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The purpose of this study was to explore and describe the situational factors and structural dimensions of the 58 Youth At Risk program sites studied. It also sought to explore the coalition member's perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship. Additionally, this study sought to describe the relationships that existed between the situational factors and the structural dimensions with the coalition member's perceived effectiveness.

Three Youth At Risk program site types were studied. They included: Building Coalitions; School Aged Child Care; and Science, Technology and Literacy.

The findings of this study indicated that the active collaborators perceived the collaborative relationships of the Youth At Risk coalitions to be effective.
The respondents who had a greater dependence on resources were more likely to experience effective collaborative relationships. As resource flows from the respondent to the coalition and resource flows to the respondent from the coalition increased, so did the perception of effective collaborative relationships.

Coalition members who had prior knowledge of, or working relationships with other members were more likely to experience effective collaborative relationships. Consensus among members was associated positively with the effectiveness of the collaborative relationships. Coalition members who had similar organizational domains were more likely to experience effective collaborative relationships.

Formal agreements between members led to more effective collaborative relationships. Both quality and frequency of communications were important to effective collaboration.

The best predictors of perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships were level of consensus, formalization of agreements and resource flows from the respondent to the coalition.

Recommendations from this study are for coalition builders to seek a consensus among members on goals and methods. Once a consensus is reached formal agreements should be used assigning responsibilities, and formal meetings should be held with minutes and agendas. Finally, the coalition builders should encourage the flow of resources between members and the coalition.
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1. Structural Framework
2. Revised Structural Framework
In 1914, Woodrow Wilson signed the Smith-Lever Act and the Cooperative Extension service was born. Eighty years later, the organization has changed and evolved, and is still a viable force working to improve the lives of the people of the United States.

The Cooperative Extension Service gets the word "Cooperative" from a special arrangement with the federal, state, and local governments. The federal partner is the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) which gives the service links throughout the department and into other federal governmental units. The state partner is the Land Grant Universities which were established through the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The local partner is the local county or parish government bodies (Rasmussen 1989).

The first sentence of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 contained a statement of mission: "to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same"(p. 49). Later, additional subjects were added so that the phrase
read in part: ". . . agriculture, uses of solar energy with respect to agriculture, home
economics, and rural energy" (p,193). In 1988 the Cooperative Extension System
adopted the following mission statement: The Cooperative Extension System helps people
improve their lives through an educational process which uses scientific knowledge
focused on issues and needs (Rasmussen 1989).

Youth development in the manner used by the Cooperative Extension System
predates the System itself by some 20 years. Rasmussen (1989) noted some work with
youth conducted by the Land Grant Universities as early as the late nineteenth century.
The 4-H program has developed over the life of the system to become a recognized and
respected youth development organization. The commitment to youth development by
the Cooperative Extension System was strengthened with the addition of a national
initiative on youth at risk.

In 1987, the Cooperative Extension System identified youth-at-risk as an initiative
for future emphasis. The initiative was one of nine that were identified originally to help
focus efforts on issues that faced the nation. Rasmussen (1989) suggested that Extension
programs have the capacity to--and should--explore the possibility of contracting with
other agencies within federal, state, and local governments to provide issue-oriented
education programs. He also noted that some have already done so very successfully in
the areas of adolescent health, nutrition, pregnancy, suicide, drugs and crime. These
efforts at collaborating with others have long been a part of the Cooperative Extension
System.
One could argue that the concept of using Collaboration and Coalitions in Extension has been around since the beginning of the Extension Service. The group of business owners Seeman Knapp pulled together to underwrite the risk taken by the W.C. Porter farm in Terrell, Texas in 1903 (Prawl 1984) could be called a coalition. Since that time Extension professionals have formed groups to help solve community problems in areas ranging from farm commodities to the complex problems of today's youth.

Statement of the Problem

In 1991, the United States government funded sixty-nine sites throughout the country to conduct innovative programs for Youth At Risk. The programs were funded through competitive grants to Extension Service field offices from the United States Department of Agriculture--Extension Service. These programs all had one common requirement, they must have a collaborative component.

The collaborative component required the sites to work with others in the community who have a stake in Youth At Risk issues. These stakeholders ranged from school systems, social service providers, and criminal justice authorities to individuals in the affected communities.

Three national Coalition Centers were established by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to support the collaborative component of the sites. However, the unique nature of these projects posed special problems in working collaboratively. Little work has been done in associating characteristics of the coalitions and the individuals involved in the coalition with the success of the collaborative effort.
The decade of the 80's saw funding for most extension programs remain constant or decrease while the cost of providing those programs increased. Most states were unable to keep up. This lack of funds caused down-sizing of extension staffs across the country.

Extension professionals were faced with trying to "do more with less". One method these professionals used was collaboration. Many questions arise: Do the members of the Youth At Risk Coalitions perceive the relationships to be effective? To what extent do they depend on other members for resources? To what extent do they share resources with other members? Is prior knowledge of other members associated with effectiveness? How important is agreement or consensus between members? How similar are the members? How often do members communicate with each other? What types of resources are shared between members and to what extent? How important are formal agreements? What types of Youth At Risk Coalitions have a higher perception of effectiveness of their collaborative components? How are these associated with the effectiveness of the coalition? These were the questions used to guide the study.

Significance of the Study

In 1990, the people of the United States, through the United States Congress and the President, started a program to be administered by the Extension Service--United States Department of Agriculture (ES-USDA) that provided $7.5 million for innovative programs in the area of Youth-At-Risk (YAR). In 1992, this amount rose to $10 million. These grants required using collaboration to address the problems of high risk youth in
selected areas of the country. Three areas were chosen for special focus for these funds: Science; Technology and Literature; School Age Child Care; and Coalitions.

This study examined selected situational factors and structural dimensions of the coalitions to determine if relationships exists between the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships within the coalition and those situational factors and structural dimensions. These findings should help professionals to maximize those situational factors and structural dimensions that promote effectiveness, resulting in better services for youth and families. The findings should also help decision-makers in funding those projects that should have the greatest likelihood of success. In addition, the national coalition centers will have more information from which to plan programs and prepare materials to support those coalitions that currently exist.

Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explain the relationship between the situational factors and structural dimensions of collaborative relationships with the perceived effectiveness of the relationship as experienced by the YAR sites that were funded for their second year in 1992. This study sought to understand some of the situational factors and structural dimensions of the collaboration process that were outlined by the literature and describe the extent to which the 1992 re-funded YAR sites experienced effective collaborative relationships. The study also sought to understand if situational factors and structural dimensions were associated with perceived effectiveness. It also
examined the nature and strength of any relationships.

The information gathered by this study should help decision-makers to better understand the collaboration process associated with the YAR sites so future programming needs of the coalitions can be met. It should also help decision-makers to predict which types of coalitions have the best chances for success and, in turn, where to place their limited resources. The study will help collaborators to maximize the structural dimensions and situational factors that predict greater effectiveness in order to achieve more effective collaborative relationships.

Eight research objectives were formulated to guide the study:

1. To describe the population of second year Youth At Risk sites on the following characteristics; type of community served, coalition size, coalition type, effect of changes in membership, and how youth were involved in the project.
2. To describe the active collaborators involved in the Youth At Risk sites on the following characteristics; race, sex, education level, and employment status and tenure.
3. To describe how the situational factors (coalition size, coalition type, resource dependence, agency or personal awareness, consensus, and domain similarity) were experienced by the active collaborators.
4. To describe how the structural dimensions (frequency of
communications, quality of communications, resource flows, and formalization of agreements) were experienced by the active collaborators.

5. To determine the degree to which the active collaborators perceive the collaborative relationships to be effective.

6. To determine if, and to what extent, selected situational factors are associated with perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships.

7. To determine if, and to what extent, selected structural dimensions are associated with perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships.

8. To determine the best predictors, from the variables studied, of the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships.

**Definition of Terms**

There were differences in the way some of the terms associated with coalitions and collaboration were used in the literature. The following terms used in this study were operationally defined as follows.
Collaboration - The process of sharing information and resources between two or more individuals and/or groups in order to achieve what one individual and/or group alone could not.

Coalition - A noun used to identify a group of individuals and/or groups which are working collaboratively.

Youth At Risk Site - A coalition which was awarded grant funds through the USDA Youth At Risk initiative with an Extension Service professional acting as director.

Active Collaborator - An individuals identified by the YAR site director and completing the survey instrument, who represented themselves or a group, agency or organization and was directly involved in the sharing of information and resources and the decisions that affect the coalition.

Structural Dimensions - Dimensions of a coalition which appeared to capture its structural essence. In this study resource flows, formalization, communication frequency and communication quality were selected.
Situational Factors - Factors which appeared to assess the conditions under which individual members of the coalition try to build collaborative relationships. In this study coalition size, coalition type, resource dependence, awareness, consensus and domain similarity were used.

Coalition Size - The number of active collaborators in the coalition.

Coalition Type - The kind of Youth At Risk site; either Science, Technology and Literacy, or School Aged Child Care, or Developing and Building Coalitions.

Resource Dependence - The extent to which members needed resources from the other members of the coalition in order to accomplish their goals.

Agency or Personal Awareness - Prior knowledge of, or relationships with other agency or individual members of the coalition.

Consensus - The extent to which coalition members agreed on needs, problems, solutions and methods.

Domain Similarity - The extent to which the members shared like goals, funding sources, staff skills, clientele, and services.
Frequency of Communications - How often members communicated; either written, as a group, individual face to face discussions, or by telephone.

Resource Flows - Direction and intensity of resources shared among coalition members.

Formalization - The extent to which written, verbal or legally binding agreements were used by the coalition.

Communication Quality - Coalition members' perception of the quality of communications between themselves and other members of the coalition.

Perceived Effectiveness - The members perception of the effectiveness of the coalition relationship. The extent to which members carry out commitments and believe relationships were worthwhile, productive and satisfying.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study were generalized only to the study population and no inferences were made to coalitions in general or to the USDA funded Youth At Risk sites not included in this study. Due to the nature of the groups studied, reaching all the active collaborators from each Youth At Risk site may not have been accomplished. The
researcher's efforts were made in good faith to reach these active collaborators but recognizes the possible shortcomings. Due to the nature of the study, more emphasis may have been placed on the relationships between coalition members and the site director than on the relationships with all coalition members. This study was designed to explore the effectiveness of the collaborative relationships and in no way sought to examine the effectiveness of the YAR sites, their projects or the overall USDA YAR initiative. No such inferences should be made.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter contains a review of the literature relating to coalitions, collaboration, partnerships and interorganizational relationships. The first section contains a discussion of the literature relating to coalitions and collaboration. Characteristics of coalitions are discussed in the second section. A discussion of the literature relating to individuals and the coalitions can be found in the third section. Advantages and barriers to effective collaboration and coalition formation can be found in the fourth and fifth sections. The structural framework used by the researcher was discussed in the final section of this chapter.

Literature Relating to Coalitions

Quick (1981) stated that the sharing of ourselves, our talents, our resources, our ideas--is the nucleus around which various elements of community development move. The movement toward more coordination in the planning and delivery of youth services should not be viewed as an isolated phenomenon, but in the context of several other trends: changes in the nature of youth services, changes in the organization of responsibilities for human services in general, and changes in state government
organization and capabilities (O'Connor, 1984). O'Connor also said that efforts to link interagency relationships to the effectiveness of services to children and youth go back to at least the mid 1950's.


1. There is a growing movement in the creation of a variety of national coalitions, consortia, and councils between national organizations.

2. At the local community level we are observing a great increase in community-wide coordinating councils responsible for designing and monitoring collaboration in a variety of areas.

3. There is a significant increase in interagency collaboration in the generating of joint program proposals and funding requests, and the recruiting and training of volunteers.

4. The development of community resource directories, referral services, resource centers and volunteer bureaus.

5. Growth of interest in city-wide goal-setting and planning conferences.

6. Many institutions of higher education, faced with the challenge of changing composition of their student bodies, are putting more attention to their role in the community and are initiating leadership of community issue forums, leadership training, and consultation to community organizations and agencies.

7. Futuring is in rapid development in all sectors and at all levels of society. (p. 16-17)

Stevens (1990) wrote, coalitions are needed when one organization recognizes it alone does not have the technical capability or people power to have a real impact on an issue. Van de Ven (1974) suggested that organizations would rather not become involved
in an interorganizational relationship because they lose autonomy, but they feel compelled
to get involved because of internal needs for more resources or, because of a
commitment to an external problem or opportunity.

According to Gray (1989) collaboration was defined as a process through which
parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences
and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible.
Jackson and Maddy (1991) defined collaboration as a process of parties working together,
sharing information and resources to achieve common goals. Bennard's (1991),
definition of collaboration was: a group of individuals who work together on common
goals, a process that exemplifies the principles of prevention philosophy (empowerment,
mutual problem solving and decision making, and mutual respect), and coming together
out of mutual concern and agreeing to work together. Bennard also described
collaboration as a people process that requires, first and foremost, attention to people
issues. Bennard further stated that human dynamics is the basis for any collaborative
effort. Hord (1986) described collaboration as the development of the model of joint
planning, joint implementation, and joint evaluation between individuals or organizations.
Hord stated that the term collaboration implies the parties involved share responsibility
and authority for basic policy decisions while cooperation is a term that assumes two or
more parties with separate and autonomous programs agree to work together in making
all such programs more successful. Hord stated that collaborative relationships are more
likely to grow from successful previous experience.
Reilly (1974) wrote that coalitions are logical extensions of networks. Reilly stated, organizations participate in coalitions around a particular concern so that jointly they can amass enough power to win on an issue even though one group alone would not have been able to prevail. According to Reilly, coalitions are usually temporary, once their purpose is accomplished they are abandoned.

Jackson and Maddy (1991) defined coalition as using collaboration to provide better services at lower costs. Parks (1985) defined a coalition as a temporary alliance or union of groups, parties or factions for a specific purpose. Parks continued to say, compelling immediate issues give rise to the uniting of groups that may disagree about other matters, and the interests the groups have in common act as a binding force that overrides differences of opinion on other issues.

The National 4-H Omni Agent Committee (1989) defined coalition as a grouping of interest groups who are committed to achieving a common goal and who have communicated and agreed to coordinate their actions, and the joining together of individuals or agencies in a common action on a specific, time limited issue or agenda, bound by a set of ideas. Stevenson (1985) stated coalitions are deliberately constructed, independent of formal organization's structure, lack of formal internal structure, with mutual perceptions of membership, issue oriented, externally focused concerted member action.

Miller (1983) described coalitions as marriages of convenience, not overpowering romantic couplings, and even with romance certainly with arrangements of convenience the partners have to learn how to live with each other. Miller went on to say building
and maintaining coalitions is no easy business, each organizational member of the coalition has its own ideology, agenda, and structures--none of which coincide exactly with those of other members.

Groups joined together on their goals may not share the same attitudes and values (Reilly, 1974). Reilly continued, writing it is the diversity of membership that creates the strength of the group. The author stated, these groups share their ideas, resources and ultimately, their power. These groups rely heavily on the self interest of their member organizations to keep them together. Coalition building offers much opportunity for creativity, but creativity based on solid information (Reilly, 1974).

Children and Teens Today (1990) described a process of establishing a partnership. First, participants in a partnership accept that the agenda of the partnership as a whole differs from that of each participating organization alone. Members then develop a common view of the problem. There is a common definition of the recipient of services. A common language without professional jargon must exist. A common understanding of the organizational structure of the agencies and institutions involved in a partnership is developed. Interdependence is essential in maintaining partnerships. Cooperation develops from equality and teamwork. Preventing problems in a partnership must be a priority and be rewarded, and credibility and visibility must be shared.

Astroth (1990) suggested that establishing alliances with others will change internal roles, relationships, and power dynamics for the organizations entering into the alliance. Astroth wrote that before initiating contact with others you must determine what is the issue that necessitates a broader cooperative effort. There must be a sense
of mutual need and interest among parties to warrant a common effort. Astroth suggested that failure to establish mutual goals and objectives is a major reason some collaborative efforts fail.

Astroth (1990) identified some of what Extension may offer to a collaboration or coalition. Extension bridges the gap between public and private organizations; has a large cadre of professionally trained staff, has a long history of community development; has extensive and effective relationships between federal, state and local levels; offers a visible presence in nearly all counties; has a strong link to university research and knowledge, and has a history of success in volunteer leadership development.

Characteristics of Coalitions

Parks (1985) suggested that the following characteristics are basic to effective coalitions; clearly defined mission, emphasis on common ideology and goals, equal power among groups, effective leadership, overlapping interests, and frequent member contacts, image of power, variable resources and appropriate termination. Children and Teens Today (1990) stated that participants in a partnership must first accept that the agenda of the partnership as a whole differs from that of each participating organization alone. The authors also suggested characteristics that are needed for success. The characteristics outlined by Children and Teens Today are: a common view of the problem, a common definition of the recipient of the services, a common language with no professional jargon, a common understanding of the organizational structure of the
agencies and institutions involved, interdependence, equality and teamwork, leadership, savvy, involvement of key personnel, sharing rather than withholding information, holding productive meetings, routinely communicating important details, and sharing credibility and visibility.

Bennard (1991) stated that through the process of involving representatives from all sectors of the community, problems will more likely be addressed at their source and not just dealt with symptomatically. Essential attributes of the coalition listed by Bennard were: a sense of gain for each member; joint planning and consensual decision making; energetic people at the heart of a collaborative team; sharing of resources; group meetings, ongoing and frequent; support from institutions involved; broad based representation, including clientele; mutual goals and objectives; shared power control and responsibilities; shared planning, decision-making, evaluation and leadership (commitment is the outgrowth of equal participation by partners); and incentives and rewards for members.

Members of the coalition should be all of the natural allies, individuals, groups, types of people who share the concern and support of a similar position (Hart, 1989). Hart also stated that the members should include all of the types of persons, groups, and social structures, likely to be affected by the issue or position taken, both positively or negatively. The membership should also include all potentially interested and civic-minded groups who might stand to gain indirectly by supporting the same issue or constituents, Hart suggested. According to the Cooperative Extension Services of Michigan State University (year unknown), group effectiveness depends on the size of
the group, personal characteristics of its members, the physical setting in which meetings are held, the nature of the group's tasks, the style of leadership, the group's motivation toward fulfilling the task and many more. Dluhy (1990) suggested that representativeness of the coalition and not its size, may dictate legitimacy and success.

Schindler-Rainman (1981) said that in order to maintain the momentum of the coalition it should rotate temporary membership of the coalition and vary meeting hours. The author also suggested keeping careful documentation and keeping an open system so every member has the opportunity to participate. Good feedback and review, recognition of accomplishments along the way were also important according to Schindler-Rainman. The author suggested an analysis of individual and organizational resources and skills, an activity centered beginning, and developing ways for the members to report back to their own groups could all be important ways to maintain momentum.

Van de Ven (1974) suggested that there are structural dimensions and process dimensions to an interorganizational relationship. Van de Ven's work with child service agencies and their partners in Texas displayed the use of these structural dimensions. The Texas study involved gathering information about each individual organization from all the other partners involved in the interorganizational relationship. The structural dimensions Van de Ven (1974) included were formalization, centralization and structural complexity. Formalization refers to the degree to which rules, policies and procedures govern the inter-agency agreement and contacts. The indicators used to measure formalization are the extent to which rules, policies and procedures are established to transact activities between parties, and the extent of procedures (agendas, minutes, etc.)
followed by a committee or group that governs the interorganizational relationship. Centralization is the locus of decision making. It is measured by the perceived degree of influence by the individuals in making decisions that are binding on the member agencies. Structural complexity is the number of differentiated elements that must be contended with and integrated in order for the interorganizational relationship to act as a unit. Structural complexity is measured by the number of organizations involved and the number of different issues or tasks on which the interorganizational relationship is based. Van de Ven (1974) suggested that size is often a predictor of structural complexity.

Van de Ven's (1974) process dimensions of an interorganizational relationship were resource flows and information flows. Resource flows are the units of value transacted between agencies. Resource flows are measured by the intensity, direction, and variability. Information flows are the messages or communications about the units of exchange or the nature of the relationship transmitted between organizational parties through a variety of media (written, phone, face-to-face, and group or committee meetings).

Van de Ven (1974) suggested that without some ongoing transaction of resources, it is highly probable that one or more agencies will terminate their membership. The more intensively or frequently a single organization transacts resources and communicates with other member agencies, the greater the strategic position or power of that agency. Van de Ven (1974) further suggested that the direction of resources and information flows to and from an agency indicated the role it performs in the social action system.
Van de Ven (1974) stated that the defining criterion of an inter-agency relationship is the intensity of resource flows among agencies. According to Van de Ven (1974) growth, adaptation, or dissolution of an interorganizational relationship can be directly monitored by observations of resource flows over time.

Van de Ven (1979) used seven dimensions in a study to define and operationalize a pattern of relationships among organizations. The seven dimensions were resource dependence, awareness, consensus, frequency of communications, formalization, effectiveness of relationships, and impact. Resource dependence refers to the degree to which organizations need external resources to achieve their self-interest objectives. Awareness is the degree to which organizational boundary spanners are familiar with the services and goals of other agencies, and the degree of personal acquaintance among boundary spanners. Consensus refers to the degree of agreement among agency boundary spanner on the services and goals of each others' organizations and the lack of conflict between agencies. Frequency of communications among agencies is measured in terms of numbers of written reports and letters, telephone calls, face to face contacts and committee meetings in a given time period. Formalization is the degree to which rules, policies and procedures govern the agreement and contracts between organizations. The effectiveness of relationships is the perceived extent to which agencies carry out their commitments and believe their relationships are equitable productive worthwhile and satisfying. Impact is the extent to which organizations involved in a relationship are perceived to change or affect the internal operations of one another.
Brown (1983) implied that leadership is essential in a coalition but the style of leadership seems to determine its success. Brown said organizers who appear to want to control the coalition engender suspicion and distrust. According to Brown, facilitating and enabling style of leadership seems best by balancing a firm and intentional approach so that people have confidence that something will happen and there is an openness to other’s ideas, needs and directions.

Black (1983) suggested that for a coalition to be viable, one or more persons must spend a great deal of time communicating, organizing, developing resources, and facilitating the involvement of others. Black also suggested that since self interests prevail and because it is often seen in very narrow terms, a strong coalition needs at least one staff person hired by the coalition, or one or more staff persons from a member organization, who can devote substantial time to the forwarding of the coalitions goals.

Yukl (1989) stated that the quality of a group decision depends on the contribution of information and ideas by group members, the clarity of communication, the accuracy of prediction and judgments, the extent to which the discussion is focused on the problem, and the manner in which disagreement is resolved. Yukl said that group processes are influenced by the size and composition of the group, member cohesiveness, status differential among members, member knowledge and personality, the immediate environment, and the leader’s skill and behavior.

Communication becomes more difficult as the number of members increases, according to Yukl (1989). The author reasons, a larger group usually has the advantage of more collective knowledge and greater variety of perspectives on a problem.
According to Yukl, there is a trade-off between costs and benefits as group size increases. The trick is to determine what size is optimal in a given situation. As the size of the group increases beyond eight members, the potential contribution of any additional persons should be carefully weighed against the added difficulty of running an effective meeting (Yukl, 1989). Yukl also stated that obvious status differences among members inhibit information exchange and accurate evaluation of ideas. Low status members are usually content to criticize or disagree with high-status persons, according to Yukl.

Group cohesiveness is the degree of mutual affection among members and their attraction to the group (Yukl, 1989). Yukl stated that cohesiveness is a characteristic of the group, but is dependent on individual characteristics of the members. The author suggested that a group is much more likely to be cohesive if its members have similar values, attitudes, and cultural backgrounds. A cohesive group is more likely to agree on a decision, but members tend to agree too quickly without a complete, objective evaluation of the alternatives. Yukl cautioned, members of a cohesive group are less willing to risk social rejection for questioning a majority viewpoint or presenting a dissenting opinion. Consequently, the critical evaluation of ideas is inhibited during decision making and creativity is reduced during problem solving (Yukl, 1989).

Each member of a group brings to a meeting certain needs, attitudes, values, knowledge and experience. Some of these characteristics of the members have obvious implications for group processes according to Yukl (1989). Information and knowledge of members is a major determinant of decision quality. Another important determinant is the goal orientation of its members. The traits and values of members can also affect
the quality of decisions and group processes. Yukl stated that groups with compatible members are more productive, especially when agreement is necessary under conditions of time pressure.

Yukl (1989) said, meetings occur in physical environments that helps to determine psychological climate and indirectly influences group processes. Seating arrangements can create psychological separation between the leader and other members. The presence or absence of distractions, such as noise, telephones and interruptions can also influence group decision making according to Yukl.

Quality of leadership is one of the most important determinants of meeting success, Yukl (1989) stated. The leadership role can be shared to some extent but, according to Yukl, studies of decision-making groups find that members usually prefer a take-charge leader who performs many of the essential leadership functions. Such leaders tend to have more satisfied and productive groups. The leader who dominates the discussion will likely discourage the contribution of ideas and the critical evaluation of proposals.

**Individuals and Coalitions**

Group effectiveness depends on the personal characteristics of its members (Miller, 1983). Reilly (1974) pointed out that while groups joined together agree on their goals their members may not share the same attitudes and values. Children and Teens Today (1990) suggested that members must develop a common view of the problem among members.
Bennard (1991) said that each member must have a sense of gain and that the people at the heart of the collaborative team must be energetic. Bennard also suggested that the members must be a broad representation of the problem, including among others, the clientele.

Schindler-Rainman (1981) identified several competencies needed of group members. They are conflict utilization skills, appreciation of differences, resource retrieval skills, ability to decrease turfdom roles, ability to utilize resistance to change, recognition for other members, and evaluation and feedback competencies. Lieberman (1986) indicated that time for collaboration needs to be allotted. People often underestimate the amount of energy it takes to work with other people. Lieberman also indicated that shared experiences over time build mutual trust, respect, risk-taking and commitment. Hord (1986) agreed with Lieberman stating that collaborative relationships are more likely to grow from successful previous experience. Hord also suggests that the assumptions and decisions in a collaboration seem to come out of the members personal experience.

According to Yukl (1989), the characteristics of the members have obvious implications for group processes. Information, knowledge and the goal orientation of members are major determinants of decision quality. Yukl also indicated that the traits and values of group members can affect the quality of decisions and group processes, stating that groups with compatible members are more productive.
Advantages of Effective Coalitions

Bennard (1991) identified program effectiveness, pooling of resources to reduce the loss from duplicated and fragmented interventions, and providing a cost effective way to address problems as some of the benefits of coalitions. Bennard also stated that the process of collaboratively planning, problem solving, decision making, resolving conflicts, and laughing together breaks down the isolation people experience working alone and creates a stimulating empowering creative experience that builds nurturing and supportive relationships among the participants.

According to O'Connor (1984), interagency linkages can improve service delivery but are unlikely to cut costs. Hord (1986) disagreed stating that the members will experience economic savings.

Hord (1986) listed enhanced project outcomes and improved communications along with the economic savings as benefits associated with coalitions. Communication, sharing of resources, and consensus on goals are the benefits identified by participants, according to Hord.

Hahn (1981) pointed to expanded scope of services and programs, increased awareness of situations in the community, better access to a wider range of resources, less duplication of effort, increased quality of services, improved credibility and greater visibility as benefits of interorganization relations. Lippett (1981) said collaboration can provide a way to cope with increasing complexity, meeting expanding expectations, needs and demands of human services, involving unused human resources, shared use of facilities and program resources, and improved utilization of funds and personnel.
Since funding sources want the greatest mileage from their investments, coalition building can improve the prospects for funding, according to Brown (1983). Black (1983) listed allowing organizations to become involved in new and broader issues without the necessity of totally managing or developing those issues, giving organizations greater power and influence on an issue than any organization would have working alone, enabling mobilization of greater resources to influence an issue than any single organization could achieve alone, and bringing a variety of effective approaches to bear on an issue as the major advantages to coalitions. Jackson and Maddy (1992) wrote that the advantages of collaboration identified most frequently are more effective and efficient delivery of programs, professional development of members, improved communications, elimination of duplication, increased use of programs, improved public image, better needs assessment, consistency of information and increased availability of resources. Rossi (1982) pointed out that through economies of scale, fewer duplicate programs and improved cost-benefit ratios will make the delivery of programs more effective and efficient.

**Barriers to Coalition Effectiveness**

Thomas (1989) wrote that coalitions may divert energy and resources from an organization's own priority issues. It may also take positions that are contrary to a member organization's interest or policy, or it may use a consensus process for decision making that is slow and sometimes cumbersome resulting in a weakened position issues
or missed opportunities. The coalition may, due to differences among organizations, be prevented from making as strong a stand or moving as swiftly as possible on issues.

Schindler-Rainman (1981) listed the following traps of coalitions: fear of merger of member organizations, giving up turfdom and territory, letting one person or one organization take over, lack of time to keep people informed and involved, poor documentation, permanent subcommittees, elitism and exclusiveness, lack of follow up plans, poor initial involvement process, inadequate funding plans, and unequal commitment. Van de Ven (1974) pointed out that without some ongoing transaction of resources among all members it is probable that some members will be lost.

Hord (1986) identified the lack of resources and limitations of organizations in transferring resources and power, external institutional decision making processes and lack of skills for cooperative decision making, incompatible structures of organizations, lack of concepts for organizing the parties, and poor matches between what one party can offer and what the other party needs as barriers to coalitions. Participants according to Hord identified lack of time and financial support and the overburdening of agencies from planning, implementing and evaluating the collaboration as barriers to their participation in coalitions. Robinson (1989) identified similar barriers listing competitiveness, dominating rather than shared leadership which discourages group decision making, inflexibility in scheduling meetings and activities, a lack of understanding about how community agencies operate, hidden agendas for personal advancement, cynicism about the advantages of information sharing, time constraints and pressure to push things through without giving adequate time for discussion and to work
through conflicts, more emphasis on talking than listening, preferring to do things alone
rather than spending time negotiating with others, closed participation, and prescribing
actions for a partnership from the top down rather than taking the necessary time to plan,
involve and encourage the key decision making to come from the participants at the local
grassroots level.

According to Hahn (1981) the time and effort required to get items on each others
agenda is a cost of interorganizational relations. Hahn also listed the time and effort
required to reach joint decisions, additional communication links and information
processing as costs. Negotiation of roles for distribution of power and influence,
potential loss of autonomy and potential leaking of organizational secrets were also costs
identified by Hahn.

Who takes credit for program results, using a paid staff versus a volunteer staff
and a system oriented direction versus one driven by grassroots were barriers identified
by Quick (1981). Johnson (1987) indicated conflicting policy goals, funding patterns,
eligibility criteria for services, and other variables which may vary across agencies may
be barriers. Johnson also pointed out that a lack of flexibility and coordination among
services and lack of client involvement, inadequate understanding of the workings of
other agencies and a limited understanding of coalition process skills may also become
barriers to effective coalitions.

Two major problems that plague coalitions arise from the fact that coalitions are
made up of different organizations (Black 1983). Black stated that individual
organization needs of member groups will compete with, if not, contradict the needs of
the coalition. Because of the priorities of different organizations vary, there is a tendency in the best coalitions to keep broadening the political agenda, expanding to cover the interests of additional organizations or more of the interests of certain organizations. Black wrote that far too often the effectiveness of a coalition decreases as the breadth of its agenda increases.

Gray (1989) listed institutional disincentives, historical and ideological barriers, power disparities, societal level dynamics, differing perceptions of risk, technical complexity, and political and institutional cultures as obstacles to collaboration. The institutional disincentives were a fear that mediation will dilute the mission of the organization, a fear of uncertainty, and limited resources which may be drained because of collaborating. Past bitter relations between parties may be a historical or ideological barrier. Concerns over preserving an institutional power base may create power disparities. Societal-Level dynamics creating obstacles to collaboration according to Gray were: cultural norms rooted in a strong sense of individualism, and viewing negotiation as a weakness. Different perceptions of risk may keep some members form participating. Disputes over value judgements and accuracy on technical issues may create an obstacle. Political and institutional cultures such as budget cycles, which must be planned well in advance when collaborative opportunities cannot be anticipated, may also be barriers to effective coalitions according to Gray.
**Structural Framework**

The structural framework for this study was adapted from Van de Ven and Ferry (1980). It included the Van de Ven and Ferry's situational factors and structural dimensions, but also included characteristics used to describe the population of active collaborators and Youth At Risk sites. These were used to provide a better understanding of the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships involved in the Youth At Risk coalitions (Figure 1).

The characteristics of the Youth At Risk sites used in the structural framework were: type community served, coalition size, coalition type, effect of changes in membership and how youth were involved in the project. The characteristics of the active collaborators included were: race, sex, education level and employment status and tenure. The situational factors identified by Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) and included in this study were: coalition size, coalition type, resource dependence, agency or personal awareness, consensus, and domain similarity. The structural dimensions identified by Van de Ven and Ferry and included in this study were: frequency of communications, quality of communications, resource flows, and formalization of agreements.

A representation of this structural framework is found in Figure 1. The work of Van de Ven and Ferry was very valuable in developing a conceptual way to examine the collaborative relationships among the Youth At Risk coalitions.
Characteristics of YAR sites
- community type
- coalition size
- coalition type
- effect of membership changes
- how youth involved

Characteristics of Active Collaborators
- race
- sex
- education level
- employment status
- employment tenure

Situational Factors
- coalition size
- coalition type
- resource dependence
- agency or personal awareness
- consensus
- domain similarity

Structural Dimensions
- frequency of communications
- quality of communications
- resource flows
- formalization of agreements

Perceived Effectiveness of Collaborative Relationships

Figure 1. Structural Framework
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This the study was *ex post facto* in nature and was designed to gather data concerning the nature and strength of relationships between variables. The independent variables for the study were the Situational Factors and Structural Dimensions of the Coalition. The Situational Factors selected for this study were the same as those identified by Van de Ven and Ferry (1980); coalition size, coalition type, resource dependence, agency or personal awareness, consensus, and domain similarity. The Situational Factors selected were the same as those identified by Van de Ven and Ferry (1980); frequency of communications, resource flows from the member to the coalition, resource flows to the member from the coalition, formalization of agreement between members, and quality of communications. The situational factors and structural dimensions were discussed by Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) in their book entitled "Measuring and Assessing Organizations". These independent variables had already occurred and were not controlled. The dependent variable was the effectiveness of the relationships among coalition members as perceived by the active collaborators. The intent of this study was to describe the population studied. The results were not generalized to all coalitions or to all collaborative partnerships using the USDA grants.
for Youth At Risk. The perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships should not be confused with the overall effectiveness of the YAR projects.

**Definition of the Population**

In 1992, the United States Department of Agriculture--Extension Service funded, for their second year, sixty-eight of the original sixty-nine local sites for work on issues related to Youth At Risk. These sites consisted of directors, who were employed by their state Cooperative Extension Services, and various partners. Ten of these sites, that were re-funded in 1992, chose not to participate in this study. Some of these ten sites had just completed an evaluation study and did not want to be a part of another study. The remaining non-participating sites were on Indian reservations and because of cultural reasons did not wish to give information on their sites or about themselves.

The population of this study consisted of 58 Youth At Risk grant sites funded for their second year in 1992. The directors and the other active collaborators who were involved in the operation of the programs funded by the USDA Youth At Risk grants were surveyed. The active collaborators were identified by the site directors. Permission to study the USDA funded sites was obtained from the USDA Extension Services in Washington, D.C.
Instrument Validity

External validity referred to the degree to which the results of the study could be generalized to the population. Because the study was a census, the major threats to external validity were frame error and non-response error.

Frame error was controlled in this study by using the list of USDA funded sites supplied by USDA. The directors identified the active collaborators in each Youth At Risk site. The list is considered to be complete and accurate. A total of 58 USDA Youth At Risk sites were included in this study.

Non-response error can occur when the accepting sample was less than the total population. Non-respondents may vary significantly from respondents on key variables of interest to the researcher. Non-response error was controlled by comparing the responses of early respondents to those of late respondents (Miller and Smith, 1983). The researcher recognizes the weaknesses of this method and would favor a random sample of nonrespondents, but due to time, financial, and physical constraints this method was not practical. The comparison of early to late respondents was conducted on the dependent variable, the situational factors and structural dimensions and on demographic variables using a t-test. An alpha level of .05 was established a priori as the level of significance. The t-test yielded no significant difference on any of the variables selected for comparison. Clausen and Ford (1947) found that late respondents are recurrently similar to nonrespondents. Therefore, the researcher concluded that the nonrespondents were not significantly different from respondents on the variables of interest in this study.
Internal validity of the study referred to the accuracy of the data generated by the study. An important threat to internal validity is that of measurement error. In an attempt to control measurement error the mail questionnaire was presented to a panel of experts (Appendix F) in the field of Youth At Risk and coalitions. The panel was asked to review the instrument items for content and face validity. It was decided a priori to delete or modify any items that were judged to be inappropriate or unclear by more than two members of the panel. Although no items met this criteria, some items were modified using suggestions from the panel in an attempt to make the instrument as clear to the subjects as possible. Following review by the panel the instrument was judged to be content and face valid.

**Instrument Reliability**

A mail questionnaire was adapted from one used by Van de Ven and Ferry (1980), to gather data for the study. The work done by Van de Ven and Ferry was a great help to the researcher in building a conceptual framework for this study.

Using a draft of the adjusted instrument, a pilot test was conducted using the USDA Youth At Risk site in Oktibbeha County Mississippi. This site was funded for the first time in 1992, and was not a part of the population of this study. This YAR site was selected because it was determined that it would be like the population to be studied and it was accessible to the researcher.

From the data collected in the pilot test, Cronbach's alpha, a measure of internal consistency of the results generated by the instrument, was calculated using SPSSPC+.
An acceptable value for Cronbach’s alpha was set \textit{a priori} at .50. Nunnally (1967) contended that a satisfactory level of reliability depends on how a measure is being used. In the early stages of research on predictor tests or hypothesized measures of a construct, one saves time and energy by working with instruments that have only modest reliability, for which purposes values of .50 or .60 will suffice.

The independent variables used were divided into two groups, Situational Factors and Structural Dimensions. The survey instrument was designed to collect data on four of the six situational factors studied. Data on type of Youth At Risk site was determined by information provided by USDA, and coalition size was determined by the number of instruments returned by the site directors. The four situational factors collected with the instrument were:

1. Resource Dependence
2. Agency or Personal Awareness
3. Consensus
4. Domain Similarity

Table 1 contains the reliability coefficients for the items used in collecting the data on the situational factors and structural dimensions. Four items were used to assess resource dependence. One item assessed the dependence on resources from the coalition by the respondent and another assessed the dependence on resources from the respondent by the other coalition members as perceived by the respondent. Two other items gave checklists to identify the kinds of resources needed. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980)
observed a Cronbach's alpha measure of internal consistency of .53 for the variable Resource Dependence. The pilot test of the instrument used in this study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .68 on the same variable measures (Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Van de Ven and Ferry's reported alpha</th>
<th>Calculated Chronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Dependence</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Similarity</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Communications</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Flows From Respondent</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Flows To Respondent</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communications</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Effectiveness</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NR = Not Reported
Awareness was measured using four survey items. One item assessed how well informed the respondent was on the specific goals and services provided by the other members. A second item assessed the extent to which the other coalition members participated in the project prior to funding. Two items identified personal acquaintances among members. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) observed an alpha of .89 on the Awareness measures. The pilot test conducted with this study yielded an alpha of .57 on the variable measures for Awareness (Table 1).

Consensus, the extent to which members agree on needs, problems, solutions and methods, was assessed using four items. One item for each assessed agreement on needs, problems, goals or solutions, and methods. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) observed an alpha of .87 on the measures of Consensus. The pilot test with this study yielded an alpha of .79 on the variable measures (Table 1).

Domain Similarity, the extent to which members share funding sources, goals, staff skills, clients and services, was assessed using five items. One item for each. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) observed an alpha score of .31 on this variable measure. The pilot test conducted as a part of this study yielded an alpha of .85 on these items (Table 1).

The variables Size of Coalition and Type of YAR site were not measured using this instrument. The size of each coalition was determined to be the number of respondents from each site. The type of YAR site was identified by a list supplied by USDA and was either, Science Technology and Literacy, School Aged Child Care or Coalitions.
The survey instrument was also used to collect data on the four structural dimensions. They were:

1. Frequency of Communications
2. Quality of Communications
3. Resource Flows
4. Formalization

Table 1 contains the reliability coefficients for the items used in collecting the data on the situational factors and structural dimensions. Frequency of communications, how often members communicate either written, as a group, individual face to face, and/or by telephone, was measured using four items. One item identified frequency of group meetings, one for written communications, one for face to face discussions and one item for telephone conversations. Van de Ven and Ferry observed a Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency measure of .45 on these measures. An alpha of .72 was observed from the pilot test conducted along with this study (Table 1).

Resource Flows, the direction and intensity of resources being shared, were measured using two sets of items. One set measured flows from the respondent and one set measured flows to the respondent. Each item identifies the extent and type of resource being exchanged. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) did not report an alpha on resource flows. The pilot test on the instrument used in this study yielded an alpha of .87 on resource flows from the respondent to the coalition and an alpha of .93 on resource flows to the respondent from the coalition (Table 1).
Formalization, the extent to which written, verbal or legally binding agreements are used, was measured using nine items. These were separated into two groups; one group for the coalition and one group for the coordinating committees. Four items identified the extent to which agreements are verbalized, written, legally binding or mandatory by law. If the coalition used a committee to coordinate activities it was determined to be standing or ad hoc and whether minutes or agendas were kept and if the committees' decisions were binding on the coalition. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) observed an alpha of .64 on this variable. An alpha of .82 was found in this study's pilot test (Table 1).

Quality of Communications was measured using three items. One item measured difficulty in contacting other members, one item measured overall quality of communications and one measured how often messages were lost. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) recorded an alpha of .51 on these items. The pilot test conducted with this study yielded an alpha of .60 on these items. The items were summed to develop the variable Quality of Communications. The researcher recognized that the scales are not the same but felt they measured the same construct, communication quality (Table 1).

The dependent variable, Perceived Effectiveness, was measured using four items. Items measured how well members carry out commitments, relationship productivity, if time and effort were worthwhile, and satisfaction with relationships in the coalition. Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) observed an alpha of .78 on these items. An alpha of .88 was observed with the pilot test.
Some general concerns were added to the instrument at the request of the panel of experts. This information may be useful in determining training needs of the YAR sites. Membership changes and their effect on the coalition were measured. Respondents were given the opportunity to identify the things they liked most and least about the coalition. Whether or not conflict had been experienced and how it was resolved was also a general concern of the panel. Data on how and if youth were involved were also gathered.

Selected Demographic information was gathered to help in describing the population, and to control these extraneous variables. Data on race, gender, education, employment status, and community size were all gathered.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data were collected using a variation of the mailing procedures recommended by Dillman (1978). A letter from Dr. Jon Irby, Co-chair of the USDA Youth At Risk task force and coordinator of the Youth At Risk sites, was sent prior to the questionnaire requesting the support of the site directors in distributing and collecting the instruments. A letter was sent to site directors on February 4, 1993, requesting the number of active collaborators in the coalition in order to determine the number of instruments needed. Their response was requested by February 26. Those who did not respond by this date were contacted by telephone in order to obtain the number of instruments needed for each site. A packet of instruments, each in individual envelopes, along with a letter signed
by Dr. Richard Clark, Director of the Ohio Center for Action on Coalitions, was sent to each site director on April 16, 1993. The YAR site directors were asked to distribute the instruments to the active collaborators. Active Collaborators were encouraged to respond by May 15.

Each individual questionnaire was identified by a code number identifying the site to which it was mailed. On June 10 a reminder letter was sent to the sites that had yet to respond requesting a that they respond by June 24. A second reminder letter was sent to those sites that still had not responded on August 2, 1993. Those sites directors that had not responded during the process were also contacted by telephone. The sites contacted by telephone that did not receive the original packets or were not in possession of them were sent a second set of instruments. Individual contacts by telephone were made with the remaining sites until September 1, 1993. This was determined to be the final deadline for accepting data for analysis. The total number of questionnaires received was 308, of these 283 were useable. Useable data was received from 39 of the total 58 Youth At Risk sites studied for 67% of the total studied. Because of the diversity of the population studied and the fact that much of the data were gathered in summer, this was considered to be an acceptable response rate.

Research Design and Data Analysis

The design of the study was a one shot case study. Data were analyzed using the SPSSPC+ computer program for IBM compatible microcomputers.
Descriptive statistics were used to describe the population on selected demographic variables. Next, nominal variables were dummy coded and Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients were used to determine the nature and strength of relationships between variables. Point biserial correlation coefficients were used as the measure of association between dichotomous nominal variables and interval variables. Measures of association between multichotomous nominal variables and interval variables were reported using an eta statistic. Measures of association between multichotomous nominal variables were reported using Cramer's statistic. Terms used to describe measures of association between variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Terms Used to Describe Measures of Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Descriptive Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very Strong Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .68</td>
<td>Substantial Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Davis, 1971

Stepwise multiple regression was used to determine the proportion of variance in the perceived effectiveness of coalitions associated with the situational factors and structural dimensions of the coalition. An attempt was made to control for the extraneous variables: race, sex, education level, employment status and tenure, and
community type. The multivariate statistic, multiple regression, was used to understand and explain the data and to determine if the data could have occurred by chance alone. Stepwise multiple regression was used to determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable -- perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship.

The dependent variable for the regression model in this study was the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship. The independent and extraneous variables entered into the regression model included: resource dependence, personal or agency awareness, consensus, domain similarity, frequency of communications, resource flows from the respondent, resource flows to the respondent, formalization of agreements, quality of communications, race, sex, education level, employment status, length of time employed, and community type. The total $R^2$ was computed to determine the amount of variance accounted for by the linear combination of the independent and extraneous variables.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe the situational factors and structural dimensions of the 58 Youth At Risk sites studied. It also sought to explore the coalition member's perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship. Additionally, this study sought to describe the relationships that existed between the situational factors and structural dimensions with coalition member's perceived effectiveness. This chapter presents a description of the coalition members, the collaborative component of the USDA Youth At Risk sites and the measures of association on the variables studied.

Objectives 1 and 2: YAR Sites and Active Collaborators

Tables 3 and 4 contain a profile of the coalition members. This information was collected to describe the population studied and to control for extraneous variables. The characteristics included race, sex, education level, employment, and type community served.

Eighty percent of the active collaborators studied were white. African Americans accounted for 12%, Native Americans 3%, Hispanics, Asian Americans and Others
accounted for the remaining 4% of the active collaborators. Two-thirds (67%) of the population were women while one third (33%) were men.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Race, Sex, and Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 283
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 through 5 Years</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 through 10 Years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 through 15 Years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Community Served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town &lt;10,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 10 to 50,000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb of City &gt;50,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City &gt;50,000</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority (61%) of the respondents held graduate degrees and 31% held bachelor's degrees. Only 8% of the respondents had less than a bachelor's degree. Nearly all (99%) of the respondents were employed. Only 1% of the respondents were not employed. Nearly one half (47%) of the respondents had been employed 5 years or less.

Rural areas, towns with populations between 10,000 and 50,000, and central cities dominated the respondents on type community served with 26%, 32%, and 31% respectively. Towns under 10,000 accounted for 6% and suburbs of cities with more than 50,000 people accounted for 5% of the respondents.

Table 5 presents data describing the effect of changes in membership of coalitions. Changes in membership had little or no effect on the coalition for 59% of the population. Thirty-one percent experienced some effect on the project and 10% had no changes in membership. Of those projects that experienced fluctuation in membership 43% found the fluctuation to be positive, 10% negative and 47% found the changes to be neither negative nor positive (Table 6).

Table 7 presents the frequency and percentages of respondents who experienced conflict between members. Sixty-one percent of the respondents experienced no conflict among members. Sixteen percent experienced some conflict and 23% did not know if conflict had been experienced among members.
Table 5

**Effect of Changes in Membership N=283**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no effect</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little effect</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some effect</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no changes in membership</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

**Direction of the Effect of Changes in Membership N=256**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Conflicting Experienced Between Members N=283

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents data describing how youth were involved in the Youth At Risk coalitions. Thirty-six percent of the population had youth involved as members of the coalition, 19% had youth as advisors to the coalition. Youth were recipients of the coalition's services according to 90% of the respondents and 9% had youth involved in other ways.

Table 8

How Youth were Involved in the Project N=283

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of Project</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors to Project</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipients of Service</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sum of percentages is greater than 100 because youth were involved in the projects in more than one way.
Objective 3: Situational Factors

Table 9 presents information on the resource dependence of the respondents and the other members of the project. Resource dependence attempted to measure the interdependence on resources by coalition members. Coalition members reported that other members depend on the resources supplied by the respondent from "no extent" to "great extent". The mean response for the group was between "some extent" and "much extent" (M=3.77, sd=.90). The respondents reported that the other members need resources from the coalition to accomplish from "no extent" to "great extent". The mean response for resources needed by other members was 3.86 (sd=.901).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>minimum</th>
<th>maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needed by Respondent</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed by Other Members</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 gives the number and percentage of the total respondents that identified dependence on the resources by their own organization or other member organizations. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents reported needing resources from other coalition members in order to attain their goals. Forty-three percent reported other members needing facilities, 84% needed information, 72% needed time, 33% needed supplies,
52% needed access to clientele, 41% needed staff, 52% needed visibility, 40% needed new programs or curriculum from the respondents, and 13% needed some other resource in order to attain their goals for the project.

Table 10

**Dependence on Selected Resources by Respondents and Other Coalition Members**

\[
N = 283
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Own Organization</th>
<th>Other member Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Respondents</td>
<td>% of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Clientele</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Programs/ Curriculum</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifty one percent of respondents needed financial resources from other members in order to attain their goals for the project. Forty percent needed facilities to attain goals, 73% needed information, 63% needed time, 31% needed supplies, 46% needed access to clientele, 47% needed staff, 51% needed visibility, 49% needed new programs or curriculum and 8% needed some other resource from the other coalition members in order to attain their goals for the project.

The reported values on all measures for personal or agency awareness of other coalition members ranged from "no extent" to "great extent" (see Table 11). The mean for "informed about goals of and services provided by other members" was 3.78 (sd=.74). Means for "participated in planning prior to funding" and personally acquainted" were 3.53 (sd=1.10) and 2.34 (sd=.93) respectively.

Table 11

**Summary Statistics for Agency or Personal Awareness of Other Coalition Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness Measure</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed about Goals of, and Services Provided by</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Planning Prior to Obtaining Funding</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally Acquainted</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1=No Extent, 5=Great Extent
Respondents who reported personal knowledge of other members reported being acquainted with other members from less than one year to more than 20 years. Seventy seven percent knew other members two to five years, 16% 9 years or more and 18% one year or less (Table 12).

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Acquainted with Other Members</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 through 5 years</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 through 8 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years or more</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sum of the frequencies is greater than the number of respondents because each respondent could give up to three responses.

Reported values on Consensus of coalition members ranged from "disagree much" to "agree very much" (see Table 13). The mean values for "needs of youth" was 4.22 (sd=.65). "Way service in general should be provided", "goals of project" and "way youth services are provided" had means of 3.95 (sd=.71), 4.24 (sd=.69), and 4.00 (sd=.72) respectively.
Table 13

**Summary Statistics for Consensus Among Coalition Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus Measure</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of Youth</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way Services should be provided</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals of the Project</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways Youth Services are Provided</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=disagree much, 5=agree very much.

Reported values of all domain similarity measures ranged from "no extent" to "great extent" (see Table 14). "Funding sources" had a mean value of 2.28 (sd=1.18), "type services provided", "individuals or families served", "operating or program goals", and "staff skills, training, or expertise" had means of 2.41 (sd=.97), 3.17 (sd=1.06), 3.00 (sd=1.02), and 3.03 (sd=1.10) respectively.

Table 15 gives a summary of the size of Youth At Risk site types. Of the 283 respondents, 57% represented Coalition sites, 22% represented School Aged Child Care sites, and 21% represented Science, Technology and Literacy sites. Of the 39 sites responding 41% were coalition sites, 26% were Science, Technology and Literacy sites, and 33% were School Aged Child Care sites.
Table 14

Summary Statistics for Domain Similarity among Coalition Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Similarity Measure</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Services Provided</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals or Families Served</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating or Program Goals</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Skills, Training or Experience</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1=No Extent, 5=Great Extent

Table 15

Summary of Youth At Risk Site Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean number of members</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Aged Child Care</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Technology and Literacy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean size of the YAR program sites responding was 7 members (sd=4.73). The number of members ranged from 1 to 21 with 7 members per
coaltion occurring most frequently (Table 15). Table 16 presents the mean scores for the structural dimensions and situational factors for each YAR program site type for comparison.

Table 16

Comparison of Variable Means Among Youth At Risk Site Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coalition Mean</th>
<th>Coalition sd</th>
<th>ST&amp;L Mean</th>
<th>ST&amp;L sd</th>
<th>SACC Mean</th>
<th>SACC sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Dependence</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal or Agency Awareness</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Similarity</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Communications</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>72.45</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>75.17</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>66.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources From the Member to Coalition</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources To the Member from the Coalition</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communications</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Effectiveness</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ST&L = Science Technology and Literacy sites, SACC = School Aged Child Care Sites.
The Coalition sites were the largest with a mean number of members of 10, while Science, Technology and Literacy sites had a mean of 6 members, and School Aged Child Care sites had an average of 5 members per site. Agency or personal awareness and consensus were slightly higher for the Science, Technology and Literacy sites and School Aged Child Care sites than Coalition sites. There was little difference between groups on the variables domain similarity and quality of communications. Coalition sites and School Aged Child Care sites communicated more often than did the Science Technology and Literacy sites. Science Technology and Literacy sites had higher levels of resource flows from the members to the coalition and from the coalition to the members than did the Coalition and School Aged Child Care sites. School Aged Child Care sites had the highest level of formalization followed by coalition sites. Science Technology and Literacy sites perceived their collaborative relationships to be more effective than did the other two. School Aged Child Care sites perceived their collaborative relationships to be more effective than did the coalition sites.

Objective 4: Structural Dimensions

The summary statistics for frequency of communications among coalition members are presented in Table 17. Communications over a six month period by letter or written reports ranged from 0 to 180 times with a mean of 8.12 contacts (sd=15.23). Overall coalition meetings averaged 6.37 times or about one per month
(sd = 13.93) and ranged from 0 to 180 meetings. Face to face discussions with another member ranged from 0 to 180 discussions with a mean of 18.94 (sd = 33.6) face to face discussions in a six month period. Telephone calls between respondents and other members ranged from 0 to 180 calls, mean 22.46 (sd = 38.1).

Table 17

**Summary Statistics for Frequency of Communications Among Coalition Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Method</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>minimum</th>
<th>maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters or Written Reports</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Coalition Meetings</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Discussions</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Calls</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Score = Number of contacts during 6 month period.

Table 18 indicates the number of contacts during the six month period prior to collecting the data. Outliers can be found in the written and overall meeting items. These indicate that 6 respondents in the written item, and 4 respondents in the overall meeting item, indicated that these contacts were made daily. The researcher doubts the accuracy of these items. Overall coalition meetings held or some written communication held daily would be impractical for a coalition whose membership consisted of different groups. The researcher believes that phone calls or some type of face to face discussion with any other member of the coalition would be possible.
Table 18

Number Respondents Reporting the Number of Contacts in 6 Month Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Type</th>
<th>0 times</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-6</th>
<th>12-24</th>
<th>75-180</th>
<th>missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Discussions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary statistics for resource flows from the respondent to the coalition are presented in Table 19. The resources flowing from the responding member to the coalition rated highest were information (M=3.61, sd=.98), attainment of goals (M=3.55, sd=1.00), visibility (M=3.33, sd=1.06), and use of staff (M=3.17, sd=1.18). Money (M=1.97, sd=1.34), equipment, supplies, or space (M=2.98, sd=1.46) and client referrals (M=2.87, sd=1.28) were the resources flowing from the responding member to the coalition that were rated lowest. All items ranged from 1-no extent to 5-great extent.
Table 19

Summary Statistics for Resource Flows From Respondent to Coalition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Staff</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Referrals</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation or Technical Assistance</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility, Recognition or Goodwill</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, Supplies or Space</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of Goals</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Programs or Curriculum</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1=No Extent, 5=Great Extent

Table 20 presents information on the resources flowing from the coalition to the respondent. The resource flows to the respondent that were rated highest were information ($M=3.45$, $sd=1.01$), attainment of goals ($M=3.29$, $sd=1.15$), visibility ($M=3.25$, $sd=1.11$) and human resources ($M=3.22$, $sd=1.19$). Money from the coalition ($M=1.91$, $sd=1.31$), Money from third party ($M=1.87$, $sd=1.21$), and equipment, supplies or space ($M=2.5$, $sd=1.42$) were the resources identified by the respondents that they rated lowest. All measures ranged from 1-no extent to 5-great extent.
Table 20

Summary Statistics for Resource Flows to Respondent from the Coalition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money from Coalition</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from Third Party</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Referrals</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation or Technical Assistance</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility, Recognition, or Goodwill</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, Supplies or Space</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of Goals</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Programs or Curriculum</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = No Extent, 5 = Great Extent

Fifty eight percent reported some form of agreement established to define the relationship between members. The item measuring the extent to which the agreement was verbalized and discussed had a mean of 3.83 (sd=.84). Written, legally binding and mandatory by law had mean scores of 3.34 (sd=1.25), 2.32 (sd=1.53), and 1.52 (sd=1.10) respectively. All measures had a range of 1-no extent to 5-great extent.

Sixty-four percent reported a committee being established to coordinate activities between members of the coalition. Eighty percent of those reported the committee to be standing and 20% reported having an ad hoc committee.

Those groups with committees reported the extent to which the committee is formalized with agenda’s, minutes, etc., to have a mean of 3.83 (sd=1.04). The item
measuring extent to which the committees decisions are binding upon the respondent had a mean of 3.12 (sd = 1.19). The item scores ranged from 1-no extent to 5-great extent.

Table 21

Summary Statistics for Formalization of Coalition Agreements (N=164)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbalized and discussed</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written in detail</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally Binding</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory by law</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = No Extent, 5 = Great Extent

Table 22 gives a summary of the items used to describe communications quality.

When members wanted to communicate with other members they had 1-no difficulty to 5-great difficulty in contacting them. The mean score was 1.8 (sd = .89). The overall quality of communications was characterized as 1-poor to 5-excellent. The mean score for overall Quality of Communications was 3.6 (sd = .99). When attempting to contact other coalition members, respondents reported messages getting lost, no response or calls not returned, 1-never to 5-very often, mean 1.47 (sd = .66).
Table 22

Summary of Communications Quality Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in Contacting (1=none, 5=great)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality (1=poor, 5=excellent)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Messages/No Follow through (1=never, 5=very often)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 5: Relationship Effectiveness

The respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the collaborative relationships is presented in Table 23. The respondents generally perceived the collaborative relationships to be effective. The mean score on all items measuring effectiveness exceeded 4.0 (much extent). The area where respondents reported the highest extent of effectiveness was in time and effort spent developing and maintaining the relationship (M=4.18).

Table 23

Summary Statistics for Perceived Effectiveness of the Collaborative Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Measure</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry out Commitments</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive Relationship</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and Effort Worthwhile</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Relationship</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1=No Extent, 5=Great Extent
Objectives 6 and 7: Variable Associations

The purpose of the measures of association were used to assess the relationships between selected situational factors and structural dimensions with the dependent variable, perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship. Associations ranged from negligible to strong according to Davis (1971).

The measures of association are found in Table 24. Point biserial correlation coefficients were calculated for the nominal variables: sex and employment status. The eta statistic was used as the measure of association between the interval dependent variable, perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship, and the multichotomous nominal variables type of YAR site, race, education, and community type. The Phi coefficient was used as the measure of association between dichotomous nominal variables, and Cramer's statistic was used for measures of association between nominal variables where one or both of the variables were multichotomous. Pearson's Product Moment correlations were used for all other variables. The extraneous variables race, sex, education, employment status, time employed, and community type had low to negligible associations with perceived effectiveness.

The situational factor Youth At Risk site type, had a low association (eta=.234) with the dependent variable. Correlations of the other selected situational factors with perceived effectiveness revealed moderate positive relationships with resource dependence (r=.35) and agency or personal awareness (r=.43), a substantial positive association with consensus (r=.52) and a low association with domain similarity (r=.27). Coalition size had only a negligible association (r=-.07) with the dependent variable.
### Table 24

**Summary Data: Intercorrelations Between Selected Situational Factors, Structural Dimensions and Perceived Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>X₃</th>
<th>X₄</th>
<th>X₅</th>
<th>X₆</th>
<th>X₇</th>
<th>X₈</th>
<th>X₉</th>
<th>X₁₀</th>
<th>X₁₁</th>
<th>X₁₂</th>
<th>X₁₃</th>
<th>X₁₄</th>
<th>X₁₅</th>
<th>X₁₆</th>
<th>X₁₇</th>
<th>X₁₈</th>
<th>X₁₉</th>
<th>X₂₀</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (X₁)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAR Site Type (X₂)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.056*</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>.195*</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>.131*</td>
<td>.208*</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.238*</td>
<td>.076*</td>
<td>.287*</td>
<td>.095*</td>
<td>.091*</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.095*</td>
<td>.234*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Dependence (X₃)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>.165*</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness (X₄)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.067*</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td>.090*</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus (X₅)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.237*</td>
<td>.058*</td>
<td>.058*</td>
<td>.128*</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Similarity (X₆)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.125*</td>
<td>.008*</td>
<td>.132*</td>
<td>.116*</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Communications</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>.087*</td>
<td>.110*</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>57.15</td>
<td>71.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources From (X₇)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.091*</td>
<td>.044*</td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>.218*</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>27.57</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources To (X₈)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.085*</td>
<td>.053*</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization (X₉)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.237*</td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.181*</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communications</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.065*</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>.081*</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (X₁₀)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.146*</td>
<td>.061*</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.120*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (X₁₁)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.020*</td>
<td>.132*</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status (X₁₂)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.098*</td>
<td>.110*</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (X₁₃)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.121*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Type (X₁₄)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Effectiveness (Y)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measures of association between multichotomous nominal variables and interval variables are reported using an eta statistic.

b Measures of association between multichotomous nominal variables are reported as a Cramer's statistic.

c Measures of association between dichotomous nominal variables and interval variables are reported as a point biserial correlation coefficient. All other measures of association are reported as a Pearson's Product Moment correlation coefficient.
Correlations between perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship and the selected structural dimensions ranged from low to moderate associations. Resource flows to the member from the coalition had the highest association with perceived effectiveness of the five structural dimensions studied. This relationship was moderate positive ($r = .49$). Resource flows from the member to the coalition also had a moderate positive relationship with perceived effectiveness ($r = .45$). Correlations of the other selected structural dimensions with perceived effectiveness revealed quality of communications to have a moderate positive relationship ($r = .43$), formalization of agreements to have a moderate positive relationship ($r = .31$) and frequency of communications to have a low positive association ($r = .23$).

**Objective 8: Predictors of Effectiveness**

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to determine the proportion of variance in perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship that was explained by the linear combination of selected variables. To assure that the assumptions of multiple linear regression were met, the residuals were found to be normally distributed and had a mean equal to zero; scatterplots indicated that the residuals were not correlated with the independent variables and had a constant variance and normal probability plots showed that errors were independent. Multicollinearity was not considered to be a problem since none of the independent variables were highly correlated ($r > .80$) with other independent variables.
Stepwise multiple regression was performed to determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable—perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship. The independent and extraneous variables entered into the regression model include: resource dependence, personal or agency awareness, consensus, domain similarity, frequency of communications, resource flows from the respondent, resource flows to the respondent, formalization of agreements, quality of communications, race, sex, education level, employment status, time employed and community type. Table 24 presented the intercorrelations found between the independent variables.

Table 25 shows the variables that entered into the regression model. Table 25 illustrates that 64% of the variance in perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship could be explained by the linear combination of the variables consensus, formalization of agreements and resource flows from respondents.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R_{\text{change}}^2$</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization of Agreements</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Flows From Respondent</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

std. error = 1.73
adjusted $R^2 = .61$
for model, $F = 21.49$, $p < .001$
The first variable entered into the model was consensus which accounted for 46% of the total variance in perceived effectiveness. Formalization of agreements was the second variable to enter into the regression model. It accounted for an additional 13% of the variance in perceived effectiveness. The third and final variable to enter into the model was resource flows from the respondent, which accounted for an additional 5% of the variance in perceived effectiveness. The variable resource flows to the respondent from the coalition did not appear in the model even though its association with the dependent variable had one of the highest correlation coefficients ($r = .49$). The researcher assumed that because of the high correlation between resource flows from the respondent and resource flows to the respondent ($r = .70$), the variables explained much of the same variance in the dependent variable.

The regression indicates that for every one point change in Consensus there will be a .70 point change in Perceived Effectiveness of the Collaborative Relationships. Likewise a one point change in Formalization of Agreements will have a corresponding .23 change in the dependent variable, and a one point change in Resource Flows From the Respondent will have a corresponding .10 change in Perceived Effectiveness.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe the situational factors and structural dimensions of the 58 Youth At Risk sites studied. It also sought to explore the coalition member's perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship. Additionally, this study sought to describe the relationships that existed between the situational factors and structural dimensions with the coalition member's perceived effectiveness. This chapter summarizes the study and reports the conclusions drawn and recommendations of the researcher. The findings of this study should be used to improve collaborative relationships that exist in coalitions and other collaborative efforts, especially those that seek to improve the lives of our families and children.

In 1991, the United States government funded 69 sites throughout the country to conduct innovative programs for Youth At Risk. These programs were funded through competitive grants to Extension Service field offices from the USDA Extension Service. These programs all had one common requirement, they must have a collaborative component.

The collaborative component required the sites to work with others in the community who had a stake in Youth At Risk issues. These stakeholders ranged from
school systems, social service providers, and criminal justice authorities to individuals in affected communities.

Three national Coalition Centers were established by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to support the collaborative component of the sites. However, the unique nature of these projects posed special problems in working collaboratively. Little work had been done in associating characteristics of the coalitions and the individuals involved in the coalition with the success of the collaborative effort.

The Extension Service has been faced with fewer personnel to reach the increasing demands of young people in all areas. The emerging issue of Youth At Risk posed special problems for the Extension Service in effectively reaching this audience. The decision was made to encourage the use of collaboration to compliment the educational expertise possessed by Extension professionals, in order to reach this audience and have a greater impact. With little prospects of significant increases in staff to impact new emerging issues, Extension was looking for ways to impact these issues with existing resources. Collaboration and Coalitions may be one method that will continue to be used.

The questions that this study sought to answer were: Did members of the Youth At Risk coalitions perceive the relationships to be effective? To what extent did they depend on other members for resources? To what extent did they share resources with other members? Was prior knowledge of other members associated with effectiveness? How important was agreement or consensus between members? How similar were the members? How often did members communicate with each other? What types of
resources were shared between members and to what extent? How important were formal agreements? What types of Youth At Risk coalitions had a higher perception of effectiveness of their collaborative relationships? How were these associated with the effectiveness of the collaborative component of the coalition?

The purpose of this study was to explain the relationships between the situational factors and structural dimensions of collaborative relationships with the perceived effectiveness of the relationships as experienced by the Youth At Risk sites that were funded for their second year in 1992. This study sought to understand some of the situational factors and structural dimensions of the collaboration process that were outlined in the literature and describe the extent to which the 1992 re-funded Youth At Risk sites experienced effective collaborative relationships. The study also sought to understand if situational factors and structural dimensions are associated with the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships and the nature and strength of these relationships.

The information gained from this study should help decision-makers and practitioners to better understand the collaboration process associated with the Youth At Risk sites. It should also help decision-makers to predict which types of coalitions have the best chances for success, and in turn place their limited resources in the areas where they can have the greatest impact. This study should help collaborators to maximize the structural dimensions and situational factors that may predict greater effectiveness in order to achieve more effective collaborative relationships.
The eight research objectives that were formulated for this study were:

1. To describe the population of second year Youth At Risk sites on the following characteristics; type of community served, coalition size, coalition type, effect of changes in membership, and how youth were involved in the project.

2. To describe the active collaborators involved in the Youth At Risk sites on the following characteristics; race, sex, education level, and employment status and tenure.

3. To describe how the situational factors (coalition size, coalition type, resource dependence, agency or personal awareness, consensus, and domain similarity) were experienced by the active collaborators.

4. To describe how the structural dimensions (frequency of communications, quality of communications, resource flows, and formalization of agreements) were experienced by the active collaborators.

5. To determine the degree to which the active collaborators perceive the collaborative relationships to be effective.

6. To determine if, and to what extent, selected situational factors are associated with perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships.
7. To determine if, and to what extent, selected structural dimensions are associated with perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships.

8. To determine the best predictors, from the variables studied, of the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships.

**Conclusions**

Based on the findings in Chapter IV the following conclusions were reached about the population studied.

1. Overall, the collaborative relationships were perceived as effective (overall mean score of 4.1 on a 5.0 scale). Therefore the researcher concludes that the collaborative component of the Youth At Risk sites studied was effective. This should be compared to overall effectiveness of the YAR sites in order to find out if, and to what extent, successful collaborative relationships are related to the effectiveness of the YAR sites.

2. The extraneous variables race, gender, education level, employment status and tenure and community type had low to negligible associations with the perceived effectiveness
of the collaborative relationships of the YAR sites. When associating perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship with other factors these were not considered to be important.

3. Coalition size had only a negligible association with perceived effectiveness. Even though this factor had only a negligible association, extremes may still have important associations with the dependent variable.

4. Youth At Risk site type had a low association with perceived effectiveness. YAR site type is not considered to be an important factor in associating perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships with other situational factors.

5. The perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships increased as dependence on resources increased \((r=.35)\). The members who had a greater dependence on resources were more likely to experience effective collaborative relationships. Those organizations who join a coalition
fully, sharing and depending on resources were more likely to experience effective collaborative relationships.

6. Perceived effectiveness increased as awareness of individuals or agencies increased (r = .43). Those collaborators who had prior knowledge of, or working relationships with the other members experienced more effective collaborative relationships. Members who were better informed about the other members were more likely to experience effective collaborative relationships.

7. Perceived effectiveness increased as the level of consensus increased (r = .52). Collaborators who agreed on the needs of youth, the way services should be provided, and goals of the initiative were more likely to perceive the collaborative relationships as effective.

8. Perceived effectiveness increased as domain similarity among members increased (r = .27). Members who were alike were more likely to perceive the collaborative relationships as effective.
9. Perceived effectiveness increased with an increase in the frequency of communications between members \((r=.23)\). YAR coalitions who had more frequent communications between members perceived the collaborative relationships to be more effective than YAR coalitions who communicated with less frequency.

10. Perceived effectiveness increased as resource flows from the members to the coalition increased \((r=.45)\). As the resources shared with other coalition members increased, so did the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships.

11. Perceived effectiveness increased as resource flows to the members from the coalition increased \((r=.49)\). As members received more resources from the coalition, their perception of the effectiveness of the collaborative relationship increased.
12. Perceived effectiveness increased as the level of formalization of agreements increased ($r=.31$). More formal relationships between members led to more effective collaborative relationships.

13. Perceived effectiveness increased as the quality of communications among members increased ($r=.43$). Communication quality was important to the effectiveness of the collaborative relationships. As communication quality increased, so did the perception of effectiveness.

14. The best predictors of perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships were found to be level of consensus, followed by formalization of agreements, and resource flows from the respondent to the coalition. If these factors were known, perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships could be predicted. The implications are that decision makers who seek effective collaborative relationships should identify these variables in order to put the greatest effort and resources in those that have the greatest probability of being effective.
Although the literature (Michigan State University Cooperative Extension Service (year unknown), Van de Ven (1974), Yukl (1989), Dluhy(1990)) suggests that Coalition size may be associated with effectiveness, this study did not find such an association. These literature sources implied that a curvilinear relationship may exist between size and effectiveness, however, this relationship may not exist when using "effectiveness of relationships" as opposed to "effectiveness of program efforts" as a dependent variable.

YAR site types, Coalitions and Science, Technology and Literacy were both related to perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships. The Coalition sites had less effective relationships while the Science, Technology and Literacy sites had more effective relationships. This could be due to Science, Technology and Literacy sites having more specific and tangible goals and having other sites and national centers for action that dealt with the same curriculum and issues where Coalition sites were a much more diverse group. The School Aged Child Care site type was not associated with perceived effectiveness of collaborative relationships.

Van de Ven (1980) said that even though organizations would rather not join into a collaborative arrangement, they would still do so because of a need for resources or a willingness to respond to a problem. Children and Teens Today (1990), Parks (1985), Bennard (1991) and Van de Ven (1974) all suggest that the sharing of resources is essential to coalition success. The situational factor, resource dependence, and the structural dimensions, resource flows from members to the coalition, and resource flows to the member from the coalition were all positively associated with the perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships. These findings support the literature (Van
de Ven 1974, Van de Ven 1980, Parks 1985, Children and Teens Today 1990 and Bennard 1991), indicating that coalitions with increased dependence on resources and sharing of resources are more likely to have effective collaborative relationships. The best predictor of the effectiveness of the collaborative relationship from all the variables selected was the intensity and magnitude of resource flows from members to the coalition.

Hord (1976) suggested that successful collaborative relationships are more likely to grow out of successful previous experience. Van de Ven (1979) also suggested that previous personal relationships, knowledge of other agencies or agencies with previous relationships are more apt to be successful in new collaborative relationships. These findings in the literature were supported by the positive association \( r = .43 \) between personal or agency awareness and perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationships in this study.

Children and Teens Today (1990) reported that members must develop a common view of the problem and recipients of services to be effective. Astroth (1990) said failure to establish mutual goals and objectives is a major reason some collaborative efforts fail. Findings from this research agree that as the level of consensus on needs and goals increase, effectiveness of relationships increase \( (r = .52) \).

However, Thomas (1989) indicated that using a consensus approach may slow decision making and result in weakened positions and missed opportunities. Thomas’ conclusions should not be confused with agreement on needs and goals. The nature of the collaborative effort should define the decision making method. According to these
research findings, the consensus of needs goals, services, and recipients can be used as a predictor of the effectiveness of collaborative relationships.

The findings indicated that coalition members who had similar domains were more apt to perceive the relationships to be effective. Although this may be true, Reilly (1974) suggested that diversity of membership creates strength of the group. It may be that, as with other relationships, members seek those that are most like themselves with which to collaborate. This results in more effective relationships, but overall strength may be increased by seeking diversity in the group. The key may be as Yukl (1989) stated groups with compatible members are more productive. Compatibility may be the most important issue. Dluhy (1990) suggested that representativeness may dictate legitimacy and success.

Hord (1986), Yukl (1989), Bennard (1991), Children and Teens Today (1990) and Parks (1985) all support frequent, quality communications among members. Hord indicated that improved communications was a benefit of collaboration. Yukl said, decision quality was impacted by communication clarity. Parks said, frequent member contacts was a characteristic of effective coalitions. Bennard recommended frequent and ongoing group meetings. The findings in this study support these literature sources. The findings indicated that with increased frequency ($r = .23$) and quality of communications ($r = .43$), effectiveness of the collaborative relationships will increase. Yukl (1989) suggested that increases in group size may make communications more difficult. This conclusion seems reasonable but the findings of this research failed to support it, since the relationships between size with frequency of communications and size with quality
of communications was only negligible ($r=.09$).

The findings of this study indicated that the more formal relationships between members, the more effective their collaborative relationships will be ($r=.31$). The literature did not address formalization of agreements among coalition members. It does stand to reason that formality in the keeping of minutes, agendas, etc., would lead to less misunderstanding and tend to hold members to their commitments, making the relationships more productive and satisfying. These research findings indicated that formalization is moderately associated ($r=.31$) with the dependent variable and can be used as a predictor of the effectiveness of collaborative relationships.

**Implications for Theory**

Resource dependence, awareness and consensus were the situational factors that seemed to be most important. The low relationships of size, type, and domain similarity lead the researcher to believe that they are of less importance when trying to build effective collaborative relationships. Therefore, coalition builders should seek to maximize resource dependence, awareness and consensus and be less concerned about size, type, and domain similarity.

Resource flows from both the coalition and the members are important factors associated with collaborative effectiveness. Frequency and quality of communications were of less importance. Coalition builders should seek to maximize the structural
dimensions; resource flows from the member to the coalition, resource flows to the
member from the coalition and deal with other members in a formal way.

The extraneous variables all had negligible to low associations with the dependent
variable, perceived effectiveness of the collaborative relationship. Because of these low
associations the researcher concludes that they are of less importance when building
effective collaborative relationships.

Based on these findings a new model was developed to emphasize the factors most
important when building effective relationships. Youth At Risk coalition builders should
use the revised model to maximize their chances for achieving effective collaborative
relationships. This model is illustrated in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Revised Structural Framework
Recommendations for Youth At Risk Coalitions

Based on the findings and conclusions of, and the literature reviewed in this study, the following are recommended:

1. YAR coalitions should be built around specific issues, and if possible secure assistance from outside sources with similar issues and experience.
2. YAR coalitions should develop mutual dependence on resources among members.
3. When entering into YAR coalitions, members should make efforts to increase their awareness of the goals and objectives of other members and take time to become personally acquainted with the other members.
4. When YAR coalitions are formed and as they develop, agreement on needs, goals, objectives, target audiences, services to be provided, methods and roles should be reached.
5. YAR coalitions should strive for compatibility among members, seeking diversity in membership. This recommendation is not in complete agreement with the findings but seeks to develop the strongest coalition in order to achieve program effectiveness. The literature indicates that diversity will build strength in a coalition.
The collaborators in this study indicated that effectiveness increased as domain similarity increased. However, the researcher believes, and the literature agrees that it is important to build in diversity to gain a broader view of problems, issues and possible solutions. Therefore, compatibility and not sameness may be the issue in domain similarity that is most important.

6. YAR coalition members should make efforts to contact members as frequently as possible in order to share information and ideas.

7. YAR coalition members should seek ways to use more types and increased magnitudes of the resources available from other coalition members.

8. YAR coalition members should share as many resources to the greatest extent practical with the coalition.

9. Agreements between YAR coalition members, minutes, and agendas of meetings should be documented and available to other members.

10. YAR coalition members should continually make efforts to be available to other members and to improve communications between members.
11. The national coalition centers should implement training programs that will facilitate in the adoption of these recommendations.

12. Members who enter into YAR coalitions should commit themselves to fully supporting the coalition's efforts. Partial support may not lead to the desired outcomes.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This study should be replicated with the YAR sites not included in this study.

2. This study should be replicated with other coalitions in and out of Extension in order to give broader meaning to the findings.

3. A study should be conducted to identify the sites without effective relationships and examine how they experienced these situational factors and structural dimensions.

4. A research study should be conducted which examines the relationship between collaborative effectiveness and project effectiveness among the YAR sites.
Appendix A

Letter to Site Directors
February 4, 1993

Karen Bogenschneider
Youth at Risk Coordinator
431 Lowell Hall
610 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Ms. Bogenschneider:

We are conducting a research project in order to learn more about coalitions. You have been selected to participate in the study because your Youth-At-Risk project was one of the first to be funded.

The research study has been encouraged by the USDA/ES, and they are anxious to study the results. We hope the findings of the study will allow us to develop materials to support you and other projects that have a collaboration component.

Your help is needed to complete the study. We would like to have the number of active collaborators who are involved with your project. We do not need names and addresses of these partners. Active collaborators is defined for this study as those individuals or groups who actively take part in sharing resources and making decisions that affect the project. We would like to have this number by February 26.

In mid-March you will receive a packet of materials. This packet will include an instrument designed to collect data from you and these active collaborators. You will be asked to distribute and collect these instruments then return them to us for analysis. All findings will be held completely confidential. The results will be used to better understand kinds of coalitions and the Youth-At-Risk Initiative in general.
Project Directors
February 4, 1993

If you have any questions regarding the study you can contact me at (614) 292-0202. If you have any questions regarding your participation in the study please contact Dr. Jon Irby or your Program Leader liaison with USDA.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Clark
Extension Specialist, 4-H/Director,
Ohio Center for Action on Coalition Development
Appendix B

Letter sent with Questionnaires to Directors
April 16, 1993

Laurie A. Sicko-Sandow
235 West Market Street
West Chester, PA 19382

Dear Ms. Sicko-Sandow:

Enclosed is the set of materials described in my letter dated February 4. The number of packets matches the number of "active collaborators" you identified.

Please distribute these packets to the individuals you identified and ask them to complete the enclosed questionnaire. There is a letter to each collaborator in the packet letting them know how to proceed. As director of the project you are considered to be an active collaborator, so please complete one questionnaire yourself.

When the collaborators have completed questionnaires they should be sealed in their envelopes and returned to you. You should address each of the collaborator's envelopes with your address so they can be returned to you. Once you have received all the responses, please return them to us for analysis. We would like to receive the questionnaires by May 15.

I wish to thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to help us conduct this study. Hopefully the results will help people like you to save time and effort in their future collaborative efforts as well as provide better services to the youth and families we serve.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Clark
Extension Specialist, 4-H
Director

Enclosure

locdir2.res
Appendix C

Letter to Subjects
April 16, 1993

Dear Youth-At-Risk Project Member:

Your project has been selected to participate in a research study we are conducting. It was selected because it was one of the first funded through the USDA Youth-At-Risk grants. You are being asked to participate because you have been identified by the project director as one of the individuals who has input into the direction of the project.

The purpose of this research study is to "identify factors that may influence the relationships among people who are working together on common goals. The information derived from this study may help us to assist partnerships and collaborative ventures to be more successful while avoiding some pitfalls that may distract the project from its primary goals."

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire, seal it in the envelope provided and return it to the project director. This should require around twenty minutes of your time. Your responses will be held strictly confidential. The code number on the booklet is for follow up with projects which have not responded. The code number does not identify individuals.

Thank you for the work you do with the youth and families of our country and thank you for taking time from your schedule to assist us with this study.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Clark
Extension Specialist, 4-H
Director

Enclosure

collabor.res
Appendix D

First Follow-up Letter
June 10, 1993

Marcia Nelson
University of Idaho
RNE
16952 S. 10th Ave.
Caldwell, ID 83605

Dear Ms. Nelson:

Summer is a busy time for all of us, so I know you must be swamped. I hope you will soon be able to return the survey instruments which you distributed to your collaborators in April. We believe the information we get from this study will help future coalition builders such as yourself to save valuable time and effort in building their coalitions.

If for some reason you are having trouble getting the instruments completed, please let us know. We would like to begin analyzing the data as soon as possible. Please make an effort to return the instruments by June 24.

Thank you for all your hard work and extra effort. I know it’s not easy blazing new trails. If we here at the Center can help in any way please let us know.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Clark
Director
Appendix E

Second Follow-up Letter
August 2, 1993

Laurie A. Sicko-Sandow
235 West Market Street
West Chester, PA 19382

Dear Ms. Sicko-Sandow:

The response to our research study has been tremendous. However, there is still a number of sites that have not returned the survey instruments. In order for us to draw valuable conclusions on the Youth-At-Risk sites as a whole it is important that we get responses from every site.

Your site is one that has not returned the completed instruments. I hate to impose on your busy schedule, but the current and future site directors will benefit from this information.

Please return the completed instruments by August 20. If this will not be possible or if you did not receive the instruments or need replacements for some reason, please call myself or Vicki Braddy at (614) 292-2533.

Again, I want to thank you for the work you are doing with our young people and for your assistance with this research study. If we can ever be of assistance to you please let us know.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Clark
Extension Specialist, 4-H
Director

followup2.mer
Appendix F

Panel of Experts
Panel of Experts

Dr. Jon Irby
National 4-H Program Leader
ES-USDA

Dr. Jeff Miller
Evaluation Specialist
Community CARES
National 4-H Council

Dr. Steve Mullen
National 4-H Program Leader
ES-USDA

Mr. Bill Smith
District 4-H Specialist
Ohio Cooperative Extension Service
Appendix G

Copy of Questionnaire
Building Coalitions

FACTORS INFLUENCING PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATIVE VENTURES IN FEDERAL YOUTH-AT-RISK PROJECTS

Ohio Center for Action on Coalition Development
The following questionnaire is designed to identify factors that may influence the relationships among people who are working together on common goals. The information derived from this study may help us to assist partnerships and collaborative ventures to be more successful while avoiding some pitfalls that may distract the project from its primary goals.

**PART I: SITUATIONAL FACTORS**

**Resource Dependence**

1. In order for the people working with you on this project to attain their goals (either personal or organisational) to what extent do they need the services, resources, or support from you or your organisation? (Circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>LITTLE EXTENT</th>
<th>SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>MUCH EXTENT</th>
<th>GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What specific services, resources, or support do the other people involved in this project need from you or your organisation? (Check all that apply)

- Financial
- Facilities
- Information
- Time
- Supplies
- Access to clientele
- Staff
- Visibility
- New programs or curriculum
- Other (Please list)

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________
3. In order to attain your goals (either personal or your organization's) to what extent do you or your organization need the services, resources, or support from the other members? (Circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>LITTLE EXTENT</th>
<th>SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>MUCH EXTENT</th>
<th>GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What specific services, resources, or support do you or your organization need from the other people involved in project? (Check all that apply)

- Financial
- Facilities
- Information
- Time
- Supplies
- Access to clientele
- Staff
- Visibility
- New programs or curriculum
- Others (Please list)

Agency and Personal Awareness

5. How well informed are you about the specific goals and services that are provided by the other individuals or organizations involved in the project? (Circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NOT INFORMED</th>
<th>LITTLE INFORMED</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT INFORMED</th>
<th>QUITE INFORMED</th>
<th>VERY WELL INFORMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. To what extent did the other individuals or organizations involved participate in the planning of your Youth-At-Risk project prior to submitting your grant proposal? (Circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>LITTLE EXTENT</th>
<th>SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>MUCH EXTENT</th>
<th>GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How many years and months have you personally known the other members or their contact people? (three you know best)

Name of individual or group

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Years/Months

___________

___________

___________

8. How well are you personally acquainted with the contact people of the other members? (Circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO PERSONAL ACQUAINTANCE</th>
<th>NOT VERY WELL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT WELL</th>
<th>QUITE WELL</th>
<th>VERY WELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Consensus

To what extent do you and the other members agree on:
(Circle your response)

|   | Don't Know | Disagree | Agree | Agree | Agree | Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The most important needs of the youth of your community?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The way services in general should be provided to youth in your community?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The goals of the Youth-at-Risk Initiative?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The specific way youth services are provided by the Youth-at-Risk Initiative?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain Similarity

To what extent do the individuals or organizations involved in the project (Circle your response).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Obtain their funding from the same sources as you or your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Provide the same kind of services as you or your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Provide services to the same individuals or families as you or your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Have the same kind of operating program goals as your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have staff with the same kinds of professional skills, training, or experience as those required of staff for your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: STRUCTURAL DIMENSIONS

Frequency of Communications

Answer the following questions using the scale below.

0 = No or more times during the past six months.
1 = One time during the past six months.
2 = Two times, or about every three months.
3 = Three times, or about every two months.
4 = About every month, or six times.
5 = About every two weeks, or twelve times.
6 = About every week, or twenty-four times.
7 = Every 2-3 days.
8 = About every day.

1. How frequently were letters or written reports of any kind exchanged with a coalition member during the past six months?

2. How many times has the overall coalition met during the past six months?

3. How frequently were personal face-to-face discussions held with a coalition member during the past six months?

4. How frequently were telephone calls made with a coalition member during the past six months?
**Resource Flows**

A. To what extent has the coalition received each of the following resources for its involvement with your organization during the past year? (Circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DON'T</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>MUCH</th>
<th>GREAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Money from your organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Use of your organization's staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Client referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Consultation or technical assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Public visibility, recognition, goodwill, or prestige</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Physical Equipment, supplies or space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Attainment of the coalition's goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>New programs or curriculum for the people served by the program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Other (please list)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. To what extent did your organization receive each of the following resources from the coalition during the past year? (Circle your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Don't</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money from the coalition or other individuals or organizations involved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from a third party because of your involvement in the project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of human resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation or technical assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public visibility, recognition, goodwill, or prestige</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical equipment, supplies or space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of your organization's goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New programs or curricula for people served by the program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please list)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formalization of Coalition Agreement

26. Has any form of agreement been established to define the relationship between your organization and the coalition. 
   Yes _____ or No _____ If yes, go to 27 if no skip to 31.

   To what extent is/was the agreement with the coalition. (Circle your response)

   DON'T KNOW LITTLE SOME MUCH GREAT
   0 1 2 3 4 5

27. Explicitly verbalized and discussed
   0 1 2 3 4 5

28. Written down in detail
   0 1 2 3 4 5

29. Legally binding or contractual
   0 1 2 3 4 5

30. Mandatory by law

31. Has any kind of committee or group been established to coordinate activities between members of the coalition?
   Yes _____ No _____ If yes go to 32, no skip to question 1 page 11.

32. Is this an ad hoc or standing committee?
33. To what extent is this committee formalized with agendas, minutes, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>LITTLE EXTENT</th>
<th>SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>MUCH EXTENT</th>
<th>GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. To what extent are the decisions made by this committee binding upon your organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO EXTENT</th>
<th>LITTLE EXTENT</th>
<th>SOME EXTENT</th>
<th>MUCH EXTENT</th>
<th>GREAT EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART III: PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do the coalition members carry out the commitments they agreed to in regard to your organization?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent do you feel the relationship between your organization and the coalition is productive?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent is the time and effort spent in developing and maintaining the relationship with the other members worthwhile?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall, to what extent are you satisfied with the relationships between your organization and the other members of the coalition?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent have individuals or organizations who were added after the project was funded impacted the effectiveness of the project?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality of Communications

6. When you want to communicate with other members of the coalition how much difficulty have you had getting in touch with them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CONTACT</th>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>MUCH</th>
<th>GREAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Overall, how would you characterize the quality of your communications with other members of the coalition during the past year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CONTACT</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In your attempts to communicate with persons in the coalition during the past year, how often did your messages get lost or not get a follow-through response or return call?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CONTACT</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>VERY Seldom</th>
<th>OCCASIONALLY</th>
<th>QUITE OFTEN</th>
<th>VERY OFTEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART IV: GENERAL CONCERNS

1. To what degree has fluctuations or changes in membership had an effect on the project? (Check one)
   - No effect
   - Little effect
   - Some effect
   - Membership has not fluctuated

2. Have these fluctuations or changes in membership been:
   (Check one)
   - Positive
   - Negative
   - Neither positive
   - Neither negative

3. What things do you like most about working with the other people in this project?

4. What things do you like least about working with the other people in this project?

5. Has your project experience conflict between members?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

   If yes, how was the conflict resolved?

6. How are youth involved in this project? (Check all that apply)
   - Members of project
   - Serve as advisors to project members
   - Recipients of service
   - Other (Please specify)
PART VI: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What is your race?
   Native American
   Hispanic
   African American
   Asian American
   White
   Other (Please Specify)

2. What is your gender?  Male  Female

3. What is your highest level of education?
   Less than High School
   High School
   Some College
   Technical or Associate's degree
   Bachelor's Degree
   Graduate Degree
   What Degree and What Major

4. Are you now employed? Yes  No
   If yes, how long in your current position?
   Less than 1 year
   1-5 years
   6-10 years
   11-15 years
   More than 15 years

5. What type of community is the coalition targeting?
   Rural
   Town under 10,000
   Town or city (10,000 to 50,000)
   Suburb of city over 50,000
   Central city (over 50,000)

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE INSTRUMENT. PLEASE RETURN IT IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE TO YOUR LOCAL PROJECT DIRECTOR.
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