MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT WITH POWER AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR THE JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of School Districts</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Support</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Board Support</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .22 \quad N = 50 \]
All variables enter at .05 level of significance or better.

significant \( (p < .01) \) percentage of the variability on the JVS' power \( (R^2 = .22) \).

Environment (Null Hypotheses 6 – 7)

In this study, the measurement of the extent of control over the external environment that each group of schools perceived was used as an indicator of the degree of general uncertainty that might exist in their environment. It was speculated that joint vocational schools (with respect to their complex and dynamic environment) would perceive less control over their environment than would home schools (with their more static and simple environment). A T-test approach was used to determine if there is a statistically
significant difference between the perception of both groups of schools administrators regarding their degree of control over the external environment. The results as exhibited in Table 31 indicated that the null hypothesis can be retained in this case. Multiple regression analysis and Person product-moment correlation were performed to investigate the research hypothesis: there is a nonzero linear relationship between extent of control perceived by the joint vocational schools and variables such as the number of participating school districts, extent of community support, extent of board support, and extent of competition.

**TABLE 31**

**COMPARING THE EXTENT OF PERCEIVED CONTROL OVER EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT BY JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND HOME SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joint Vocational Schools</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home Schools</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at p = .05

Table 32 explains a significant (p < .01) percentage of the variability on the extent of control due to the model ($R^2 = .42$). Interesting findings were that community
TABLE 32
MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT WITH "CONTROL" AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of School Districts</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .42$  $N = .50$
All variables enter the table at .05 level of significant or better.

support was the dominant variable in the model with a $R = .51$. If board support provides more power to the joint vocational schools within the relationships, the community support enabled the joint vocational school to perceive more control over their environment. The negative correlation between the existing competition and the extent of control indicated that competition can be considered as an important factor which creates uncertainty and consequently causes the shrinkage of control over the environment in profit oriented organizations, it is generally accepted that the existence of more suppliers provide more certainty and virtually more control over the external environment. There is only one
possible explanation for the contradicting finding of this study. With the negative relationship between control and the number of participating school districts, joint vocational schools perceive each additional school district as an extra element in the environment which must be dealt with, and that imposes additional constraints.

**Conflict (Null Hypotheses 8 - 9)**

The conflict variable was made operational by asking respondents to rate the extent to which disagreements or disputes characterized their relationships. The responses ranged from no conflict to a very great extent of conflict, and were coded from 0 to 5. The first null hypothesis stated the absence of any difference between the perception of the JVS and home school regarding the existence of conflict within their relationships. The responses of joint vocational schools (with a mean of 1.39) and the home schools (with a mean of 1.20) were not significantly different from those that might be expected by chance at the .05 level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis in this case was retained.

Table 33 exhibits the result of the T-test procedure. It should be noted that both groups believed that very little conflict existed within their relationships ($\bar{X}_J = 1.39$, $\bar{X}_h = 1.20$).

The second research hypothesis formulated was: there is a nonzero linear relationship between the extent of
TABLE 33
COMPARING THE SCORES OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND HOME SCHOOLS ON THE EXTENT OF PERCEIVED CONFLICT WITHIN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STDV</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JVS</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home School</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at p = .05

perceived conflict by the home schools' principals and variables such as positive evaluation, domain consensus, communication, and the establishment of procedures. Multiple regression analysis was conducted. The findings are presented in Table 34. Domain consensus and positive evaluation were not significantly related to conflict and the quality of communication and the procedures had weak predictive value.

The impact of the provision of academic education in the extent of conflict was examined as an aspect of domain conflict. A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine if there is a significant difference between those joint vocational schools that provide academic education and those that do not. The findings as exhibited in Table 35 indicate that the difference is significant at .05 level. Joint vocational schools that did not offer academic
TABLE 34
MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT WITH CONFLICT AS A
DEPENDENT VARIABLE (FOR HOME SCHOOL SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Domain Consensus</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive Evaluation</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procedures</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 17  N = 214
Variables entered at the .05 level of significance or better.

education perceived more conflict than the joint vocational schools that did offer academic education.

The same analysis was conducted for home schools. Table 36 presents the findings, which indicate a significant difference between two subgroups of home schools. Those home schools that did not provide academic education perceived less conflict.

**Competition (Null Hypotheses 10 – 11)**

The respondents were asked to indicate to what extent competition exists between a joint vocational school and its home schools in securing students. The null hypothesis was: there is no difference in the perception of the JVS and home
TABLE 35
JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS' PERCEPTION OF THE EXTENT OF
CONFLICT ASSOCIATED WITH ACADEMIC EDUCATION BY
SCHOOLS OFFERING AND SCHOOLS NOT OFFERING
ACADEMIC EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STDV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JVS Offering Academic</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JVS not offering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

schools' administrators regarding the extent of existing competition within their relationship for securing students. A T-test was performed to determine if there were significant differences in the mean scores of these two groups of schools. The findings are reported in Table 37. The null hypothesis was rejected at the $p < .001$ level of significance.

Perceptions of joint vocational schools superintendents regarding the existence of competition were higher (3.42)
TABLE 36
HOME SCHOOLS' PERCEPTION OF THE EXTENT OF CONFLICT
ASSOCIATED WITH ACADEMIC EDUCATION BY SCHOOLS
OFFERING AND NOT OFFERING ACADEMIC EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Home School Not Offering Academic Education</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>155.18</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>158.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than the perception held by the home school principals (1.73). This indicated that the JVS superintendents encountered more competition from the home schools than vice versa. It was obvious that both home schools and joint vocational schools were vying for a common pool of resources (students). These resources were at least physically in the dominion of the home schools who hold the potential power for controlling the flow of these resources to the JVS.
TABLE 37
COMPARING THE SCORES OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND
HOME SCHOOLS ON THE EXTENT OF PERCEIVED COMPETITION
BETWEEN SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JVS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home School</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .001

The second research hypothesis in this section was:
there is a nonzero relationship between competition and
dependence. Pearson product-moment correlation was
conducted. The resulting correlation coefficients are
presented in Table 38.

TABLE 38
CORRELATIONS OF DEPENDENCE WITH COMPETITION FOR JOINT
VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS SAMPLE AND HOME SCHOOLS SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JVS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Schools</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data indicated that there is a negative relationship between dependence and competition in the home schools' perspectives. On the other hand, dependence was positively associated with competition in the joint vocational schools' perspectives. It might be said that whenever home schools were more dependent on the JVS, they exhibited less competition.

Cooperation (Null Hypotheses 12 - 13)

In this section, the discussion of the hypotheses is based on the notion that the organizational attributes of the home schools in terms of their number of students, distance from the JVS, provision of vocational education, and provision of academic education are likely to modify the cooperative behavior of home schools toward the joint vocational schools. The research hypothesis was: if home schools are dichotomized on the aforementioned attributes, there are relationships between the extent of their perception of cooperation and their attributes.

The extent of cooperation was measured by using the home schools' perception of the existing cooperation within the relationships. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were differences between the perceptions of home schools dichotomized based on some of their attributes on the dependent variable—the extent of cooperation. The data indicated that there were significant differences in the perceived cooperation among home schools
with a low number of students and those schools with a high number of students. The findings are presented in Table 39.

TABLE 39

HOME SCHOOLS' PERCEPTION OF THE EXTENT OF COOPERATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE SIZE OF THEIR STUDENT ENROLLMENT BY SCHOOLS WITH LOW ENROLLMENT AND SCHOOLS WITH HIGH ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Home Schools with Low Enrollment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home Schools with High Enrollment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>180.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>184.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same procedures were employed to examine other home school attributes. The three one-way analyses of variance were conducted separately for independent variables such as distance, provision of academic education, and provision of vocational education. The F-ratios for these three
variables were not significant at .05. The data indicated that the null hypotheses about these three variables can be retained.

To examine the second hypothesis in this section, JVS superintendents were asked to rate home schools that possessed specific characteristics on a scale of being more or less likely to be cooperative with the JVS. The scale ran from 0 to 5. At a response of 3, the factors did not make any difference. A response of 5 indicated the tendency to be more cooperative. A response of 0 indicated the tendency to be less cooperative. The null hypothesis was: the home schools' characteristics do not make any difference on the extent of the cooperation as seen by the joint vocational schools' superintendents. Statistically, it was hypothesized that $H_0: \mu = 3$.

A Z-test regarding each factor was conducted to test the hypothesis. The findings are presented in Table 40. The data indicated that the null hypothesis regarding variables such as enrollment, distance, provision of vocational education, and representation on the board had to be rejected while the hypotheses for location and the provision of academic education remained tenable. In other words, joint vocational school superintendents believed that home schools with high enrollment and representation on the board are more likely to be cooperative than vice versa.
Home schools located a long distance from the JVS and in particular, home schools that offered vocational education programs were seen to be less likely to be cooperative. When the means exhibited on Table 40 were compared, it was noticed that with a mean of 1.286, home schools that provided vocational education were likely to be the least cooperative schools.

Coordination (Null Hypthesis 14)

For the purpose of measuring the extent of coordination within the JVS-home schools relationships, professional staff were used as respondents to tell how well the joint efforts of the JVS and home schools were coordinated. Coordination was referred to as the extent by which decisions and actions are concerted and by which the programs and activities are geared into each other with a maximum of effectiveness and efficiency.

T-test, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple regression analysis were conducted. First, the findings of the T-test indicated that the perception of joint vocational school respondents and home school respondents regarding the level at which their joint activities were coordinated differed significantly. The results are exhibited in Table 41. Joint vocational schools (with a mean of 3.83) perceived higher coordination within the relationship than did home schools (with a mean of 3.46). In general, both
TABLE 40
THE IMPACT OF HOME SCHOOLS CHARACTERISTICS ON THEIR COOPERATIVE BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Z-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Home Schools with High Enrollment</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>4.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Home Schools within a Long Distance</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-3.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the JVS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Home Schools in City</td>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-1.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Home School Offers Vocational Education</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>-3.240*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Home School Offers Academic Education</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Home School Represented on the JVS Board</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>1.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

groups felt the relationships were coordinated at an above average level.

Regarding the relationships among variables, the data indicated that communication was strongly related to coordination ($r = .66$) and conflict ($- .47$). Competition showed no relationship to any of the model variables except
### TABLE 41
COMPARISON OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL RESPONDENTS’ SCORES AND HOME SCHOOL RESPONDENTS’ SCORES REGARDING OF PERCEIVED COORDINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JVS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home School</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

### TABLE 42
CORRELATION MATRIX, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF VARIABLES IN THE MODEL (N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procedures</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Power</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conflict</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean           | 3.61 | 3.83 | 3.68 | 2.77 | 1.30 | 2.58 |
| Standard Deviation| .83  | .78  | .79  | .51  | .63  | 1.35 |

*p = .05
conflict \((r = .43)\). The quality of communication and the extent of the establishment of procedures were highly correlated \((r = .57)\). The data were not sufficient for a causal analysis of this point. It is not known whether the establishment of procedures and documented policies and principles helped in the improvement of communication or whether the communication had an impact upon the establishment of procedures.

The results of the regression analysis are shown in Table 43. A rather large number of variables were significant. The results are largely consistent with predictions. As was anticipated, coordination was affected by the quality of communication, the extent of the establishment of procedures, the amount of competition, and the amount of conflict.

The findings contradicted the prediction regarding the extent of competition. Although the correlation was negative, it was not significant. There is a possible explanation for these findings in that competition between educational institutions (as in competition between public organizations for "turf" in terms of clientele or resources) is not conducted through a market process, but rather through political mechanisms. Thus it is expected that the competition would not be openly manifested.
TABLE 43
MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT WITH COORDINATION AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE (N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R\(^2\) = .58

Communication

Communication is a dynamic process, and the nature of the relationships which exist among a joint vocational school and its home schools requires the accurate and continual transfer of information and understandings. The joint vocational schools developed a communication system to receive and deliver information in order to coordinate the joint activities. Tables 44-45 depict the frequencies of use of different communication methods and the purpose of contacts. The data indicated that joint vocational schools use committees at different levels extensively. About 80 percent of the joint vocational schools conducted a monthly meeting with the home schools' principals and the
**TABLE 44**

**PERCENTAGE OF THE JVS RESPONDENTS THAT CONTACTED HOME SCHOOLS BY METHODS OF COMMUNICATION AND FREQUENCY (N = 50)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacting Methods</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>A Few Times/Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Telephone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Letter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Report</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Person to Person Contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Schools' Administrators Committee Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>79.59</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) School Counselors' Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>79.60</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) School District and the JVS Superintendents' Committee Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Liaison Meeting</td>
<td>26.53</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 45
PERCENTAGE OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL RESPONDENTS THAT CONTACTED HOME SCHOOLS BY PURPOSES OF THE CONTACTS AND FREQUENCY (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>No Contact</th>
<th>A Few Times/Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Give Information</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Receive Information</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Settle Differences</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>51.06</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Solve Problems</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Coordinate Efforts</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>40.81</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Plan Future Efforts</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
superintendents of participating school districts. Meetings at the counselors level were conducted monthly by 76 percent of the schools. Table 43 demonstrates that joint vocational schools used all eight predetermined methods to various extents; except that 8.16 percent of them did not use written reports and 26.53 percent did not assign liaison persons.

Table 44 exhibits the purpose and the frequency of contacts by the percentage of joint vocational schools that made the contacts. A high percentage of joint vocational schools contacted their home schools on a weekly basis for giving and receiving information—48 percent and 36 percent.

A high percentage of the joint vocational schools contacted their home schools yearly for solving problems or settling differences. There was not adequate information to establish a cause and effect relationship between the frequency of contact for the purpose of solving problems and settling differences and the extent of the existence or nonexistence of problems and differences. Contacts were made by most of the joint vocational schools on a weekly basis for the purpose of coordinating their joint efforts. Contacts for planning future activities were made on a monthly basis. It was not clear as to which communication method was used more frequently for a specific purpose.

Tables 46-47 exhibit the percentage of home schools that contacted their joint vocational school by methods of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacting Methods</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>A Few Times/Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Telephone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>53.52</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Letter</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>47.89</td>
<td>28.63</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Report</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>47.64</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Person to Person Contact</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>27.57</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Schools Administrator Committee Meeting</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>41.12</td>
<td>49.07</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) School Counselors Meeting</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Liaison Meeting</td>
<td>48.11</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 47
PERCENTAGE OF HOME SCHOOL RESPONDENTS THAT CONTACTED THE JVS BY PURPOSES OF THE CONTACTS
AND FREQUENCY (N = 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Contact</th>
<th>No Contact</th>
<th>A Few Times/Year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Give Information</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>40.57</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Receive Information</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Settle Differences</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Solve Problem</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Coordinate Effort</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>46.95</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Plan Future Efforts</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>43.81</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
communication and purpose of contacts. Glancing through Tables 44-47, it can be seen that joint vocational schools in general use more communication mechanisms more frequently than home schools.

The JVS Board of Education

The JVS superintendents were asked to answer two questions regarding the JVS board of education. First, to what extent do their schools receive support from their board of education? Second, how do they evaluate the effectiveness of their board in different areas of activities. Table 48 exhibits the frequency and percentage of responses on the degree of board support to joint vocational schools. The data indicated that a high percentage of joint vocational school superintendents (92 percent) believed that they received considerable support from their board of education.

Table 49 exhibits the result of the respondents' ratings of the board's effectiveness by different areas of activities. The data generally indicate that most joint vocational schools rated their boards as highly effective in facilitating the JVS' internal activities (60 percent) and in encouraging community support (42 percent). In contrast, 40 percent and 38 percent of the joint vocational schools indicated that their boards were low in effectiveness in coordinating the JVS-home schools activities and in mobilizing agency support. It might be noticed that these
TABLE 48

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSES (N = 50) REGARDING THE EXTENT OF THE JVS BOARD'S SUPPORT TO THEIR SCHOOLS (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To a Fair Extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To a Considerable Extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To a Very Great Extent</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

conclusions were based upon the highest percentage of respondents on each area of the boards' activities and in each area of the effectiveness rating category.
TABLE 49
PERCENTAGE OF JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THEIR BOARDS OF EDUCATION (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Coordinating The JVS-Home Schools' Activities</th>
<th>Mobilizing Community Support</th>
<th>Mobilizing Agencies Support</th>
<th>Facilitating The JVS' Internal Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Effectiveness</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Effectiveness</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Effectiveness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the problem, the objectives of the study, the research procedures, and the findings. Conclusions are drawn from findings and recommendations are related to both practice and future research. These topics will be developed in the following sections: (1) summary of research procedures, (2) summary of findings, (3) conclusions, (4) recommendations and suggestions for further research.

Summary of Research Procedures

The Problem

The major purposes of this study were (1) to develop a broad understanding of joint vocational schools-home schools' relationships, (2) to determine the extent of congruence between the JVS and home school administrators' perceptions of the existing relationships, and (3) to determine the impact of selected factors on this relationship.
Null Hypothesis

In order to explore the nature of the JVS-home schools' relationships, the following null hypotheses were investigated through statistical procedures:

Evaluation

1. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the appropriateness of the joint vocational school as a system for the delivery of vocational education.

Domain

2. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the joint vocational school domain.

Dependence

3. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of the dependence of their schools on each other.

Power

4. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of power that each party has over decisions made within the network.
5. There is no relationship between the extent of power that a joint vocational school might possess over decisions made within the network and the following variables:
   a. the number of school districts
   b. the extent of community support
   c. the extent of JVS board of education support

Environment

6. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of control that each party has over external factors that might affect the achievement of the joint vocational school's goals.

7. There is no relationship between the extent of a joint vocational school's control over the external environment and the following variables:
   a. number of school districts
   b. community support
   c. the JVS board of education support
   d. competition

Conflict

8. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of existing conflict within their relationships.
9. There is no relationship between the extent of conflict perceived by the home schools' administrators and the following variables:
   a. positive evaluation
   b. domain consensus
   c. quality of communication
   d. extent of the establishment of procedures

**Competition**

10. There is no difference in the JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the extent of existing competition within their relationships for securing students.

11. There is no relationship between the extent of competition perceived by both groups of schools and the extent of perceived dependence on each other.

**Cooperation**

12. There is no difference between the two subgroups of home schools (dichotomized based on the following characteristics) regarding their perceived cooperation with their joint vocational school.
   a. has high enrollment/low enrollment
   b. has long distance from the JVS/short distance
   c. provides vocational education/does not provide
   d. provides academic education/does not provide
13. There is no difference in the extent of cooperation of the two subgroups of home schools (dichotomized based on the following characteristics) with their joint vocational school as stated by the joint vocational schools' administrators.
   a. has high enrollment/low enrollment
   b. has long distance from the JVS/short distance
   c. provides vocational education/does not provide
   d. provides academic education/does not provide

Coordination

14. There is no relationship between JVS and home schools administrators' perceptions on the level at which the joint activities were coordinated and the following variables:
   a. quality of communication
   b. extent of the establishment of procedures
   c. extent of power contradiction
   d. extent of competition
   e. extent of conflict

Research Questions

Communication

1. What are (1) the methods that were used by schools for contacting each other, (2) the frequency of use of those methods, and (3) the purpose of the contacts?
Board of Education

2. From the JVS viewpoint, to what extent was the board supportive of the JVS' attempts to fulfill its mission, and be effective in different areas?

The Sample

The study was conducted at the state level. All fifty existing joint vocational schools in the state were selected. Among the 496 possible homes schools associated with the JVS, 285 home schools (57 percent) were selected through stratified sampling procedures. The superintendents of joint vocational schools and the principals of home schools were selected as the respondents in this study. The perception of the respondents was the basis for data on the JVS-home schools interorganizational relationships.

Instrumentation

Two nearly identical instruments were developed to collect the necessary data for this study. Each instrument had two parts. Part I consisted of a set of questions to be answered on a six-point scale (0 - 5) for determining the respondents' perception of the schools relationships. Part II of the instruments was used to collect characteristic data on the schools and respondents.

Data Collection

Data were collected by mail survey. All fifty surveys from the JVS were returned (100 percent) and all were
useable. Two hundred and twenty-five surveys (79 percent) were returned from the home schools, of which only 214 were useable, processed, and reported in this study. In addition to the initial mailing, one follow-up mailing and several telephone contacts were necessary in order to achieve this rate of response.

**Statistical Analysis**

Analysis of variance, T-test, Z-test, Pearson product-moment, and multiple regression analysis were used to analyze each of the research questions and null hypotheses. The programs of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al. 1975) and the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (Helwig and Council 1979) were utilized for data analysis.

**Summary of Findings**

**Joint Vocational Schools Characteristics**

The number of joint vocational schools students ranged from 325 to 4,300.

The number of participating home schools ranged from three to thirty-five school districts.

Joint vocational schools provided 12 to 68 instructional programs in 4 to 6 educational service areas.

Ninety-six percent of joint vocational schools provided academic education.
The history of vocational schools ranged from 5 to 25 years.

Ninety-four percent of the joint vocational schools had independent board of education.

**Home Schools Characteristics**

The number of home school students ranged from 122 to 2,338.

The number of home school students that enrolled in the joint vocational schools ranged from 8 to 287.

The distance of the home schools from their joint vocational schools ranged from a few blocks to 53 miles.

About seventy-two percent of home schools did not provide academic education to their students who enrolled in joint vocational schools.

**Evaluation**

The appropriateness of joint vocational schools was rated significantly higher by the joint vocational school (with a mean of 4.53) than by the home schools (with a mean of 3.84).

The appropriateness of joint vocational schools was rated higher by respondents from small home schools than large schools in terms of number of students. In other words there was a negative relationship between the number of home schools' students and the home school respondents'
perception of the appropriateness of joint vocational school system.

**Domain**

There was no difference between the joint vocational schools and home schools' viewpoints (degree of approval) regarding the provision of vocational education by the JVS; but there were significant differences in their perspectives about the JVS involvement in adult education and particularly in academic education. Joint vocational school respondents expressed a higher degree of approval regarding the JVS' involvement in all of the mentioned areas than did the home school respondents.

**Dependence**

Both the joint vocational schools and home schools indicated that the JVS were more dependent on home schools than vice-versa.

**Power**

There was a significant difference between both groups of schools regarding their power over decisions made within their relationships. The interesting finding was that joint vocational schools perceived the power of both parties in an equilibrium state. In contrast, the home schools perceived the joint vocational school as more powerful than home schools.
Pearson product-moment correlation showed a positive correlation between the joint vocational schools' extent of power within the network and the number of their school districts (R = .32), the extent of their community supports (.26), and the extent of the JVS board of education supports (.32). Multiple regression analysis revealed that only the contribution of the number of school districts variable (R = .02), and the board supports variable (R = .24) in the JVS' power were significant. The percentage of variability on the JVS' power explained by the model was $R^2 = .22$.

Environment

T-test results indicated that there was no significant difference between the perception of joint vocational school respondents and home school respondents regarding their extent of control over the external environment. The research hypothesis that the JVS had less control was rejected. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which the number of school districts, the extent of community support, the extent of board support, and the extent of competition explained the variability in the degree of the joint vocational schools' control over the external environment. The results indicated that the model contributed in the JVS' control variability to a significant extent ($R^2 = .42$). Community support (with $R = .51$) appeared as a dominant variable in this model.
The interesting findings were the negative correlation between the number of school districts and extent of the JVS' control ($R = -.27$); and the nonsignificant relationship between the board support and the JVS amount of control.

**Conflict**

The difference between joint vocational school and home school respondents' perceptions on the existence of conflict within their relationships was not significant ($p < .05$). Both groups indicated that conflict was present to a very little extent. Multiple regression analysis showed that domain consensus and positive evaluation had no significant relationship with the extent of perceived conflict by home schools. In contrast, communication ($R = -.22$) and procedures ($R = -.17$) had a significant negative correlation with conflict.

The contribution of the provision of academic education by the JVS and home schools as a source of domain conflict was examined. The results of one-way analysis of variance indicated that home schools that did not provide vocational education perceived less conflict than home schools that did so; and joint vocational schools that did not offer academic education perceived more conflict than joint vocational schools that did so.
Competition

The difference between joint vocational school and home school respondents' perceptions regarding the degree of existing competition within their relationship was significant. Joint vocational schools (with a mean of 3.42) perceived higher competition than did the home schools (with a mean of 1.73).

The relationship between the degree of dependence that the schools had on each other and their competition was examined. The data indicated that the home schools' dependence on the JVS was negatively associated with competition (r = -.20), but that the joint vocational schools' dependence on the home schools was positively correlated with competition (r = .42).

Cooperation

For the purpose of statistical analysis, home schools were dichotomized based on students enrollment (low/high), distance from the JVS (long/short), academic education (offers/does not offer), and vocational education (offers/does not offer). A one-way analysis of variance on each of the attributes was conducted. The data indicated that the differences between dichotomized home schools regarding their perceived cooperation were significant only between home schools with low and high enrollment. In other words, the distance and provision of academic education and
vocational education did not have any correlation with the extent of perceived cooperation.

JVS superintendents were asked to rate the extent of cooperation of dichotomized home schools with their joint vocational school. The z-test results indicated that respondents believed that home schools with high enrollment and schools that were represented on the JVS' board are more likely to be cooperative than vice-versa. Home schools located a long distance from the JVS, and in particular, home schools that offered vocational education, were seen less likely to be cooperative. The provision of academic education and the location of the home schools (city or local) did not make any difference.

Coordination

The results of multiple regression analysis indicated that the quality of communication, establishment of procedures, power, competition, and conflict as independent variables contributed significantly ($R^2 = .58$) in the variability of coordination as a dependent variable.

The quality of communication ($R = .43$) was the dominant variable in this model. The regression coefficient of procedures, power, and conflict at the .05 level of significance respectively were ($R = .28$), ($R = .24$), and ($R = .31$).
Communication

Most joint vocational schools used all eight communication mechanisms (telephone, letter, report, person-to-person contact, regular meeting at three personnel levels, and assigning liaison) to some extent. About 80 percent of the JVS conducted monthly meetings with home schools at different levels of administration. Generally speaking, the findings indicated that joint vocational schools used more methods of communication and used those channels more frequently than home schools.

Board of Education

Regarding the extent of support which the JVS received from their boards of education, 76 percent of the joint vocational schools stated that their boards were supportive to a very great extent, 16 percent to a considerable extent; and 8 percent to a fair extent.

Regarding the JVS boards' effectiveness in different areas of activities, the boards were more effective in facilitating the JVS' internal activities and mobilizing community supports than in coordinating the JVS-home schools' activities and mobilizing agencies' support.

Conclusions

Several conclusions that were drawn from this research are presented as follows:
1. The joint vocational schools and home schools administrators' perspectives regarding their relationships differed significantly.

2. The joint vocational school as a delivery system for vocational education remains a debateable subject. In general, the joint vocational school concept was evaluated positively by both groups of schools, but joint vocational school respondents rated the joint vocational school system higher than did home school respondents. However, when respondents from both groups of schools rated the concept low, their low ratings conveyed entirely different messages. The joint vocational school administrators who rated the JVS low in most cases believed that the joint vocational school should be established and operated as an independent institution with the right to recruit students directly, provide all educational services, and issue diplomas. From the home schools' perspectives, the low rating reflects the preference of the comprehensive school concept over the joint vocational school concept. The findings of this study mirror the reality that exists in the educational world. Rupert Evans (1982) stated that "the comprehensive high school is seen as a bastion of democracy and a way of diminishing the effects of race and class on the achievement of youth." He
concluded that "our task is to improve the comprehensive high school—not tear it down."

Benson (1982) pointed out that there are three factors that impede the development of high-quality vocational programs in a comprehensive high school: size of enrollment, administrative leadership, and personnel policy. The area vocational school and comprehensive high school concepts should not be evaluated without considering social, educational, demographic, and economic factors. The merit of the JVS system is contingent upon several such factors. For instance, the joint vocational school was seen more appropriate by small home schools than by large home schools. Those high schools that have a small enrollment size are not able to provide vocational programs for its students.

3. Interdependence within the joint vocational-home schools relationships, can be characterized as asymmetrical. Joint vocational schools were more dependent on home schools than vice-versa. As Pfeffer (1972) stated, when the interdependence is asymmetrical there will be interorganizational influence. High dependency would constrain the organizational decision-making process and create high uncertainty.
In business and industry, the dependence on one supplier can be reduced through different mechanisms such as seeking several suppliers. Joint vocational schools, under the existing situation, do not have other alternatives that can offset their dependency on home schools.

The findings regarding dependence revealed two points. First, joint vocational schools faced much higher competition within the relationships than did the home schools. Second, the joint vocational schools that were more dependent on home schools encountered more competition within their relationships.

Wherever the nature and the extent of dependence cannot be changed, the organization may try to gain control and develop power over other things that might influence the dependency in indirect ways.

Joint vocational schools which developed more linkages with their environment and gained community support and board of education support can develop more power and control over both their external environment and their organizational interrelationships.

The findings to a great extent support Lodahl and Gorden (1973), Salancik and Pfeffer (1974), and Benson's (1975) findings that those organizations
that maintain diversified linkages to the larger environment are most likely to be powerful within their own organizational network.

4. Wherever joint vocational schools did not offer academic education or when home schools did provide academic education, students had to receive their education in two educational settings by splitting their time between these two institutions. This arrangement was considered as a source of conflict.

The joint vocational schools that provided academic education and those home schools that did not do so had less conflict. In addition, since the majority of joint vocational schools provided academic education, other arrangements might be seen as a result of an existing dispute over other things.

5. Joint vocational schools were more sensitive to encroachment on their domain than were the home schools. The provision of academic education by joint vocational schools did not trigger domain conflict. A possible explanation is that the provision academic education was not associated with the movement of students and the transfer of funds from one school to another school.

6. Home schools which provided vocational education were less likely to be cooperative.
The provision of vocational education by home schools was directly associated with the number of students who remained in their home schools and potentially could have attended the JVS.

The vocational programs conducted in the home schools were considered to be an extension of the joint vocational school's program. Therefore, some assistance and supervision was expected to be extended by the JVS to the home schools, but such relationships did not exist or were not developed to a satisfactory level.

7. The degree of domain conflict cannot be measured simply by the degree of encroachment of one organization upon another organization's domain, but rather by considering the significance of the threat to the main and vital part of the mission of an organization. For instance, the violation of the established norm through the joint vocational schools' offerings of academic education should not be considered as serious as the offering of vocational education by home schools.

8. Joint vocational school boards were both very supportive and very effective in mobilizing community support. During the time of passing levies the board members worked very closely with the administrations of the joint vocational schools
and home schools. The boards' role in the coordination between the JVS and home schools was not significant in the other areas mentioned. The boards acted effectively in those fields where they that had been expected to function. It can be concluded that the board of education was a constructive vehicle in supporting joint vocational school activities internally and externally.

9. Monthly joint meetings of the joint vocational school and home school administrators, and counselors levels were the most used methods by the schools for contacting each other for the purpose of coordinating their activities.

10. The majority of joint vocational schools and home schools maintained a low level of contact when the concern was for solving problems or settling differences.

11. Joint vocational schools initiated and maintained more contacts than did the home schools.

12. The JVS-home schools relationship can be seen as a mandated relationship whose effectiveness is based on a voluntary cooperation or on a voluntary interrelationship that was inspired by the need to meet legal requirements. This situation provides a unique framework within which joint vocational schools and home schools interact.
The main question in this respect is: what are the means and ways through which the joint activities of both groups of schools would be coordinated and their decisions and actions be concerted with a maximum of effectiveness and efficiency?

In this study it was found that first, the quality of communication and the extent of establishment of procedures were the dominant factors or major predictors of coordination. Second, the joint activities were perceived as considerably coordinated by both groups of schools. The findings support Hall et al. (1977) conclusions in two respects: (1) organizations can operate within the framework of legal mandates and achieve cooperation, and (2) whenever cooperation is in some way mandated, it is probably more appropriate toward cooperation to focus upon approaches other than exchanges.

Recommendations

In view of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations seem appropriate:

In this study it was found that communication between the JVS and home schools was a dominant
factor in coordination. Joint vocational school administrators should strive, through effective communication and interaction with home school personnel, to maintain and improve the concept of interrelationships between home schools and the vocational school in the jointure.

2. Policies and the procedures that govern the joint vocational schools and home schools' relationships should be revised, structured, and documented in a more efficient way.

3. Joint vocational school administrators should strive to build a systematic and effective mechanism for communicating with their community and to establish linkages with industry and business. Joint vocational schools have already developed and utilized diversified methods for contacting home schools in order to gain support and coordination. It is recommended that similar mechanisms be used to communicate with business, industry, and the community in general.

4. Joint vocational school boards of education should be utilized not only as a policy-maker but, more as a constructive boundary-spanning component between the schools and the communities. As the JVS strive for more support from their communities and request increased assistance from business and industry,
boards of education should be considered as a prime mover in seeking better ways to mobilize such supports.

5. It is recommended that joint vocational school should offer academic education to all students enrolled in their programs, but that students should graduate from their own home schools.

6. The provision of vocational programs by home schools can be considered as a source of conflict between the JVS and its home schools. Thus it is recommended that a number of criteria (facilities, teacher, instructional materials, etc.) should be considered regarding the establishment of any home school-sponsored vocational program to ensure the quality of the program and the continuation of efficient joint vocational school and home school relationships.

7. The findings of this study should be made available to:
   a. joint vocational school and home school administrators;
   b. school districts administrators;
   c. joint vocational school boards of education; and
   d. staff members of the national education division of the State Department of Education.
8. We have accumulated almost two decades of experience with the area/joint vocational schools. Now it is time to re-examine the concept in light of past experiences. In re-examining the concept, the focus should be on maximizing the effectiveness of the system within the framework of jointure.

9. Additional research regarding the effectiveness of joint vocational school arrangements in comparison with other arrangements such as comprehensive schools should be conducted.

10. Future studies might investigate more thoroughly the impact of the provision of academic education by joint vocational schools and the provision of vocational programs by home schools as they relate to the quality of their relationships.

11. Additional research should focus on the impact of the school administrators' personal attributes as they relate to the quality of the JVS-home schools relationships.

12. Further research focusing on communication mechanisms should be conducted relative to the JVS-home schools relationships. Research should seek to determine the effectiveness of each method of contact in terms of developing better understanding, and consequently developing more efficient coordination.
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APPENDIX B

INITIAL CORRESPONDENCE COVER LETTER FOR JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AND HOME SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
June 14, 1982

Dear:

Superintendents of joint vocational schools are the most reliable persons to provide information and make judgements concerning their schools' interactions with other educational institutions.

I am conducting a research study at The Ohio State University on "The Relationships Between Joint Vocational Schools and Their Home Schools as Perceived by the Respective Administrators."

As one who has a direct involvement in these relationships and who is familiar with the goals and challenges of this system, you are requested to contribute to this study by responding to the enclosed questionnaire. Your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire will be highly appreciated.

Be assured that all information provided will be treated confidentially. The study will not identify either the respondent or the school. The questionnaire is coded only to aid follow-up activities.

I sincerely appreciate your willingness to assist with this study. I would appreciate it if you would return your completed questionnaire by June 24, 1982. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your time, consideration and professional assistance.

Sincerely,

Mohammad Rabieh
Graduate Research Associate
The Ohio State University
June 14, 1982

Dear:

High school principals are the most reliable persons to provide information and make judgements concerning their schools' interaction with other educational institutions.

I am conducting a research study at The Ohio State University on "The Relationships Between Joint Vocational Schools and Their Home Schools as Perceived by the Respective Administrators."

As one who has a direct involvement in these relationships and who is familiar with the goals and challenges of this system, you are requested to contribute to this study by responding to the enclosed questionnaire. Your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire will be highly appreciated.

Be assured that all information provided will be treated confidentially. The study will not identify either the respondent or the school. The questionnaire is coded only to aid follow-up activities.

I sincerely appreciate your willingness to assist with this study. I would appreciate it if you would return your completed questionnaire by June 24, 1982. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your time, consideration and professional assistance.

Sincerely,

Mohammad Rabieh
Graduate Research Associate
The Ohio State University
APPENDIX C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS
THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND THEIR HOME SCHOOLS AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS

PART I

Directions

Please answer each of the following questions by circling one of the six numbers (0 to 5) with respect to each question's scale. Please be sure to circle the answer that best describes the situation existing at your school, at the present time.

Note: JVS = Joint Vocational School

1. How often do you use the following methods for contacting home schools and coordinating joint efforts?
   0 = Not used 3 = About once a week
   1 = A few times a year 4 = Once a day
   2 = About once a month 5 = Almost hourly

- Telephone................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Letter................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Written report.................................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Person to person contact................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5

Regular joint committee meeting at the following levels:

- Superintendent/director of the JVS and principals of home schools........................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
- JVS and home schools' counselors.......................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
- JVS superintendent and participating school districts' superintendents.............................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Assigning a staff member as a liaison between the JVS and home schools............................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Other (specify).......................................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
2. How often do you contact home schools for the following reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To give information</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To request information</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To settle differences</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To solve problems</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To coordinate efforts</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To plan future efforts</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other (specify)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How would you characterize the quality of the communication between the JVS and home schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No communication</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very poor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poor</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very good</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the JVS should be involved in providing the following services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Vocational education</td>
<td>- 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic education</td>
<td>- 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student certification</td>
<td>- 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adult education</td>
<td>- 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Considering the overall situation, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement: "The joint vocational school system is the best mechanism or arrangement for the delivery of vocational education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disagree</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strongly agree</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uncertain</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How well are the procedures concerning the JVS-home schools relationships established? ........................................ 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = Not at all
1 = Very poorly
2 = Poorly
3 = Adequately
4 = Well
5 = Very well

7. Your school (the JVS) may serve a number of home schools. These home schools may differ from each others on enrollment, distance from the JVS, etc. These differences may affect the degree of the cooperation with your school. How do you see the relationships of the following schools (with respect to their characteristics) with your school?
0 = Less likely to be cooperative
3 = The factor does not make any difference
5 = More likely to be cooperative
- Home school with high enrollment ....................... 0 - - 3 - 5
- Home school a long distance from the JVS .......... 0 - - 3 - 5
- Home school in city ........................................ 0 - - 3 - 5
- Home school offers vocational programs .......... 0 - - 3 - 5
- Home school offers academic education to its participating students in the JVS .................. 0 - - 3 - 5
- Home school is represented on the JVS board ...... 0 - - 3 - 5

8. How well are the efforts of your school and those of each of the home schools coordinated ( - How well the decisions and the actions are concerted and the programs and activities are geared into each other with a maximum of effectiveness and efficiency)? ............... 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = Not at all coordinated
1 = Very poorly
2 = Poorly
3 = Adequately
4 = Well
5 = Very well

9. How much control do you personally feel you have over factors (forces) external to your school which affect your ability to perform your job and consequently the school's ability to fulfill its mission? .................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = No control
1 = Very little
2 = Little
3 = Fair
4 = Considerable
5 = A great deal of control
10. Within the JVS-home school relationships, the JVS is dependent on home schools for providing students. At the same time home schools are dependent on the JVS for providing vocational education to their students. Which is the more dependent on the other? ................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = Neither is dependent on the other  
1 = JVS is much more dependent  
2 = JVS is more dependent  
3 = Both, the JVS and home schools are equally dependent on each other  
4 = Home schools are more dependent  
5 = Home schools are much more dependent

11. Within the JVS-home schools relationships, how would you characterize the influential positions of the JVS and home schools on decisions made? ................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = Neither has influence  
1 = JVS has much more influence  
2 = JVS has more influence  
3 = Both the JVS and home schools have equal influence  
4 = Home schools have more influence  
5 = Home schools have much more influence

12. To what extent do the communities of participating school districts support the joint vocational school's efforts to fulfill its mission? ................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = No support  
1 = To a very little extent  
2 = To a little extent  
3 = To a fair extent  
4 = To a considerable extent  
5 = To a very great extent

13. Overall, to what extent is there competition between the JVS and home schools in securing students? ................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = No competition  
1 = To a very little extent  
2 = To a little extent  
3 = To a fair extent  
4 = To a considerable extent  
5 = To a very great extent

14. Overall, to what extent do disagreements or disputes characterize the relationships between your school and home schools? ................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = No disagreements  
1 = To a very little extent  
2 = To a little extent  
3 = To a fair extent  
4 = To a considerable extent  
5 = To a very great extent
15. To what extent is the JVS board of education effective in each of the following areas?

0 = Not effective
1 = To a very little extent
2 = To a little extent
3 = To a fair extent
4 = To a considerable extent
5 = To a very great extent

- Coordinating the JVS-home schools efforts .............. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Mobilizing community support............................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Mobilizing the support of the participating school districts' agencies................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Facilitating internal functioning of the JVS........... 0 1 2 3 4 5

16. To what extent does the JVS board support your school's efforts to fulfill its mission?.......................... 0 1 2 3 4 5

0 = No support
1 = To a very little extent
2 = To a little extent
3 = To a fair extent
4 = To a considerable extent
5 = To a very great extent

17. Overall, to what extent is there cooperation between the JVS and home schools?.................. 0 1 2 3 4 5

0 = No cooperation
1 = To a very little extent
2 = To a little extent
3 = To a fair extent
4 = To a considerable extent
5 = To a very great extent
Part II

School Information

(1) Number of students ____
(2) Number of service areas ____
(3) Number of vocational programs (curriculum) ____
(4) Number of school districts that are members of the JVS ____
(5) Number of contracting school districts served by the JVS ____
(6) Do you offer academic education?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]
(7) The JVS board of education (check one)
   (a) the JVS has its own board........................[ ]
   (b) another board serves as the JVS board........[ ]
(8) Number of years that the school has been in existence ____

Part III

Background Information

(1) Current Position (check one): (a) Superintendent [ ]
   (b) Director [ ]
(2) Number of years served in this position ____
(3) Highest degree held __________________________
(4) Major field of study for the highest degree held __________________________
(5) Number of years of involvement in vocational education ____

COMMENTS:
APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR HOME SCHOOLS
THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND THEIR
HOME SCHOOLS AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS

PART I

Directions

Please answer each of the following questions by circling one of the six numbers (0 to 5) with respect to each question's scale. Please be sure to circle the answer that best describes the situation existing at your school, at the present time.

Note: JVS = Joint Vocational School

1. How often do you use the following methods for contacting the JVS and coordinating joint efforts?

   0 = Not used
   1 = A few times a year
   2 = About once a month
   3 = About once a week
   4 = Once a day
   5 = Almost hourly

   - Telephone........................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - Letter............................................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - Written report................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - Person to person contact.................... 0 1 2 3 4 5

Regular joint committee meeting at the following levels:

   - Superintendent/director of the JVS and principals of home schools........... 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - JVS and home schools' counselors........... 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - Assigning a staff member as a liaison between your school and the JVS........ 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - Other (specify)................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
2. How often do you contact the JVS for the following reasons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0 = No contact</th>
<th>1 = A few times a year</th>
<th>2 = About once a month</th>
<th>3 = About once a week</th>
<th>4 = Once a day</th>
<th>5 = Almost hourly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To give information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To request information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To settle differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To coordinate efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To plan future efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How would you characterize the quality of the communication between the JVS and your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>0 = No communication</th>
<th>1 = Very poor</th>
<th>2 = Poor</th>
<th>3 = Fair</th>
<th>4 = Good</th>
<th>5 = Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To give information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To request information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To settle differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To coordinate efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To plan future efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the JVS should be involved in providing the following services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1 = Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Considering the overall situation, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement: "The joint vocational school system is the best mechanism or arrangement for the delivery of vocational education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>1 = Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Uncertain</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To give information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To request information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To settle differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To coordinate efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To plan future efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How well are the procedures concerning the JVS-home schools relationships established? ............................................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = Not at all  3 = Adequately
1 = Very poorly  4 = Well
2 = Poorly  5 = Very well

7. Overall, to what extent is there cooperation between the JVS and your school? .................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = No cooperation  3 = To a fair extent
1 = To a very little extent  4 = To a considerable extent
2 = To a little extent  5 = To a very great extent

8. How well are the efforts of your school and those of the JVS coordinated ( - How well the decisions and the actions are concerted and the programs and activities are geared into each other with a maximum of effectiveness and efficiency)? ................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = Not at all coordinated  3 = Adequately
1 = Very poorly  4 = Well
2 = Poorly  5 = Very well

9. How much control do you personally feel you have over factors (forces) external to your school which affect your ability to perform your job and consequently the school's ability to fulfill its mission? .................. 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = No control  3 = Fair
1 = Very little  4 = Considerable
2 = Little  5 = A great deal of control

10. Within the JVS-home school relationships, the JVS is dependent on home schools for providing students. At the same time home schools are dependent on the JVS for providing vocational education to their students. Which is the more dependent on the other? .......................... 0 1 2 3 4 5
0 = Neither is dependent on the other
1 = JVS is much more dependent
2 = JVS is more dependent
3 = Both the JVS and home schools are equally dependent on each other
4 = Home schools are more dependent
5 = Home schools are much more dependent
11. Within the JVS-home schools relationships, how would you characterize the influential positions of the JVS and home schools on the decisions made?

- 0 = Neither one has influence
- 1 = JVS has much more influence
- 2 = JVS has more influence
- 3 = Both the JVS and home schools have equal influence
- 4 = Home schools have more influence
- 5 = Home schools have much more influence

12. Overall, to what extent is there competition between the JVS and home schools in securing students?

- 0 = No competition
- 1 = To a very little extent
- 2 = To a little extent
- 3 = To a fair extent
- 4 = To a considerable extent
- 5 = To a very great extent

13. Overall, to what extent do disagreements or disputes characterize the relationships between your school and the JVS?

- 0 = No disagreement
- 1 = To a very little extent
- 2 = To a little extent
- 3 = To a fair extent
- 4 = To a considerable extent
- 5 = To a very great extent
Part II

School Information

(1) Number of students

(2) Number of students in grades 11 and 12

(3) Number of students from your school enrolled in the JVS

(4) The distance in miles from this school to the JVS

(5) Do you offer academic education to your students who attend the JVS?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

(6) Do you offer any vocational programs? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(7) Number of years that the school has been in existence

Part III

Background Information

(1) Number of years served in this position

(2) Highest degree held

(3) Major field of study for the highest degree held

(4) Number of years of involvement in education

(5) Number of years of association with the JVS

COMMENTS:
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER FOR JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AND HOME SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
July 1, 1982

Dear:

A short time ago you should have received a questionnaire concerning "the Relationships between Joint Vocational Schools and Their Home Schools as Perceived by the Respective Administrators." To date the responses to this survey have been most gratifying. However, your completed questionnaire has not been received yet.

If this letter and your response have crossed in the mail, please allow me to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation and thanks for your help.

If you have not yet had time to complete the questionnaire, won't you please take a few minutes today for that purpose and mail the completed questionnaire?

Thank you for you assistance, time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Mohammad Rabieh
APPENDIX F

STATUTES CONCERNING JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS*
STATUTES CONCERNING JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

State of Ohio
March, 1975

Division of Vocational Education  State Department of Education

Columbus, Ohio  43215
JV 3311.01 School districts classified.

The school districts of the state shall be styled: "city school districts," "local school districts," "exempted village school districts," "county school districts," "joint high school districts," and "joint vocational school districts."

JV 3311.16 Plan for joint vocational school districts.

Any local, exempted village, city, or county board of education, or any combination of such districts, referred to in sections 3311.16, 3311.17, and 3311.18 of the Revised Code as the initiating unit, may make or contract for the making of a study pertaining to the need to establish within the county, or within an area comprised of two or more adjoining counties, a joint vocational school district, and for the preparation of a plan for the establishment and operation of a joint vocational school district covering the territory of two or more school districts within such county or counties. Any local, exempted village, city school district in the county or counties may participate with the initiating unit in the cost of such study and plan. Such plan shall be submitted to the state board of education by the initiating unit.

(130 v H 597. Eff. 10-7-63. 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.17 Submission of plan to participating districts.

On approval of the plan by the state board of education, the initiating unit shall file a copy of such plan with the board of education of each district whose territory is proposed to be included in the proposed joint vocational school district. Within thirty days after receiving such copy, such board of education shall determine whether its district shall become a part of the proposed joint vocational school district. If one or more boards of education decide not to become a part of such proposed district, a revised plan shall be prepared by the initiating unit, and if such revised plan is approved by the state board of education, such initiating unit shall file the revised plan with the board of education of each district whose territory is proposed to be included in the proposed joint vocational school district. Within thirty days thereafter, each such district shall determine whether its district shall become a part of the proposed joint vocational school district.

(130 v H 597. Eff. 10-7-63. 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.18 Creation of joint vocational school district.

Subject to the consent of the board of education of each school district whose territory is proposed to be included within a joint vocational school district, the initiating unit may create a joint vocational school district within the county or within an area comprised of two or more adjoining counties, composed of the territory of all the school districts whose boards of education have approved the formation of the joint vocational school district. The effective date for the establishment of such
district shall be designated by the initiating unit. The boards of education of the school districts participating in the establishment of a joint vocational school district may participate on a proportional basis in meeting the administrative, clerical, and other expenses necessary to the establishment and operation of a joint vocational school district until funds are otherwise provided. A school district shall not lose its separate identity or legal existence by reason of becoming a part of a joint vocational school district. Expenditures made by a school district participating in the establishment of a joint vocational school district for meeting the administrative, clerical, and other expenses necessary to the establishment and operation of a joint vocational school district until such time as the joint vocational school district commences to receive revenues as provided by law are hereby ratified and declared to have been lawfully made, the same as if such contributions had been lawful at the time they were made. (132 v H 1. Eff. 2-21-67. 131 v H 599; 130 v B 597; 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.19 Joint vocational school district board; alternative methods of selection; executive officer; compensation; mileage.

(A) The management and control of a joint vocational school district shall be vested in the joint vocational school district board of education. Where a joint vocational school district is composed only of two or more local school districts located in one county, or when all the participating districts are in one county and the boards of such participating districts so choose, the county board of education of the county in which the joint vocational school district is located shall serve as the joint vocational school district board of education. Where a joint vocational school district is composed of local school districts of more than one county, or of any combination of county, local, city, or exempted village school districts, unless administration by the county board of education has been chosen by all the participating districts in one county pursuant to this section, the board of education of the joint vocational school district shall be composed of one or more persons who are members of the boards of education from each of the city, exempted village, or county school districts affected to be appointed by the boards of education of such school districts. Unless administration by the county board of education has been chosen by all the participating districts in one county pursuant to this section, the board of education of the joint vocational school district shall be composed of one or more persons who are members of the boards of education from each of the city, exempted village, or county school districts. In such joint vocational school districts the number and terms of members of the joint vocational school district board of education and the allocation of a given number of members to each of the city, exempted village, and county districts shall be determined in the plan for such district, provided that each such joint vocational school district board of education shall be composed of an odd number of members.

(B) Notwithstanding division (A) of this section, a county board of education that has members of its board serving on a joint vocational school district board of education may make a request to the joint vocational school district board that the joint vocational school district plan be revised to provide for one or more members of boards of education of local school districts that are within the county school district and within the joint vocational school district to serve in the place of its county board of education members. If agreement is obtained among a majority of the boards of education that have a member serving on the joint vocational school district board of education and among a majority of the local school district boards of education included in the district and located within the county school district whose board requests the substitution, the State Board of Education may revise the joint vocational school district plan to conform with such agreement.
(C) If the board of education of any school district included within a joint vocational district that has had its board membership revised under division (B) of this section requests the joint vocational school district board to submit to the State Board of Education a revised plan under which one or more joint vocational board members chosen in accordance with a plan revised under such division would again be chosen in the manner prescribed by division (A) of this section, the joint vocational board shall submit the revised plan to the State Board of Education, provided the plan is agreed to by a majority of the boards of education represented on the joint vocational board, a majority of the local school district boards included within the joint vocational district, and each county board of education affected by such plan. The State Board of Education may revise the joint vocational school district plan to conform with the revised plan.

(D) The vocational schools in such joint vocational school district shall be available to all youth of school age within the joint vocational school district subject to the rules and regulations adopted by the joint vocational school district board of education in regard to the standards requisite to admission. A joint vocational school district board of education shall have the same powers, duties, and authority for the management and operation of such joint vocational school district as is granted by law to a board of education of a city school district, and shall be subject to all the provisions of law that apply to a city school district.

(E) Where a county board of education has been designated to serve as the joint vocational school district board of education, the county superintendent of schools shall be the executive officer for the joint vocational school district, and the board may provide for additional compensation to be paid to him by the joint vocational school district, but he shall have no continuing tenures other than that of county superintendent. The superintendent of schools of a joint vocational school district shall exercise the duties and authority vested by law in a superintendent of schools pertaining to the operation of a school district and the employment and supervision of its personnel. The joint vocational school district board of education shall appoint a clerk of the joint vocational school district who shall be the fiscal officer for such district and who shall have all the powers, duties, and authority vested by law in a clerk of a board of education. Where a county board of education has been designated to serve as the joint vocational school district board of education such board may appoint the county superintendent of schools as the clerk of the joint vocational school district.

(F) Each member of a joint vocational school district board of education shall be paid such compensation as the board may provide by resolution, provided that such compensation shall not exceed twenty dollars a meeting and mileage at the rate of ten cents a mile to and from meetings of the board not exceeding twelve meetings in any one year.

JV 3311.20 Bond issue; notes.

A joint vocational school district board of education by a vote of at least two-thirds of its full membership may, at any time, submit to
the electors of the joint vocational school district the question of issuing bonds of such district for the purpose of paying the cost of purchasing a site or enlargement thereof, and for the erection and equipment of buildings, or for the purpose of enlarging, improving, or rebuilding thereof, and also the necessity of a levy of a tax outside the limitation imposed by Section 2 of Article XII, Ohio Constitution, to pay the interest on and retire such bonds. The proceedings for such election and for the issuance and sale of such bonds shall be the same as required of a board of education by sections 133.01 to 133.65, inclusive of the Revised Code, provided that such bond issue may be submitted to the electors and such bonds may be issued for any one or more improvements which the district is authorized to acquire or construct notwithstanding the fact that such improvements may not be for a single purpose under section 133.10 of the Revised Code. The voting requirements for approval of the question of issuing bonds under this section shall be the same as required by section 133.18 of the Revised Code. On approval of such question, the joint vocational school district board of education may proceed with the issuance of such bonds and the levy of a tax outside a ten-mill limitation, sufficient in amount to pay the interest on and retire such bonds at maturity. Notes may be issued in anticipation of such bonds as provided in section 133.32 of the Revised Code.

The auditor of the county containing the most populous portion of the joint vocational school district shall certify the average annual levy necessary to pay the interest on and retire such bonds as provided in section 133.09 of the Revised Code. If the joint vocational school district is located in more than one county, such auditor shall obtain the assistance of the auditor of each county in which territory of such district is located, in order to certify a uniform annual levy within such district. The board of elections of the county containing the most populous portion of the joint vocational school district shall receive resolutions for filing and send them to the boards of elections of all other counties in which territory of such district is located and shall furnish all ballots for the election, as provided in section 3505.071 of the Revised Code, and shall prepare the election notice, and the board of elections of each county in which territory of such district is located shall make the other necessary arrangements for the submission of the question to the electors of the district. The joint vocational school district board of education shall be the taxing authority of the district as this term is used in sections 133.01 to 133.65, inclusive, of the Revised Code. The annual levy necessary to pay the principal and interest on such bonds shall be made by said board and shall be extended by the auditor of each county in which territory of the joint vocational school district is located on the tax lists of the school districts in his county participating in the joint vocational school district for each year for which the levy is made and shall be placed for collection on the tax duplicates of such districts in his county to be collected at the same time and in the same manner as other taxes on such duplicates. Such taxes authorized by this section when collected shall be paid to the clerk of the joint vocational school district and deposited by him to the credit of the bond retirement fund. (130 v H 597. Eff. 10-7-63. 130 v H 1: 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.21 Tax levy; notes.

The board of education of a joint vocational school district by a vote of two-thirds of its full membership may at any time adopt a reso-
ution declaring the necessity to levy a tax in excess of the ten-mill limitation for a period not to exceed ten years to provide funds for any one or more of the following purposes, which may be stated in the following manner in such resolution, the ballot, and the notice of election: purchasing a site or enlargement thereof and for the erection and equipment of buildings, or for the purpose of enlarging, improving or rebuilding thereof, or for the purpose of providing for the current expenses of the joint vocational school district, or for a continuing period for the purpose of providing for the current expenses of the joint vocational school district. Such resolution shall specify the amount of the proposed additional rate and, if the levy provides for, but is not limited to, current expenses, shall apportion the annual rate of the levy between current expenses and the other purpose or purposes. Such apportionment may, but need not, be the same for each year of the levy, but the respective portions of the rate actually levied each year for current expenses and the other purpose or purposes shall be limited by such apportionment. The portion of rate actually levied for current expenses shall be used in applying division (A) of section 3317.01 and the applicable provisions of section 5713.11 of the Revised Code, and the portion of the rate apportioned to the other purpose or purposes shall be used in applying section 5713.11 of the Revised Code requiring the reduction of an additional levy because of additions to the total valuation of property within the school which have resulted from improvements which have been added to the tax duplicate. On the adoption of such resolution the joint vocational school district board of education shall certify such resolution to the board of elections of the county containing the most populous portion of the joint vocational school district, which board shall receive resolutions for filing and send them to the boards of elections of all other counties in which territory of such joint vocational school district is located and shall furnish all ballots for the election, as provided in section 3505.071 of the Revised Code, and shall prepare the election notice, and the board of elections of each county in which the territory of such district is located shall make the other necessary arrangements for the submission of the question to the electors of the joint vocational school district at the next primary or general election occurring not less than thirty days after such resolution was received from the joint vocational school district board of education, or at a special election to be held at a time designated by such joint vocational school district board of education, which date shall not be earlier than twenty-five days after the adoption and certification of such resolution nor later than one hundred twenty days thereafter.

The board of elections of the county or counties in which territory of the joint vocational school district is located shall cause to be published in a newspaper of general circulation in such district an advertisement of the proposed tax levy question together with a statement of the amount of the proposed additional levy once each week for three consecutive weeks, prior to the election at which the question is to appear on the ballot.

If a majority of the electors voting on the question of levying such tax vote in favor of such levy, the joint vocational school district board of education shall annually make the levy within such district at the additional rate, or at any lesser rate, and the county auditor of each affected county shall annually place such levy on the tax duplicate of the school districts in his county participating in
the joint vocational school district. The taxes realized from said levy shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as other taxes on such duplicate and said taxes, when collected, shall be paid to the clerk of the joint vocational school district and deposited by him to a special fund which shall be established by the joint vocational school district board of education for all revenue derived from any tax levied pursuant to this section and for the proceeds of anticipation notes which shall be deposited in such fund.

After the approval of such levy, the joint vocational school district board of education may anticipate a fraction of the proceeds of such levy and from time to time, during the life of such levy, but in any year prior to the time when the tax collection from such levy so anticipated can be made for that year, issue anticipation notes in an amount not exceeding fifty percent of the estimated proceeds of such levy to be collected in each year up to a period of five years after the date of the issuance of such notes, less an amount equal to the proceeds of such levy obligated for each year by the issuance of anticipation notes, provided, that the total amount maturing in any one year shall not exceed fifty per cent of the anticipated proceeds of such levy for that year. Each issue of notes shall be sold as provided in sections 133.01 to 133.65 of the Revised Code, and shall, except for such limitation that the total amount of such notes maturing in any one year shall not exceed fifty per cent of the anticipated proceeds of such levy for that year, mature serially in substantially equal installments, during each year over a period not to exceed five years after their issuance. If such notes are issued, the amount necessary to pay the interest and principal thereon shall be deemed appropriated for such purposes from the proceeds of such levy, and appropriations from such levy by the joint vocational school district board of education shall be limited each year to the balance available in excess of such amount. (1972 S 455, eff. 6-28-72. 1969 H 1; 132 v H 1005, S 350, R 82; 130 v H 597; 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.211 Tuition; acceptance of funds.

The board of education of the joint vocational school district shall be authorized to charge and collect tuition for the attendance of pupils who are school residents of districts not a part of the joint vocational school district pursuant to arrangements made between the board of education of such district and the joint vocational school district board of education. The board of education of the joint vocational school district may accept gifts, grants, federal funds, tuition and other allocations of funds for the purposes of erecting, repairing, and equipping buildings and for the cost of operation of the vocational schools of such district. (129 v 1544. Eff. 10-26-61)

JV 3311.212 Use of buildings.

The board of education of a school district which is a part of a joint vocational school district and the board of education of such joint vocational school district may enter into agreements to permit the school buildings of the district first noted to be used for the purposes of carrying on a vocational school program. Such use may be either free of cost or pursuant to such rental arrangements as may be stipulated in such agreements. (129 v 1544. Eff. 10-26-61)
JV 3311.213  Enlargement of existing joint vocational school district.

With the approval of the board of education of a joint vocational school district which is in existence, any other school district in the county or counties comprising the joint vocational school district or any school district in a county adjacent to a county comprising part of a joint vocational school district may become a part of the joint vocational school district. On the adoption of a resolution of approval by the board of education of the joint vocational school district, it shall advertise a copy of such resolution in a newspaper of general circulation in the school district proposing to become a part of such joint vocational school district once each week for at least two weeks immediately following the date of the adoption of such resolution. Such resolution shall become legally effective on the sixtieth day after its adoption unless prior to the expiration of such sixty-day period qualified electors residing in the school district proposed to become a part of the joint vocational school district equal in number to a majority of the qualified electors voting at the last general election file with such board of education a petition of remonstrance against such transfer. If such resolution becomes legally effective, the board of education of the joint vocational school district shall notify the county auditor of the county in which the school district becoming a part of the joint vocational school district is located, who shall thereupon have any outstanding levy for building purposes, bond retirement, or current expenses in force in the joint vocational school district spread over the territory of the school district becoming a part of the joint vocational school district. On the addition of a county, city, or exempted village school district to the joint vocational school district, pursuant to this section, the board of education of such joint vocational school district shall submit to the state board of education a proposal to enlarge the membership of such board by the addition of one or more persons at least one of whom shall be a member of the board of education of such additional school district, and the term of each such additional member. On the addition of a local school district to the joint vocational school district, pursuant to this section, the board of education of such joint vocational school district may submit to the state board of education a proposal to enlarge the membership of such board by the addition of one or more persons who are members of the county board of education of such additional local school district. On approval by the state board of education additional members shall be added to such joint vocational school district board of education. (1971 S 34, eff. 9-29-71. 130 v H 597; 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.215  Use of facilities.

Facilities of the joint vocational school districts may be used for post-high school training, technical training, and retraining programs of vocational education. A joint vocational school district operating a vocational school may construct, maintain, and operate facilities other than those used for vocational training to be used solely for post-high school training, technical training, retraining programs of vocational education, dormitories, and other facilities for the use of any student. (132 v H 545. Eff. 12-1-67. 131 v H 599; 129 v 1544)
JV 3311.216 Funds; contract certification.

All joint vocational school district funds shall be kept in depositories selected pursuant to the provisions of sections 135.01 to 135.21, inclusive, of the Revised Code. The clerk of the joint vocational school district shall be the custodian of such funds. Such funds shall be disbursed only pursuant to warrant signed by such clerk and a person so authorized by the board of education of the joint vocational school district, and pursuant to order of such board approving such expenditure. No contract of such board of education involving the expenditures of money shall become effective until the fiscal officer of the joint vocational school district certifies there are funds in the treasury and otherwise unappropriated sufficient to provide therefor. (132 v S 321. Eff. 6-11-68. 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.217 Dissolution of district.

Upon approval by a majority of the full membership of the board of education of a joint vocational school district, or upon the receipt of resolutions formally adopted by a majority of the boards of education of the school districts participating in the joint vocational school district, the board of education of the joint vocational school district shall adopt and send to the state board of education a resolution requesting the dissolution of the joint vocational school district. Such resolution shall state the reasons for the proposed dissolution of the joint vocational school district, shall set forth a plan for the equitable adjustment, division, and disposition of the assets, property, debts, and obligations of the joint vocational school district, and shall provide that the tax duplicate of each participating school district shall be bound for and assume its share of the outstanding indebtedness of the joint vocational school district. Upon approval of the resolution by the state board of education, the joint vocational school district shall be dissolved in accordance with the provisions of the resolution. (130 v H 597. Eff. 10-7-63. 129 v 1544)

JV 3311.218 Agreement between joint vocational school district and technical college district.

The board of education of a joint vocational school district may enter into a written agreement with the board of trustees of any technical college district, the boundaries of which are coterminous with such joint vocational school district, which agreement may provide for the sharing of use of any physical facility or equipment owned or used by either district. Such agreement may further provide that the joint vocational school district may contribute a portion of its funds for current operating expenses, regardless of whether such funds are derived from a tax levy or otherwise, to the technical college district to be expended by the technical college district for any lawful purpose. The agreement shall require the approval by resolution of both boards and shall be executed by the president and clerk of both boards. A copy of such agreement shall be filed with the board of regents and a copy shall be filed with the state board of education. (1971 S 396, eff. 2-17-72. 132 v S 317)
JV 3311.28 Creation of school districts; requirements.

No school district shall be created in this state, except a joint vocational school district, which does not maintain within such district, schools covering grades from first to twelfth. A school district which is not a joint vocational school district may include kindergarten. (1971 H 475, eff. 12-20-71. 125 v 511)

JV 3313.12 Compensation and mileage.

Each member of the county board of education shall be paid such compensation as the board may provide by resolution, provided that such compensation shall not exceed twenty dollars a day and mileage at the rate of twelve cents a mile one way to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred during his attendance upon any meeting of the board not exceeding twelve meetings in any one year. Such expenses and the expenses of the county superintendent, itemized and verified, shall be paid from the county board of education fund upon vouchers signed by the president of the board.

The board of any school district other than a county school district may provide by resolution for the compensation of its members, provided that such compensation shall be paid out of current operating funds derived from a local tax which is in excess of the tax levy required for participation in additional aid from the state public school fund and that such compensation shall not exceed twenty dollars per member for regular meetings attended not exceeding twelve meetings in any one year. (131 v H 258. Eff. 11-5-65)

JV 3313.35 Counsel for school board.

Except in city school districts, the prosecuting attorney of the county shall be the legal advisor of all boards of education of the county in which he is serving. He shall prosecute all actions against a member or officer of a board for malfeasance or misfeasance in office, and he shall be the legal counsel of such boards or the officers thereof in all civil actions brought by or against them and shall conduct such actions in his official capacity. In joint vocational school districts the legal advisor shall be the prosecuting attorney of the most populous county containing a school district which is a member of the joint vocational school district. When such civil action is between two or more boards in the same county, the prosecuting attorney shall not be required to act for either of them. In city school districts, the city solicitor shall be the legal adviser and attorney for the board thereof, and shall perform the same services for such board as required of the prosecuting attorney for other boards of the county. Such duties shall devolve upon any official serving in a capacity similar to that of prosecuting attorney or city solicitor for the territory wherein a school district is situated regardless of his official designation. In a district which becomes a city school district pursuant to section 3311.10 of the Revised Code, the legal adviser shall be the solicitor of the largest of the municipal corporations all or part of which is included within the school district boundaries. No compensation in addition to such officer's regular salary shall be allowed for such services. (132 v H 447. Eff. 12-11-67. 131 v H 286)
JV 3313.48 Free education to be provided; minimum school year.

The board of education of each city, exempted village, local, and joint vocational school district shall provide for the free education of the youth of school age within the district under its jurisdiction, at such places as will be most convenient for the attendance of the largest number thereof. Every day school so provided shall be open for instruction with pupils in attendance for not less than one hundred eighty-two days in each school year, which may include up to four school days per year in which classes are dismissed one-half day early or the equivalent amount of time during a different number of days for the purpose of individualized parent-teacher conferences and reporting periods and which may include up to two days for professional meetings of teachers when such days occur during a regular school week and schools are not in session or as provided in sections 3313.481, 3313.482, and 3313.484 of the Revised Code, less the number of days the school is closed as a result of public calamity as provided in section 3317.01 of the Revised Code. The state board of education shall adopt standards for defining "school day" as used in sections 3313.48, 3313.481, 3313.482 and 3313.484, and 3317.01 of the Revised Code. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each day for grades seven through twelve shall consist of not less than five clock hours with pupils in attendance, except in such emergency situations, including lack of classroom space, as are approved by the state board of education. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each day for grades one through six shall consist of not less than five clock hours with pupils in attendance which may include fifteen minute morning and afternoon recess periods, except in such emergency situations, including lack of classroom space, as are approved by the state board of education. (1971 H 475, eff. 12-20-71. 132 v S 356; 130 v Pt 2, H 5; 130 v H 144; 127 v 77)

JV 3313.53 Special instruction schools.

The board of education of any city, exempted village, or local school district may establish and maintain in connection with the public school systems:

(A) Manual training, industrial arts, domestic science, and commercial departments;

(B) Agricultural, industrial, vocational, and trades schools;

(C) Kindergartens.

Such board may pay from the public school funds, as other school expenses are paid, the expenses of establishing and maintaining such departments and schools and of directing, supervising, and coaching the pupil-activity programs in music, language, arts, speech, government, athletics, and any others directly related to the curriculum.

JV 3313.90 Vocational education programs.

Each school district shall establish and maintain a vocational education program adequate to prepare a pupil enrolled therein for an occupation which program shall meet standards adopted by the state board of
education. A school district that is a member of a joint vocational school district or that contracts with a joint vocational school district or another school district for vocational education and that meets the standards adopted by the state board of education in compliance with this section, which standards shall include criteria for the participation by non-public students in such programs without financial assessment, charge, or tuition to such student except such assessments, charges, or tuition paid by resident public school students in such programs. Such non-public school students shall be included in the average daily membership of the school district maintaining the vocational education program as a part-time student in proportion to the time spent in the vocational education program.

In meeting standards established by the state board of education, school districts, where practicable, shall provide vocational programs in high schools. A minimum enrollment of fifteen hundred pupils in grades nine through twelve is established as a base for comprehensive vocational course offerings. A school district may meet this requirement alone, through a cooperative arrangement pursuant to section 3313.02 of the Revised Code, through school district consolidation, by membership in a joint vocational school district, by contract with a school licensed by any state agency established by the Revised Code which school operates its courses offered for contracting with public schools under standards as to staffing and facilities comparable to those prescribed by the state board of education for public schools provided no instructor in such courses shall be required to be certificated by the state department of education, or in a combination of such ways. Exceptions to the minimum requirement of fifteen hundred pupils may be made by the state board of education based on sparsity of population or other factors indicating that comprehensive educational and vocational programs as required by this section can be provided through an alternate plan.

Approval of state funds for the construction and operation of vocational facilities in any school district shall be contingent upon a comprehensive vocational program plan approved by the state board of education no later than July 1, 1970. The state board of education shall not approve a school district plan unless the plan proposed reasonably meets the vocational needs of other school districts in the general area of the school district submitting the plan. The plan shall be submitted to the state board of education no later than April 1, 1970. Such plan shall contain:

(A) The organization for vocational education pursuant to the requirements of this section;

(B) Vocational programs to be offered in the respective comprehensive high schools, in specialized schools or skill centers, and in joint vocational schools;

(C) Remodeled, additional, and new vocational facilities required at the respective locations.

In approving the organization for vocational education the state board of education shall provide that no school district is excluded in the statewide plan. (1969 H 531. Eff. 8-18-69. 131 v H 950)
JV 3313.91 Contracting for vocational services.

Any public board of education may contract with any public agency, board, or bureau, or with any private individual or firm for the purchase of any vocational education or vocational rehabilitation service for any resident of the district under the age of twenty-one years and may pay for such services with public funds. Any such vocational education or vocational rehabilitation service shall meet the same requirements, including those for teachers, facilities, and equipment, as those required of the public schools and be approved by the state department of education.

The State Board of Education may assign school districts to joint vocational districts and shall require districts to enter into contractual agreements pursuant to section 3313.90 of the Revised Code so that special education students as well as others may receive suitable vocational services.

JV 3317.16 Calculation of aid for joint vocational districts.

Payments to each joint vocational school district shall be the sum of:

(A) The total salary allowance for the teachers employed in the joint vocational school district for units approved annually by the state board of education, such allowance to be computed in the manner prescribed in section 3317.02 of the Revised Code for school districts;

(B) Fifteen per cent of such salary allowance and an amount for adult technical and vocational education and specialized consultants;

(C) Four thousand dollars times the number of teachers of approved vocational units, for the unit operating allowance.

(1971 H 475, eff. 12-20-71. 1969 H 531; 132 v S 350)

STATE BOARD RESOLUTION, JULY 12, 1972

Modification of 45 Unit Requirement

WHEREAS the minimum standards for existing Ohio high schools require chartered high schools to provide a curriculum consisting of at least 45 units or courses for the students of that school; and

WHEREAS some small school districts which are associated with a joint vocational school district have requested a period of time to make appropriate adjustments in course offerings which relate to the high school and the joint vocational school; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED that, until September 1, 1975, an existing school district that is a member of a joint vocational school district may include up to five (5) units of the vocational instruction as a part of the total 45 units, provided that at least ten per cent of the enrollment in grades nine through twelve of that particular school district are in attendance at the joint vocational school.
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INTRODUCTION

Vocational education in Ohio is provided for youth and adults in the broad areas of agriculture, business, distribution, health, home-making, and trade and industrial education. The major goal of the vocational program is to provide opportunities for persons to gain the skills and knowledge required for employability.

Under Chapter 3313.90 of the Ohio Revised Code, the legislature mandated that each school district, or a combination of districts, establish and maintain a vocational program. The legislature directed the State Board of Education to establish standards for vocational education.

Advice and counsel in the development of the vocational education standards was provided by the Ohio Advisory Council for Vocational Education, the Ohio Vocational Association, and a committee of school administrators broadly representative of the school districts of the state. The State Board of Education conducted a public hearing in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 119 of the Ohio Revised Code.

The standards, as set forth in this publication, were duly adopted by the State Board of Education.

These standards are designed to provide a dimension of leadership and direction for school districts in the State of Ohio to comply with the legislative mandate for vocational education.
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3301-61-01 Statutory Requirements

All school districts shall comply with the Revised Code of the State of Ohio in matters relating to, but not limited to, operation and control of the school. Significant statutes concerning vocational education programs are the following:

A. 3313.90—Each school district shall establish and maintain a vocational education program.

1. The program shall be adequate to prepare a pupil enrolled therein for an occupation.

2. The program shall meet standards adopted by the State Board of Education.

3. Non-public students shall be provided opportunities to participate in the vocational education program.

4. Where practicable, school districts shall provide vocational programs within high schools. A minimum enrollment of 1,500 students in grades nine through twelve is the base for comprehensive vocational course offerings.

5. A school district may meet the requirement of providing vocational education through a co-operative arrangement pursuant to section 3313.92, Ohio Revised Code.

B. 3313.91—Any public board of education may contract with any public agency, board, or bureau, or with any private individual or firm for the purchase of any vocational education or vocational rehabilitation service.

1. Any such vocational education or vocational rehabilitation service shall meet State Board of Education standards mandated for public schools. Approval by the State Department of Education is required.
2. The State Board of Education may assign school districts to joint vocational districts to meet the statutory mandate of vocational education.

3. The State Board may require school districts to enter into contractual agreements pursuant to section 3313.90 of the Revised Code.

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-01

3301-61-02 Fulfillment of statutory mandate

A school district may fulfill the statutory mandate of vocational education through any one or a combination of the following methods:

A. An arrangement pursuant to Ohio Revised Code section 3313.92,

B. School district consolidation to provide a minimum enrollment of 1,500 students in grades 9 through 12,

C. Membership in a joint vocational school district,

D. Contract with a school district or with a school licensed by any state agency established by the Ohio Revised Code and which operates in compliance with standards prescribed by the State Board of Education for public schools, or

E. Being an individual district with 1,500 students in grades 9 through 12.

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-02

3301-61-03 Job training approval

Each school district shall provide by September 1, 1975 through an approved plan for vocational education job training for eligible students based upon the following percentages:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Graduates Entering College or Degree-Granting Higher Education Programs</th>
<th>Percentage of Students 16 Years of Age or Older for Whom Vocational Education Shall be Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% or less</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% — 60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% — 70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% or more</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-03

3301-61-04 Criteria for job training programs

Each school district shall provide through an approved plan for a minimum of 12 different vocational education job training offerings and 20 classes of vocational education under O.R.C. Chapter 3317, with no more than four of the 12 offerings to be provided by cooperative education methods. All job training programs shall meet criteria and standards for vocational offerings established by the State Board of Education with consideration of present and future labor market trends and with consideration of recommendations of local advisory committees composed of appropriate representatives of employers and employees in each field related to the proposed job training offering.

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-04

3301-61-05 Allocation of funds

Allocation of construction funds shall be made only to the district which has a minimum enrollment of 1,500 students in grades nine through twelve and which provides the minimum required programs in an individual, jointure, or contractual type arrangement. Because of the limitation of funds, districts or combination of districts with a minimum of 3,000 students in the upper four years of school will be given priority.
Those districts now in compact arrangements shall continue to be eligible for funding.

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-05

3301-61-06 Approval of request for funds

State Board procedures for the approval of request for construction and equipment funds and for the submission of these requests for approval of the State Controlling Board shall be as follows:

A. Funds shall not be allocated until the district or area plan for Vocational Education has been approved by the State Board of Education.

B. After approval of a request for funds by the State Board of Education, a request for State Funds shall be made to the State Controlling Board for release of funds for the project.

C. Any district adversely affected by the determination of the Division of Vocational Education or action of the State Board of Education may follow the procedure for appeal as outlined in Chapter 119 O.R.C.

D. Procedures for applying for allocation of State and Federal funds to match funds from the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation shall follow the same procedure as for the allocation of construction and equipment funds.

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-06

3301-61-07 Criteria for contractual agreement between school districts

Any contractual agreement between school districts for vocational offerings shall include:
A. The provisions for physical facilities for the vocational offerings by one or more of the boards of education with one participating school district providing for no less than 10 job training offerings and 16 classes.

B. The tax source for building needed vocational facilities and an agreement that each district will guarantee to pay a participation fee for students annually to the district which will be offering the vocational education program based upon the following formula:

1. Districts enrolling 60% or less of graduates in degree-granting higher education programs will guarantee to pay a participation fee to the district which will be offering the required scope of the vocational education program for a minimum of 20% of the 11th and 12th grade enrollment.

2. Districts enrolling 61 to 70% of graduates in degree-granting higher education programs will guarantee to pay a participation fee to the district which will be offering the required scope of the vocational education program for a minimum of 15% of the 11th and 12th grade enrollment.

3. Districts enrolling 71 to 90% of its graduates in degree-granting higher education programs will guarantee to pay a participation fee to the district which will be offering the required scope of the vocational education program for a minimum of 8% of the 11th and 12th grade enrollment.

4. Districts sending 91% or more of its graduates to degree-granting higher education programs will guarantee to pay a participation fee to the district which will be offering the required scope of the vocational education program for a minimum of 5% of the 11th and 12th grade enrollment.

5. Contract arrangements between boards of education under this section shall be for no less than 5 years, renewable on the basis of 5 year periods. Contracts between boards of education, however, in cases where a board of education offering the required scope of the vocational education offerings has obligated funds for the construction and for equipping of vocational facilities, must cover a period of years.
necessary to amortize the obligation. Such contracts shall be with the approval of the State Department of Education.

6. Districts that cooperatively develop a creative or exemplary plan or plans for providing vocational education offerings, in which provisions other than (1) through (4) above are desirable, may establish mutually agreeable fiscal arrangements which shall be stated in such plan or plans.

7. Contractual arrangements or changes in contractual relationships as contracts expire and new ones are written, or modification to such contractual arrangements during the life of the contract must have approval of all participating districts and the State Department of Education.

In districts operating under the provisions of (1) through (5) above, a participation fee will be established. Participating districts are responsible to pay participation fees based upon the formula above even though less than the formula number of students participate in vocational classes in the vocational center.

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-07

3301-61-08 Revisions of vocational plans
Revisions of plans for a vocational education planning district, individual district, or combination of districts shall be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval at any meeting. Proposed amendments are to be submitted to the State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education by the 20th of the month prior to the month in which they are to be considered by the State Board of Education. In accordance with the Ohio Revised Code Section 3313.90, in approving the organization for vocational education, the State Board of Education shall provide that no school district is excluded in the state-wide plan.

Effective January 30, 1975

Formerly EDb-463-08
3301-61-09 Prohibitions on grant programs

In grant programs which support the provision of health, education or welfare services, discrimination in the selection or eligibility of individuals to receive the services, and segregation or other discriminatory practices in the manner of providing them, are prohibited. This prohibition extends to all facilities and services provided by the grantee under the program or, if the grantee is a State, by a political subdivision of the State. It extends also to services purchased or otherwise obtained by the grantee or political subdivision, and to the facilities in which such services are provided, subject, however, to the provisions of 80.3 (e). Sec. 602, Civil Rights Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 252; 42 U.S.C. 2000d-1; and Sec. 153.91 O.R.C., Executive Order January 27, 1972, and interim order of June 30, 1972.

Effective January 30, 1975
Formerly EDb-463-09

3301-61-10 Exemptions to enrollment requirement

Exemptions to the minimum requirement of 1,500 students in grades 9 through 12 may be made by the State Board of Education based on sparsity of population or other factors indicating that comprehensive educational and vocational programs can be provided through an alternate plan.

Effective January 30, 1975
Formerly EDb-463-10

3301-61-11 Provisions for nonpublic school students

Each vocational education planning district shall provide the opportunity for all eligible non-public school students with legal residence within the geographic boundaries of the public school district to participate in the vocational job training programs without financial assessment, charge, or tuition to such student except such assessments, charges, or tuition paid by resident public school students in such programs. The non-public school students shall be included in the
average daily membership of the school district maintaining the voca-
tional education program as a part-time student in proportion to the
time spent in the vocational education program.

Effective January 30, 1975
Formerly EDb-463-11

3301-61-12 Compliance

Except for good and sufficient reason established to the satisfaction of
both the State Board of Education and the State Controlling Board, if
the State Board of Education determines that a school district has
failed to comply with Ohio Revised Code section 3313.90, such school
district shall not participate in the distribution of funds authorized by
Ohio Revised Code section 3317.02. In making such determination, the
State Board of Education shall observe the requirements of the Ad-
mnistrative Procedure Act, Chapter 119, Ohio Revised Code.

Effective January 30, 1975
Formerly EDb-463-12

3301-61-13 Full-time equivalent student for
vocational education

Full-time Equivalent Student for Vocational Education. Full-time equiva-
 lent vocational students shall be determined by multiplying the number
of hours per week in vocational programs by the number of students
enrolled full-time in the total instructional program and dividing the
product by thirty (the number of educational hours possible in the
school week). The resulting quotient is the number of full-time equiva-
 lent students to be reported as full-time equivalents for vocational units.

Effective April 1, 1972
Formerly EDb-463-16

3301-61-14 Reporting of students enrolled in vocational
programs in average daily membership for grades
seven through twelve

Reporting of Students Enrolled in Vocational Programs in Average
Daily Membership for Grades 7 - 12. The number of students enrolled
in vocational programs who may be counted in average daily membership on the form used to calculate the aid for each school district, as described in section 3317.15 of the Revised Code, shall be no more than the difference between the number of full-time equivalent pupils reported on the same form and the total number enrolled in the vocational program(s), except for students enrolled in joint vocational school districts. Twenty-five per cent of the students enrolled in a joint vocational school from a participating school district shall be counted in the average daily membership of the school district of residence.

Effective April 1, 1972

Formerly ED6-463-17

3301-61-15 Standard for extended service for vocational education

Standard for Extended Service for Vocational Education. The following provisions shall be applied in determining and granting extended service funding for vocational education programs:

A. Extended service shall be granted for vocational education instructional programs required to operate beyond the regular school year.

B. Non-degree instructors teaching on a one-year certificate may be approved for extended service beyond the regular school year up to a maximum of four (4) weeks. Extended service granted beyond the school year shall be used only for curriculum development and development of professional competence.

C. Extended service for cooperative programs shall be provided for four (4) weeks beyond the regular school year and may be approved for funding.

D. Special conditions which shall apply within identified programs of Vocational Education are:

1. Agriculture Education

   a. Agricultural Production and Farm Management —
      For approved programs, twelve (12) weeks of extended
service shall be provided and may be approved for funding. The twelve (12) weeks shall be prorated when offered in combination with other programs which qualify for less extended service.

b. Agriculture Supplies, Business, and Service; Agricultural-Industrial Equipment and Mechanics; Agriculture Products Processing; Agriculture Resource Conservation and Recreation; and Environmental Management — For all two-year programs, twelve (12) weeks of extended service shall be provided and may be approved for funding.

c. Horticulture — For all two-year programs, an extended service period of twelve (12) weeks shall be provided and may be approved for funding. No more than two twelve (12) week periods of extended service may be funded in a three-year Horticulture program.

d. Forestry — For all two-year programs, an extended service period of twelve (12) weeks shall be provided and may be approved for funding provided that such programs consist of an 11th grade laboratory and a 12th grade cooperative course.

2. Home Economics
a. Dual Role or Comprehensive Homemaking — For all programs, a four-week period of extended service beyond the regular school year shall be provided and may be approved for funding.

b. Homemaking Impact — For all programs, a two-week period of extended service beyond the regular school year shall be provided and may be approved for funding.

Effective January 1, 1974

Formerly EDb-463-18
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