

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8001785

MILLER, PAMELA A.

AN EXAMINATION OF INTERORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES IN  
COORDINATION OF HUMAN SERVICES

*The Ohio State University*

PH.D.

1979

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background \_\_\_\_\_
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages \_\_\_\_\_ throughout  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
9. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available  
from school or author \_\_\_\_\_
10. Page(s) 6 seem to be missing in numbering only as text  
follows ✓
11. Poor carbon copy \_\_\_\_\_
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type \_\_\_\_\_
13. Appendix pages are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
14. Original copy with light type \_\_\_\_\_
15. Curling and wrinkled pages \_\_\_\_\_
16. Other \_\_\_\_\_

AN EXAMINATION OF INTERORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES  
IN COORDINATION OF HUMAN SERVICES

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate  
School of The Ohio State University

By

Pamela A. Miller, B.A., M.S.W.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Ohio State University  
1979

Reading Committee:

Milton S. Rosner  
Thomas M. Meenaghan  
Robert O. Washington

Approved by

  
Adviser  
College of Social Work

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The responsibility for this study is mine and mine alone but it represents the contributions of many in both tangible and intangible ways. I would especially like to acknowledge the assistance of those who have guided me to the completion of this study during the last year.

My deepest gratitude goes to my committee. Dr. Rosner has consistently been supportive and encouraging during the conceptualizing, researching and writing of this study. Dr. Meenaghan has given generously of his time and energy to guide me in the process of conceptualizing, structuring and writing of the study. Dr. Washington has been a model to me of a dean who sincerely and consciously attempts to provide a structure and climate in which students can act in the role of consumers. Each of my committee members treated me as a colleague and in the process helped me develop as a student and professional.

Bette Madson who patiently edited my writing and Vi Glenn who is responsible for the typing of this study are in my debt for their patience and assistance during a sometimes tedious process.

As always my family and friends deserve mention and my appreciation for their consistent support and encouragement throughout my career.

Finally, I thank all of those in the community who gave me valuable time for interviews, without their cooperation this study would not have been possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
 Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Rational Approach to Planning	
Interorganizational Perspective on Planning	
Propositions From Interorganizational Perspective	
Group I Domain Consensus	
Group II Organization-Set	
Group III Location of Input Resources	
Case Study	
Implications of Study	
Footnotes For Chapter I	
II RATIONALE FOR STUDY . . . . .	17
Footnotes For Chapter II	
III METHODOLOGY . . . . .	31
Population Sample	
Data Collection	
Board Meetings	
Propositions and Case Study	
Group I Domain Consensus	
Group I and II Organization Set and	
Location of Input Resources	
Presentation and Analysis of Data	
Limitations of The Study	
Footnotes For Chapter III	
IV PRESENTATION OF DATA . . . . .	51
Domain and Domain Consensus	
Coordination as the Commission's Primary Domain	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter

IV (continued)

- Constraints To Coordination
- Type of Coordinating Organization
- Activities to Implement The Commission's Domain
- Most Valuable Activity
- Least Valuable Activity
- Activities Commission Should Not Have Done
- Activities Commission Should Do
- Participation in the Commission
- Benefits From Participation
- Effectiveness of the Commission
- Summary of Domain and Domain Consensus Section
- Organization-Set and Goal-Setting During  
Commission Board Meeting
- January 25 Meeting
- February 8 Meeting
- Summary of Chapter
- Domain and Domain Consensus
- Coordination
- Activities
- Organization-Set and Goal-Setting

V INTERPRETATION . . . . . 115

- Group I Domain Consensus
- Relationship of Findings to Organization and  
Planning Literature
- Group II and II Organization-Set and Location  
Of Input Resources
- Relationship of Findings to Organization and  
Planning Literature
- Summary of Chapter
- Organization-Literature
- Planning-Literature
- Footnotes for Chapter V

VI IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND  
LIMITATIONS OF STUDY . . . . . 144

- Implications and Recommendations For Metropolitan  
Human Services Commission Relative to  
Strategies and Future Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter	Page
VI (continued)	
Implications and Recommendations for Theory And Research on Planning Limitations of Study Footnotes for Chapter VI	
APPENDIX A . . . . .	155
Interview Schedule and Lists of Services and Commission Activities	
APPENDIX B . . . . .	160
Coding Rules	
APPENDIX C . . . . .	171
Tables With Descriptive Data on Sample	
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	177



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1	Summary Data On Organizations (n=30): Sanction, Funding Source And Programs On Commission Service Priority List . . . . . 172
2	Summary Data On Organizations (n=15) In Top Funded Group: Sanction, Funding Source and Programs on Commission Service Priority List. . . . . 173
3	Summary Data On Organizations (n=15) In Bottom Funded Group, Sanction, Funding Source, Programs on Commission Service Priority List. . . . . 174
4	Types of Programs in Organizations (n=30) By Sanction and Function Level . . . . . 175
5	Data On Funding Source For Organizations (n=30) By Sanction and Funding Level . . . . . 176
6	Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Types of Present Coordination . . . . . 58
7	Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Types of Desirable Coordination . . . . . 61
8	Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Types of Constraints to Desirable Coordination . . . . . 63
9	Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Types of Coordinating Organizations for Implementing Desired Coordination . . . . . 66
10	Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Commission Activities Most Valuable to the Organization . . . . . 69

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page	
11	Frequencies And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Commission Activities Least Valuable to the Organization . . . . .	72
12	Frequencies And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Commission Activities It Should Not Have Done . . . . .	75
13	Frequency And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Activities the Commission Should Do . . . . .	77
14	Frequency And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Participation in the Commission By Organization . . . . .	79
15	Frequencies And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Benefits From Participation . . . . .	82
16	Frequencies And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Effectiveness And Commission . . . . .	85
17	Chart of Participation of Board Members And Staff at January 25 Meeting . . . . .	94
18	Topic, Sequence And Priority of Participation at January 25 Meeting . . . . .	95
19	Chart of Participation of Board Members And Staff at February 8 Meeting . . . . .	100
20	Topic, Sequence And Priority of Participation at February 8 Meeting . . . . .	101
21	Objectives Presented At January 25 and February 8 Board Meetings . . . . .	102
22	Summary of Findings on Domain and Domain Consensus (Perceptions of Decision Makers On Coordination, Part I) . . . . .	106
23	Summary of Findings on Domain and Domain Consensus (Perceptions of Decision Makers On Activities of the Commission, Part II) . . . . .	108

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
24 Summary of Findings on Organization-Set And Goal-Setting (Data on Observations of Board Meetings) . . . . .	113

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The major question explored in this study is the extent to which planning for social services reflects the interorganizational or organization-environment, domain and resource issues identified in this study. The two primary interorganizational issues identified in the study are whether there is agreement or disagreement between organizations concerning the definitions of their respective domains and whether there is control of resources by a few organizations of the necessary resources for their own and other organizations' domains. Domain is defined by Thompson as the products, services, functions, customers or clients an organization's decision makers claim for their organization's area of activity in a geographic area.<sup>1</sup> An organization-environment is defined by Turk as the organizations which affect or potentially affect the domain of an organization or are within the domain of the organization.<sup>2</sup> They are the "relevant" organizations for that organization's domain.

In social service planning, the dominant model, identified by Kahn and others, is the rational approach. The rational approach, as described later in this chapter, is characterized by a systematic

process to define needs or problems and subsequent planning goals to meet those needs or resolve the problems. A deficit in rational approaches identified in this study is their failure to include, with some exceptions, interorganizational issues which may shape planning.

This study attempts to partially address this apparent deficit by developing an interorganizational perspective on planning. The interorganizational perspective of this study, as described later in this chapter, is characterized by a focus on the interactions between organizations around the issues of domain definitions and control of resources for domains as central to a planning attempt. Decisions about planning goals and implementation of those goals are assumed to take place in organizations which themselves are affected by their organization-environment. It is also assumed in the interorganizational perspective that planning for social services must affect the domains and resources of organizations from which services are delivered. The planning attempt, therefore, to be effective must be implemented from a dominant organization in the environment. Dominance is defined, based on Emerson, as control by the organization of the major resources for the domains of organizations to be affected by the planning attempt.<sup>3</sup>

As an introduction to the study, this chapter describes Kahn's rational model of planning and his integrated service delivery system since both are characteristic of planning for social services. The interorganizational perspective developed in this study is next presented along with the similarities and differences between it and the

rational approach described in Kahn's model and integrated services delivery system. At the end of the chapter the case study is introduced. Data from the case study is used later to illustrate propositions in the study's interorganizational perspective.

#### Rational Approach to Planning

For this study, rational planning is defined as a systematic method to: define problems; choose among alternative courses of action and develop strategies for their resolution. It is characterized by a focus on planning objectives as products of utilizing objective data, logically and systematically gathered and agreed to by the major participants in the planning effort. Kahn's model of "planning in action" and integrated service delivery system are both examples of the rational approach to planning applied to social service planning. The major components of Kahn's model of "planning in action" are:

1. Determination of what is and what will be through gathering of facts, projections and resource inventories.
2. Definition of planning task through choice of types and levels of intervention.
3. Formulation of policy (standing plan).
4. Programming to carry out policy.
5. Evaluation, monitoring and feedback about implementation of programs.<sup>4</sup>

A rational approach to planning for services, like that found in Kahn's model, relies on fact-gathering and expert knowledge for decision-making about policies and assumes that lack of knowledge is at the root of problems in social services. Another source of problems

identified in the rational approach is the lack of an organization or individual with a mandate to implement a systematized approach to service delivery. The result of the lack of knowledge and the lack of an organization with a mandate is fragmentation, characterized by Kahn as multiple organizations delivering services in a community without joining efforts for a community-wide approach, i.e., without coordination.<sup>5</sup> There exists in a fragmented approach to services gaps and/or contradictions in some service areas and overlap in others. A systematized approach is characterized by way of contrast as consisting of:

1. Accessibility--people are able to learn about and obtain services.
2. Channeling--people move or are moved from one service to another.
3. Case integration--there is a meshing of multiple services as needed by a client.
4. Program or service integration--there is a meshing of multiple programs or services according to a community-wide plan for service delivery.
5. Accountability--there is assurance of responsiveness of services to consumers needs and preferences.<sup>6</sup>

#### Interorganizational Perspective on Planning

The interorganizational perspective developed in this study rather than focusing on the technology of planning as the rational approach does, focuses on domain and resource issues in the organization-environment within which planning takes place. The interorganizational perspective is characterized by a focus on planning objectives as products of organizational interactions around attempts

to obtain domain consensus and control of resources for domains. Levine and White define domain consensus as the extent of agreement by decision makers in an organization's environment about the appropriateness of its domain for the environment.<sup>7</sup> According to Thompson, the extent of domain consensus partially determines the extent of resource support in the environment for the organization.<sup>8</sup> Within the inter-organizational perspective, therefore, domain consensus is a critical issue for the survival of the organization.

Within this perspective, domain consensus is also a critical issue for planning. Planning is characterized as taking place in organizations with organization-sets which partially determine goal-setting in the organization. An organization-set is defined by Evan as the organizations which provide resources and decision premises for an organization and/or outlets for products or services of the organization.<sup>9</sup>

As a consequence of the focus on domain consensus and resources, the major components of the interorganizational perspective consist of resource concerns related to the establishment of domain and domain consensus:

1. Organizational domain as a determinant of resource interdependencies between organizations.
2. Domain consensus as essential for members of an organization to carry out domain functions because of resource requirements.
3. Goal-setting as a continual process of establishing organizational domain by positioning an organization in the organization-environment relative to input resources and outlets for products or services.



4. Planning as an attempt to create change in domains of organizations and consequent patterns of resource interdependencies and linkages between organizations.

Although the interorganizational perspective requires a dominant organization or lead agency, as does Kahn's model, in the interorganizational perspective the focus on the lead agency is different from that found in Kahn's model. A lead agency is Kahn's designation for the organization with a mandate to create and administer a service delivery system.<sup>10</sup> The rational approach found in Kahn's model focuses on the techniques of planning, i.e., need identification and prioritization, goal-determination, policy formation, etc., once the lead agency is created. The interorganizational perspective with a focus on domain and resource issues in an organization-environment emphasizes the problems of creating a dominant organization or lead agency. It also identifies the implications for planning of the position of the planner's organization. Position is defined by Aldrich and Pfeiffer as the level of control by an organization of the input resources for the domains of other organizations and/or outlets for their products.<sup>11</sup> It is this emphasis on the position of the planner's organization in the organization-environment and on the problems of creating a dominant organization or lead agency that characterizes propositions in an interorganizational perspective.

#### Propositions from Interorganizational Perspective

In regard to the position of an organization in its organization-environment the propositions in an interorganizational perspective

describe implications for the functioning of an organization and goal-setting in the organization.

Although the propositions are grouped into three areas: domain consensus, organization-set and location of input resources, the groupings reflect emphases rather than distinct areas. The propositions about organization-set and location of input resources provide further specification of the relationships identified in the propositions about domain consensus. The propositions about location of input resources also provide further specification of the relationships identified in the propositions about organization-set. The propositions as a consequence complement and complete each other.

In the first group of propositions the emphasis on domain consensus broadly relates the ability of members of an organization to carry out its domain to domain consensus. They are based principally on Thompson's work on organizations. Thompson defines organizations as open systems, dependent on their environments for resources necessary for survival.<sup>12</sup> The emphasis on domain consensus in the propositions reflects Thompson's definition of organization as an open system.

#### Group I Domain Consensus

- 1.1 The more decision makers of organizations in the domain of an organization agree with and support its domain, i.e., domain consensus, the more members in the organization are able to carry out its domain functions.
- 1.2 The more there is not domain consensus by decision makers of organizations in the domain of an organization, the less members of the organization will be able to carry out its domain functions.

The propositions in group two specify further the emphasis in the first group of propositions on the importance of the support of an organization's environment to its functioning in a domain. The second group relates characteristics of an organization-set which affect the ability of decision makers in the set to have influence on the goal-setting in the organization. An organization-set, as the organizations which provide resources and outlets for an organization, is a specific group within an organization's environment identified by their resource linkages with the organization. Goal-setting is described by Thompson and McEwen as a continual process of adjusting an organization's domain to its environment and thus is a process of specifying and modifying an organization's domain.<sup>13</sup> The characteristics of size, concentration and overlap in membership are identified by Evan in his organization-set model as particularly important factors which affect the influence of an organization-set on an organization's goal-setting.<sup>14</sup> The propositions in group two are from Evan's organization-set model.

#### Group II Organization-Set

- 2.1 The greater the size of the input organizations in the organization-set of an organization, the more the input organizations' decision makers control the goal-setting in the organization.
- 2.2 The higher the concentration of input for an organization in a few organizations, the more the input organization's decision makers control the goal-setting in the organization.

- 2.3 The greater the overlap in membership between the organization and its organization-set the more the decision makers in the organization-set control the organization's goal-setting.

Propositions in group three specify further the focus in both group one and two propositions. The propositions in group three relate the position of an organization's input resources, i.e., within or outside the setting, to the ability of decision makers in the organization-set to influence goal-setting in the organization. A relationship is also identified between control of input resources by the organization for the domains of the organizations in its set and ability of decision makers in the organization to influence goal-setting in the organization-set. These propositions, like those in group two, are from Evan's organization-set model.

#### Group III Location of Input Resources

- 3.1 The more an organization receives input resources from organizations in the setting of the organization, the more decision makers in the organizations in the setting will influence goal-setting in the organization.
- 3.2 The more an organization receives input resources from organizations outside of the setting of the organizations, the less decision makers in the organizations in the setting will influence goal-setting in the organization.
- 3.3 The more an organization is a major source of input resources for other organizations, the more decision makers in the organization will influence goal-setting in other organizations in their setting.

#### Case Study

To explore the utility of the propositions from the inter-organizational perspective for describing and analyzing,

interorganizational factors in a social service planning context, a study of an attempt at community-wide planning for social services was conducted by the writer. As recommended by Davidson in his study of planning and coordination of social services, the material gathered from the study is used to illustrate relationships identified in the propositions.<sup>15</sup>

The setting for the study is the human service organizational field in Columbus, Ohio. It was chosen as it is an example of an attempt to create an integrated community-wide service delivery system using a rational planning approach. In addition, the planning organization's composition reflects an attempt to arrive at decisions about planning objectives through consensus of major participants in the planning effort. Representatives from the major funding organizations in the area are on the planning organization's board and cabinet of executives. Board meetings of the organization are therefore an opportunity to observe attempts by representatives from the major funding organizations to influence decisions about planning objectives or goal-setting in the organization. The setting also provides an opportunity for interviews with a sample of decision makers from a wide range of organizations in the organization-set of the planning organization about their perceptions of the domain of the planning organization. It also provides an opportunity to interview them about their perceptions of the influence of the organization-environment and, specifically, the organization-set on the planning organization's domain and attempt to carry out the domain, i.e., its activities.

The planning organization in the case study is the Columbus Metropolitan Human Service Commission, incorporated December, 1976, as a non-profit organization to create coordination between human service organizations in the metropolitan area. The Commission is the result of recommendations of a Citizen Committee, itself formed as a result of a Columbus city council resolution. The resolution calls for coordination to solve what the council identifies as ineffective and inefficient use of monies for social services.<sup>16</sup> Following recommendations of the Citizen Committee, the Commission has a seventeen member board and a cabinet of executives with membership from major funding and service-providing organizations along with representatives from the Columbus city governments, business, labor, foundations and community-at-large. Representatives from the funding organizations for the Commission are on the board and, except for the governments, on the cabinet of executives. The funding organizations are, within the interorganizational perspective, the major input organizations for the Commission. According to the perspective, the major input organizations should be dominant in goal-setting in the Commission.

The primary domain of the Commission is defined by the Citizen Committee as coordination which consists of:

"Comprehensive planning to coordinate the efforts of both public and private social service organizations."<sup>17</sup>

Following the assumptions in the rational approach to planning, it is assumed in the Citizen Committee's recommendations that by bringing the major funding organizations together in the Commission and gathering community-wide data on needs and services, consensus will be reached

by the major participants and coordinated planning will take place.

Activities of the Commission during its first two years were a response to the recommendations of the Citizen Committee and an attempt to implement a rational planning approach. They consisted primarily of a fact-gathering process to define needs, prioritize services and define community-wide goals for human services. In Kahn's model of "planning in action" these activities are identified as, determination of what is and defining the planning task. Resource development and development of an information management system were also undertaken during the first two years.<sup>18</sup> If the rational planning process was continued into the 1979 planning period, Commission objectives for that year would refer to the development of comprehensive plans and evaluation reflected in priorities for funding and accountability criteria of the funding organizations and programming by the service providing organizations.

The 1979 objectives for the Commission, however, emphasize a mix of short range program and technical assistance objectives. Long term objectives related to comprehensive planning tasks are given low priority in the list of fifteen objectives. The five top objectives on the list are:

1. Maintain current resource development effort.
2. Implement transportation project.
3. Undertake financing of transportation strategies.
4. Develop compatible program and fiscal reporting requirements.
5. Initiate development of management support center.<sup>19</sup>

An interorganizational perspective on planning explains the apparent shift in the Commission's objectives from implementing a rational planning process to a mix of short range program and technical assistance objectives as a change in domain to accommodate to its environment. The perspective examines the change in relation to the Commission's position in its organization environment and more specifically in relation to its position in its organization-set.

#### Implications of Study

The theoretical and practical implications of this study are related to its use of interorganizational propositions. Theoretically, interorganizational propositions have not been included in social work planning models except for limited applications by a few writers. Integration of these in planning models is advanced by their inclusion in the perspective developed in this study.

Practically, the case study used for material to illustrate the perspective's propositions, is a current planning effort. As a result of this study, the case study's planner are provided with additional material to examine their strategies in relation to feedback provided from decision makers interviewed in the study. Examination of a current planning effort also benefits theory development by providing additional material from the field for continual work on a more inclusive theory of planning.



Footnotes for Chapter I

- 1 James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 26.
- 2 Herman Turk, "Interorganizational Activation in Urban Communities: Deductions From the Concept of System," in Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series (Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1973).
- 3 Richard A. Emerson, "Power-Dependency Relations," in American Sociological Review 27, 1962, p. 31-41.
- 4 Alfred J. Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969), p. 62.
- 5 Alfred J. Kahn and Sheila Kamerman. Social Services in the United States (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1976), p. 496.
- 6 Ibid., p. 505.
- 7 Sol Levine and Paul White. "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," in Administrative Science Quarterly 5, 1961, p. 583-601.
- 8 Thompson, op. cit., p. 27.
- 9 William Evan, "The Organization-set: Toward a Theory of Inter-organizational Relations," in Approaches To Organizational Design. James D. Thompson (ed.) (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966), p. 173-191.
- 10 Kahn and Kamerman, op. cit., p. 513.
- 11 Howard E. Aldrich and Jeffrey Pfeffer, "Environments of Organizations," in Annual Review of Sociology 2, 1976, p. 79-105.
- 12 Thompson, op. cit., p. 85.
- 13 James O. Thompson and William McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting as an Inter-Action Process," in American Sociological Review 23, 1958, p. 23-31.
- 14 Evan, op. cit.

- 16 Final Report and Recommendations of Citizens Committee (Columbus, Ohio: Citizens Committee, 1976), p. B-1, Appendix B.
- 17 Ibid., p. 11.
- 18 First Year Report of Metropolitan Human Services Commission, (Columbus, Ohio: Daven Management Co., 1977), p. 1-11.
- 19 1979 Objectives as passed in prioritized form at February 8 meeting and reported in Minutes of that meeting (The Columbus, Ohio: Metropolitan Human Service Commission, 1979), unpublished.

## CHAPTER II

### RATIONALE FOR STUDY

In this chapter a rationale is provided from planning and organization-environment literature for developing an interorganizational perspective on planning. Failures of rational models of planning to include organizational resistances to planning are identified and related to organization-environment literature which identifies sources of organizational influence and resistance to planning objectives.

Planning for human services as described by Kahn, Morris and Binstock and Rein is dominated by rational models of planning.<sup>1</sup> A rational model is characterized by Kahn as a model which describes a process of systematically determining needs, logically relating needs to goals to meet those needs, designing programs to carry out the goals and developing criteria for evaluating the programs. Kahn's model of "planning in action" focuses on methods of:

1. Determining needs and resources.
2. Defining the planning task.
3. Formulating policy or the standing plan.
4. Programming to carry out the policy.
5. Evaluation, monitoring and feedback.<sup>2</sup>

Morris and Binstock describe rational planning as a systematic method to solve problems.<sup>3</sup> Rein describes it as a strategy that "relies on the power of knowledge."<sup>4</sup>

One of the limitations of the rational model is a failure to take into account resistances by participants to changes required of them by planning goals. Rein describes the limitations as a failure to "reconcile the conflicting requirements of rationality and feasibility."<sup>5</sup> The major resistance to planning goals identified by Morris and Binstock in their study of the Ford Foundation demonstration programs for the elderly was perceptions of decision makers in organizations that the present way in which their organizations function in the environment was satisfactory. Change was perceived by the decision makers as unnecessary and possibly detrimental to the functioning of their organization. A feasible goal, according to Morris and Binstock, is one that takes into account resistances by decision makers to change and also influences or incentives available to the planner for overcoming those resistances.<sup>6</sup>

Although Kahn focuses on methods of planning rather than on resistances to planning goals by decision makers, he does indicate that organizational factors are important in implementing plans. A lead agency is identified by Kahn as necessary for the implementation of his rational model of service delivery. A lead agency is defined by Kahn as an individual or organization with a mandate and resources to create and administer the service delivery system.<sup>7</sup> The lead agency provides the planner with the influences that Morris and Binstock identified as

necessary for overcoming resistances by decision makers to changes required of their organization. Morris and Binstock, unlike Kahn, focus on sources of organizational resistances to planning goals. Their focus is on perceptions by decision makers of planning goals as introducing innovations in their organization's allocation of resources. The innovations will be resisted, according to Morris and Binstock, if they are perceived by decision makers, as one or more of the following:

1. Threatening attachments to old ways.
2. Introducing uncertainties of new practice.
3. Disrupting a satisfactory balance.
4. Violating the culture or ethos that supports the organization.
5. Subordination of the organization to the will of outsiders.
6. Cost of adopting innovations outweighs the benefits.<sup>8</sup>

The perceptions identified by Morris and Binstock as a source of resistance to planning goals are identified in the literature on organization, organization-environment and coordination as domain and domain consensus concerns of decision makers. The domain of an organization is defined by Paulson as the products or services, services or functions, customers or clients that a decision maker claims as the organization's area of activity.<sup>9</sup> Domain consensus, according to Thompson, is the extent to which decision makers in other organizations support and recognize the right of a decision maker in the organization to claim the domain for his or her organization.<sup>10</sup> Resistances

by decision makers to change are explained, using domain and domain consensus concepts, as a consequence of the organization's position in the environment. The position of an organization is a function of the nature of resource linkages that it has as a result of its domain requirements for resources and support given to it by decision makers in other organizations. Each of the perceptions of the decision makers identified as sources of resistance by Morris and Binstock can be explained as concerns about the organization's domain and level of domain consensus for the organization's domain in its organization-environment. The domain of organizations, according to Thompson and McEwen, is constantly shifting during goal-setting.<sup>11</sup> The goal-setting process, rather than the rational planning process described by Kahn, is a "sounding out process" by decision makers to learn about the position of relevant organizations in their environment. The position of an organization as a function of the nature of its resource linkages is also related to control of resources for the domain of the organization. Consequently it is also a function of the level of influence of decision makers to form or change resource linkages in relation to the proposed goals.

Emerson describes exchanges between decision makers in the development of resource linkages between organizations in a power or resource dependency model of organization-environment.<sup>12</sup> Schmidt and Kochan define organization-environment from a resource dependency model as the other organizations which have resources needed for the domain of the organization.<sup>13</sup> Emerson characterizes a power or resource dependency model of organization environment as a model which focuses

on resource linkages between organizations as a function of competition for control of scarce resources. Conflict and bargaining between decision makers rather than cooperation, according to Emerson, characterize exchanges between decision makers for resources for their organization.<sup>14</sup> Aldrich and Pfeffer describe the exchanges as based on attempts by decision makers to increase their control of resources for the domain of their organizations.<sup>15</sup> Schmidt and Kochan assume that both cooperation and conflict exist in exchanges between decision makers over resources. They also assume that exchange take place when one or both parties to the exchange perceive benefits from the exchange. Whether cooperation or conflict exists depends, in Schmidt and Kochan's framework, on the distribution of power or control of resources between decision makers and degree of complimentarity between the domains of organizations. The primary propositions in Schmidt and Kochan's model are:

1. The lowest frequency of exchange occurs between decision makers when there is no apparent benefit from the exchange for either of their organizations.
2. The highest frequency of exchange occurs when both organizations benefit.
3. Exchange, when one benefits more than another is higher than when neither benefits.
4. In an unequal exchange, factors which increase the level of the exchange are:

- a. Compatible domains between organizations.
- b. Exchange is important to functioning of lesser organization.
- c. More powerful organization's decision maker has influence over lesser organization's policy, resources and marketing.
- d. More powerful organization's decision maker has conflict and bargaining tactics with appropriate resources.<sup>16</sup>

Schmidt and Kochan's framework is supported by the literature on coordination and Evan's organization-set model of interorganizational relations which is discussed later.

Underlying Kahn's rational planning model of a service delivery system is an assumption that organizations can be coordinated to provide services according to a community-wide plan for social service delivery. Reid uses five dimensions, agreement formalization; size of resource investment; reciprocity or balance in resources exchanged; mutuality in reaching terms; standardization or fixedness of the units exchanged, to identify three primary types of coordination of organizations:

1. Ad hoc case coordination is at the lowest end of the dimensions as it requires the least from decision makers in resources, formalization of agreements, reciprocity or mutuality.
2. Systematic case coordination is a higher level type which requires moderate resource investment, formal arrangements, standardization, reciprocity and mutuality.



3. Program coordination is at the highest level of the dimensions with high resource investment, formal arrangements, mutuality and reciprocity.<sup>17</sup>

White, Levine and Vlasak and Gans and Horton found in their studies of coordination of organizations and integration of services, minimal support for coordination by decision makers which required high levels of resource investment or agreement formalization. Instead lower level types of coordination were supported by decision makers to the extent that coordination was perceived by them as contributing to the organization's position and share of resources.<sup>18</sup> Gans and Horton found that decision makers in organizations rather than cooperating in creating a community-wide service system, which required coordination similar to that of Kahn's service delivery system, attempted to maximize the ability of their organization to fulfill accountability criteria of their funders.<sup>19</sup> Within an organization-environment perspective, this is an attempt by decision makers to maximize resources for their organization's domain and to maximize their organization's position in the environment.

Evan's organization-set model places the resource dependence model within an intersystem model of interaction. An intersystem is defined by Chin as two systems connected to each other in either conjunctive or disjunctive interdependencies. The assumption is that they are relatively autonomous systems rather than interdependent. Interdependencies or linkages between them are assessed in relation to the level of interdependence or resource investment involved in the

interaction.<sup>20</sup> Evan's intersystem model provides a conceptual framework for describing the nature of interdependencies present in exchanges for resources for organization domains. The model consists of a focal organization, which is defined by Evans as the organization which is the focus of analysis, and its organization-set. Evans defines the organization-set as the input constituent organization which provide input resources for the domain of the organization, i.e., financing, facilities, staff, supplies, sanction, staff, along with the output constituent organizations which provide outlets for the products of the organizations. The model builds on the propositions previously described in the resource dependence model, i.e., Schmidt and Kochan's propositions, in that it is based on the assumption that exchange of resources determines the nature of interdependencies between organizations. It posits that the nature of the organization-set determines control of goal-setting or autonomy in decision making in the focal organization. Evan assumes that the level of autonomy in decision making is directly related to control of resources for an organization's domain and consequent goals. Size, concentration and position of the input constituent organizations in the organization-environment are primary factors which affect decision making autonomy in the focal organization. The level of overlapping membership between the focal organization and the organization-set is also important as a factor which affects decision making autonomy. Taking each of these factors, Evan's propositions about the relation of the organization-set to decision making autonomy in the focal organization are:

1. The greater the size of an organization's input organizations in its organization-set, the lower the autonomy of the organization's decision maker in goal-setting.
2. The higher the concentration of input in a few organizations, the lower the decision making autonomy in the organization.
3. The greater the overlap in membership between the organization and its organization-set the lower goal-setting autonomy in the organization.
4. The more an organization is a major input organization for other organizations in the setting, the more the decision maker in the organization has influence over goal-setting in the organizations.
5. The more a decision maker in an organization is dependent on organizations in the setting for input resources, the less the decision maker will influence their goal-setting and the more decision makers in the other organizations will influence goal-setting in the organization.
6. The more an organization's input resources are from outside its setting, the more autonomy in goal-setting its decision maker will have.<sup>21</sup>

Although Kahn identifies characteristics of input organizations as important for the lead agency, his analysis focuses on structural

characteristics rather than resource characteristics. Kahn relates fragmentation of social service programs at the federal level to fragmentation at the local, county or city level. An example of federal fragmentation is administrative structures for services for the aged under the Older Americans Act separated from services for the aged under public assistance titles. Reorganization to create centralization of administration of services at the federal level, Kahn assumes, is necessary for a unified service system at the local level.<sup>22</sup> An organizational factor, identified in Evan's organization-set model, which complements Kahn's recommendations for centralization, is control by the focal organization of the input resources for its organization-set. The federal level as the focal organization, within Evan's model, should control a large share of funding for the human service organizations and thus be able to control goal-setting at the local level.

Morris and Binstock focus on organizations at the local level. Decision makers of organizations at this level may block change perceived as unfavorable to their organization or may influence planning goals to be favorable for their organizations. Organizational factors in Evan's model which complement Morris and Binstock's analysis of planning are the size, concentration and position characteristics of a focal organization's input constituent organizations as factors which affect decision making autonomy in a focal organization. Morris and Binstock characterize planning as the attempt of an actor with limited influence to change the policies of organizations. The match of the

actor's influence in relation to resistance of decision makers which need to be overcome determines the feasibility of planning goals.<sup>23</sup> By providing indicators of a planning organization's position in its organization-set, Evan's model provides some indication of the planner's level of influence.

Although in analyses of planning, Kahn, Morris and Binstock, Warren and others identify organizational characteristics such as structure and decision maker perceptions of threat, only Warren explicitly uses interorganizational concepts. Warren uses the concepts of domain consensus and interorganizational field in a study of model city programs. Interorganizational consensus in an interorganizational field was identified by Warren as primarily responsible for blockage of social change in the communities he studied. An interorganizational field is defined by Warren as an aggregate property of organizations in a community. It is characterized by Warren as consisting of:

1. Interaction between organizations which takes the form of mutual adjustments to new situations so that their domains remain intact.
2. Norms governing the range of acceptable behavior for the interaction between organizations.
3. A basic consensus or institutionalized thought structure about the nature of social reality, of American society, of social problems and of efforts at social change and human betterment.<sup>24</sup>

Warren's interorganizational field, unlike Evan's organization-set model, depicts the community as a network of organizations or a system joined together by norms, basic consensus on the nature of reality and mutual adjustments around domain issues. The community in

Evan's organization-set model rather than one system is a composite of multiple systems, each a group of interdependent organizations. Interdependence, in Evan's model, is a function of resource linkages between the organizations in a system and between systems. Exchanges between decision makers to establish linkages, according to Evan's, are both cooperative and conflictual. The nature of the exchange partially depends on whether there is domain consensus and/or competition for control of scarce resources.<sup>25</sup>

In this study, propositions are used from Evan's organization-set model and from Thompson's and Thompson and McEwen's works on domain consensus. They are used to describe the relationship not focused on in Warren's work between resource interdependencies between organizations and resistance to and influence of planning. By making specific applications of these propositions in a case study, planning is placed, as a result, in an intersystem model of organization-environment with resource interdependencies between organizations as the focus of analysis. The extent of a planner's ability to develop and implement planning goals within the perspective is related to domain consensus, i.e., recognition and support of the proposed goals by decision makers in its organization-set and to the position of the planning organization in its organization set, i.e., control of resources for the domains of organizations in the set.

The next chapter describes the methodology used to relate the case study to the propositions on domain consensus, organization-set and location of input resources identified in the organization-environment literature for this study.

Footnotes for Chapter II

- 1 Alfred J. Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning (New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1969); Robert Morris and Robert Binstock, Feasible Planning For Social Change (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966); Martin Rein, Social Policy: Issues of Choice and Change, (New York: Random House, 1970).
- 2 Kahn, op. cit., p. 62.
- 3 Morris and Binstock, op. cit., p. 5.
- 4 Rein, Op. cit., p. 203.
- 5 Ibid., p. 205.
- 6 Morris and Binstock, op. cit., p. 28.
- 7 Alfred J. Kahn and Sheila Kamerman, Social Services in the United States (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1976), p. 513.
- 8 Morris and Binstock, op. cit., p. 95.
- 9 Steve K. Paulson, "A Theory and Comparative Analysis of Inter-organizational Dyads," in Rural Sociology 41, 1976, p. 311-329.
- 10 James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 29.
- 11 James D. Thompson, "Organizational Goals and Environment Goal-Setting as an Inter-action Process," in American Sociological Review 23, 1958, p. 23-31.
- 12 Richard M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations," in American Sociological Review 27, 1962, p. 31-41.
- 13 Stuart Schmidt and Thomas A. Kochan, "Interorganizational Relationships: Patterns and Motivations," in Administrative Science Quarterly 22, 1977, p. 220-224.
- 14 Emerson, op. cit.
- 15 Schmidt and Kochan, op. cit.
- 16 Ibid., p. 222.
- 17 William Reid, "Interagency Coordination in Delinquency Prevention and Control," in Social Service Review 38, 1964, p. 418-428.

- 18 Paul White, Sol Levine and George Vlasak, Paul White, Sol Levine and George Vlasak, "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for Understanding Interorganizational Relations: Application to a Non-Profit Organization," in Modern Organization Theory Anant Neganohi (ed.) (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, 1973, p. 174-188); Sheldon P. Gans and Gerald Horton, Integration of Human Services, 2nd Ed. (New York: Praeger Publishing Company, 1975).
- 19 Gans and Horton, op. cit., p. 182.
- 20 Warren Bennis, Kenneth Benne and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change 2nd Ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977), p. 208.
- 21 Evan, op. cit.
- 22 Kahn and Kamerman, op. cit., p. 510-519.
- 23 Morris and Bimstock, op. cit.
- 24 Roland Warren, et. al., The Structures of Urban Reform (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1974), p. 17-36.
- 25 Evan, op. cit.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this study was selected to obtain data from the case study relative to the propositions in the interorganizational perspective. The focus of the interorganizational perspective is on the position of an organization in its organization-set. The position of the organization, according to Evan, Schmidt and Kochan, is a function of its resource linkages with its organization-environment or organization-set. The nature of the linkages is partially determined by the level of domain consensus for the domain of an organization in its organization-set and by the location of control of resources in the set for the domain.<sup>1</sup>

In this study, data on domain consensus for coordination, the domain of the planning organization, i.e., Metropolitan Human Service Commission, was obtained by interviewing a sample of directors of organizations in the Commission's organization-set and by observing board meetings about 1979 objectives. Based on management theory, especially Fayol's framework of five elements or functions of management, for this study the director of an organization is designated as the decision maker of the organization. In management theory the

director of an organization is assumed to be the top manager with responsibility for planning, organization, command, coordination and control within the organization.<sup>2</sup>

The first part of this chapter describes the relationship of the research procedures to the study's interorganizational perspective. The second part takes the propositions of the perspective and describes how they would be manifested in the case study. The third and last part of the chapter has two sections, the first describes the methods used to examine the findings and the second section identifies the limitations of the study.

#### Population/Sample

According to Selltitz, et. al., a population is the aggregate of all cases that conform to some designation.<sup>3</sup> Given the focus of this study on an interorganizational perspective of planning, the designation for the population of this study was all organizations involved with the domain of the planning organization. Since the domain of the Metropolitan Commission is coordination of human services in the metropolitan area, the population for the study consisted of all human service organizations in the metropolitan area. There are approximately four hundred human service organizations in the metropolitan area.

In order to ensure that the directors of organizations who would be interviewed would have some knowledge of the Commission a subpopulation was selected from the population. A subpopulation or stratum, according to Selltitz, et. al., is defined by one or more specifications that divide the population into mutually exclusive segments.<sup>4</sup> To ensure at least minimal contact with the Commission,

the specification for the sub-population was inclusion in the first service inventory of the Commission, i.e., service inventory of 1977, and in the second inventory, i.e., service inventory of 1978-1979. One hundred and sixty-nine organizations were part of the first and second inventories of the Commission. This specification also ensured that the decision makers were from the organization-set of the Commission even if their organization had only a minimal role in the set as input organizations in the service inventory activities.

Due to the researcher's limited resources, rather than interviewing all the directors in the subpopulation, a sample was selected from the subpopulation for interviewing. Sampling, according to Kerlinger, is the taking of any portion of a population or subpopulation as representative of the population or subpopulation.<sup>5</sup> Given the purpose of this study, however, to examine the interorganizational propositions in relation to planning for social services, the sample was selected to provide material relative to the propositions.

According to the resource dependency model, upon which the organization-set model is partially based, control of resources by an organization is related to its position in an organization-environment. Extreme groups in the subpopulation, therefore, relative to control of resources were used to observe whether control of resources is related to the organization's position in the environment. Since organizations that control more resources tend to be large, use of extreme groups also provides data relative to the organization-set propositions that have size of the organization as an intervening variable. The thirty

top funded and thirty bottom funded organizations in the subpopulation were used as the extreme groups for the sampling. By taking the top one fifth and bottom fifth of the subpopulation according to funding level the researcher maximized variance which, according to Kerlinger, is one of the functions of a research design.<sup>6</sup>

Although it would have been preferable to interview all of the directors from both groups, because of the limited resources of the researcher, only half from both groups could be interviewed. To ensure that potentially important organizational factors were present in the sample, a purposive or judgmental sample method was used to select fifteen organizations from each group for the interviews.

According to Davidson, whether the organization is a public or private sanctioned organization may affect its control of resources and position in the organization environment. A private sanctioned organization is defined as one created through a constitution or charter by a group of citizens organized outside the elective process. A public sanctioned organization is defined as one mandated by an elected public body such as a legislature. Since there were only six organizations with public sanction represented in the sixty organizations in the extreme groups, all of the six were included in the thirty chosen for interviews. These six were in the top funded group.

The domain of an organization, according to Thompson, largely determines its resource dependencies with the environment.<sup>8</sup> To provide for organizational domain as a factor which may influence resource dependencies between organizations, a wide range of organizations

according to domains were selected. They were selected with the Commission's service prioritization list to have their programs represent the top, middle and bottom service systems on the list (Appendix A). The top fifteen funded organizations in the sample include twelve different domains according to programs on the service list. The bottom fifteen include twelve different domains also according to programs on the service list. The researcher attempted to match organizations by program type from the bottom and top funded groups but this was not possible since in only a few cases were programs represented in both groups.

In addition to domain, another concept used in the interorganizational perspective, i.e., organization-set, relates characteristics of the input organizations of an organization to control of goal-setting in the organization. To ensure that the decision makers from the major input organizations of the Commission were included in the interviews, two directors of funding organizations, not included in the subpopulation, and two public officials were interviewed. The public officials were from the county and city governments. By including the two directors and two public officials with the directors of the public sanctioned organizations, all the directors from the funding organizations for the Commission were interviewed.

The director of the Commission was also interviewed during the course of the study for his perceptions of the Commission in relation

to its organization-environment. His perceptions were compared with the perceptions of the directors who were interviewed.

### Data Collection

A semi-structured interview format was used to enable decision makers to provide their perceptions as key informants (Appendix A). Their perceptions were elicited based on the assumption that their behavior, i.e., decisions, is partially a function of their perceptions. This assumption is supported by Bobbitt, et. al. study of decision-making which concludes that the "internal state" of the decision maker is a primary factor in their decisions.<sup>9</sup>

Dexter recommends recording of interviews to control for observer or interviewer bias.<sup>10</sup> Recording of the interview, however, was a potential impediment to obtaining complete responses from the decision makers due to the sensitivity of the material discussed, i.e., a newly formed coordinating organization and the domain of coordination. In order to ensure complete responses, a decision was made not to record interviews and therefore risk observer bias. Notes were taken during and immediately after the interviews, as Dexter recommends, to eliminate as much as possible, loss of information due to memory loss by the interviewer.<sup>11</sup> Field notes were also kept to provide a context for each interview and for continual development by the interviewer of analysis of the material.

The interview schedule was pre-tested with an assistant director in one of the funding organizations who is an expert in research and evaluation. She is also knowledgeable about the Commission as well as

about the Columbus human service organization-environment. In order to test the appropriateness and clarity of the schedule, directors from organizations in the sample and other funding organizations were also used in the pre-test. The directors were selected to represent the funding organizations and the top and bottom funded service providing organizations in the group to be interviewed. A total of six directors were used in the pre-test, three from funding organizations, one from a top funded service-providing organization and two from bottom funded service providing organizations. Based on their responses and comments the instrument was modified and pre-tested in its modified form with six additional directors in the sample. The modified schedule is in Appendix A. As no further modifications were suggested in the second pre-test the schedule was used in its modified form for the remainder of the interviews.

The schedule is divided into two parts to get information on the domain of the Commission, i.e., community-wide coordination, and on the activities of the Commission during its first two years, i.e., needs assessment, goal-setting, information management, service prioritization and resource development (Appendix A). Activities of an organization are assumed, within the interorganizational perspective, to be attempts of an organization to function in its domain. Perceptions about activities of an organization by decision makers in its organization-set are indicators, therefore, of their acceptance of the domain of organization.

Part one of the schedule which consists of questions on coordination, is grouped into four areas. The areas are attempts to obtain from decision makers their perceptions of the domain of coordination, as it exists and as it should exist:

1. Coordination they perceive as currently existing between human service organizations.
2. Coordination they perceive as desirable.
3. Constraints to desirable coordination.
4. Type of organization most suited to facilitate coordination.

The areas were selected based on Reid's typology of coordination and comments made by the members of the pre-test group about coordination, i.e., constraints and types of organizations to facilitate coordination.<sup>12</sup>

Part two of the schedule, which consists of questions on the activities of the Commission, is grouped into seven areas. The areas were selected to provide an indication of the acceptance of the Commission within its organization-environment relative to its attempts to implement its domain:

1. Activities that are of most value to the organization.
2. Activities that are of least value to the organization.
3. Activities the Commission should not have done.
4. Activities the Commission should do and not on the list.
5. Participation by members of the organization in the activities.



6. Benefits to the organization from the activities.
7. Effectiveness of Commission staff in carrying out the activities.

Elaborations by the decision makers on their responses to the questions were coded using coding rules developed by the interviewer based on their responses (Appendix B). To test for coder reliability, a second coder, using the rules, coded responses from decision makers in six organizations. There was a ninety percent correspondence between the two coders which is a high reliability rate for content analysis, according to Budd, et. al.<sup>13</sup>

#### Board Meetings

Commission board meetings on 1979 objectives were observed for patterns of influence among the organizational representatives during the meetings using an observation analysis system developed by the author. To obtain information on patterns of influence, notes were taken by the observer during the meetings on:

1. Comments and interactions between organization representatives and Commission Staff.
2. Votes by representatives on 1979 objectives, along with any rationale given for their votes during the meetings.
3. Support or disagreements between the representatives among themselves and with staff over issues raised at the meetings.

Since it was not possible to record the meetings or have another observer present, a potential problem in the information obtained from the notes is observer bias. Some information, however, was not affected by observer bias, i.e., the minutes of the meetings taken by Commission

staff summarized motions and votes at the meetings. Information on interactions and comments, however, were based solely on the observer's notes and are potentially biased. To minimize memory loss, another source of bias, notes from the board meetings were typed after the sessions to include information that was not written down during the meetings.

The idea for the author's observation system for the board meetings was derived from the Observational System for Instructional Analysis by Hough, et. al.<sup>14</sup> Hough's system was used as a model for the author's system since it is a systematic method to describe and quantify participation of actors in a setting as well as sequences of participation. It is also a flexible system which is adapted easily to settings other than the one for which it was developed, i.e., instructional settings.

The system adapted by the author from Hough's system has four gross types of participation to identify transactions:

1. Initiate a topic or a point of discussion.
2. Respond to an initiation, question or another participant's response to an initiation or question.
3. Question or request an answer, opinion or response from another participant.
4. Call for a vote on a topic.

These gross types were chosen to give data which is useful for description of the interactions and roles of board members relative to the topics of the meetings. In reference to the major participants, each

of the meetings is described according to the number and types of transactions and priority of topics for which they were responsible.

A transaction is defined as an incident of a gross type of participation for which a participant is responsible. Although the incident involves more than one person in some role, i.e., communicator, questioner, receiver of information, etc., it is assumed in the definition of transaction that one person is responsible for defining and beginning the incident. The priority of a topic is determined by the number of transactions and participants in the sequence of participation identified with the topic. The larger the number of transactions and participants, the higher the priority the topic is given. A topic is defined as a subject area. As an example, during the meetings each objective was a subject area. A sequence of participation is the ordering of transactions about a topic in the order in which they occurred.

#### Propositions and Case Study

The data obtained by observations of board meetings and interviews with decision makers on, the domain of coordination, activities of the Commission and goal-setting in the Commission, was used to examine the case study relative to the propositions derived from the interorganizational perspective. Although other propositions exist about planning and organizations, those selected for this study are primary ones, in the writer's opinion, in relation to an interorganizational perspective on planning. Thompson and Thompson and McEwen identify domain and domain consensus along with goal-setting as key

concepts for understanding an organization's position in its environment.<sup>15</sup> The position of an organization is the primary focus of Evan's organization set model which is partially based on the assumptions and concepts of resource dependency models such as Schmidt and Kochan's.<sup>16</sup> In the resource dependency models the focus is on the nature of resource linkages between organizations. The propositions for this study are based on domain consensus and organization-set and grouped into three areas: domain consensus, organization-set and location of input resources.

#### Group I Domain Consensus

Propositions in group one on domain consensus indicate that the more decision makers in the organization-set of an organization agree with and support its domain, the more its functions can be carried out.

- 1.1 The more decision makers of organizations in the domain of an organization agree with and support its domain, i.e., the more members in the organization are able to carry out its functions.
- 1.2 The more there is not domain consensus by decision makers of organizations in the domain of an organization, the less members of the organization will be able to carry out its functions.

In the case study the primary domain of the Commission is defined by the Citizen Committee as coordination which consists of:

"Comprehensive planning to coordinate the efforts of both public and private social service organizations."

Comprehensive planning is described by the Committee as consisting of four functions:

1. Needs Assessment for human services.
2. Problem solving for meeting needs in the community.
3. Program assistance for both development, modification and expansion of human service programs.
4. Coordination of human service programs with physical development in the area.

In relation to group one propositions, the more human service organizations in Columbus, Ohio, metropolitan area, support the activities of the Commission in its primary domain, i.e., four functions, the more Commission staff will be able to carry out the functions and thus operate in the domain of the Commission.

#### Group II and II Organization-Set and Location of Input Resources

Group two and three propositions relate characteristics of the organization-set to control and influence of the goal-setting in an organization. Group three propositions focus on the location of the input resources based on propositions of the resource dependency model which relate control of resources to dominance of an organization in an organization-environment. Group two propositions focus on three characteristics of the organization-set, i.e., size and concentration of input organizations and overlapping membership between organizations in the organization-set.

- 2.1 The greater the size of the input organizations in the organization-set of an organization, the more the input organizations' decision makers control the goal-setting in the organization.
- 2.2 The higher the concentration of input for an organization in a few organizations, the more the input organizations' decision makers control the goal-setting in the organization.

- 2.3 The greater the overlap in membership between the organization and its organization-set the more the decision makers in the organization-set control the organization's goal-setting.
- 3.1 The more an organization receives input resources from organizations in the setting of the organization, the more decision makers in the organizations in the setting will influence goal-setting in the organization.
- 3.2 The more an organization receives input resources from organizations outside of the setting of the organization, the less decision makers in the organizations in the setting will influence goal-setting in the organization.
- 3.3 The more an organization is a major source of input resources for other organizations, the more decision makers in the organization will influence goal-setting in other organizations in their setting.

According to the propositions, the input organizations, or organizations that fund the Commission and provide staff for it, should control and influence goal-setting in the Commission. They are large, few in number and have representatives on the board and cabinet of executives of the Commission

#### Presentation and Analysis of Data

Since the purpose of this study is to explore the extent to which planning for social services reflects organization-environment issues relative to definitions of domains and control of resources for domains, analysis of data is used to describe and explicate interorganizational relationships found in the study. Tables with frequencies and percentages are used to put the data in a quantitative form. Given the nominal nature of the data, i.e., categories with frequencies, the chi

square test (chi square =  $\chi^2$ ) was used for comparison of groups. Since some of the categories contain less than ten subjects, the Yates correction for chi square statistics was used to compute the statistics. According to Levin, when there are less than ten subjects in a cell or category, the standard chi square formula may yield an inflated chi square value or statistic.<sup>17</sup> The Yates correction obtains a more conservative chi square statistic with small numbers in a category by reducing the difference between obtained and expected frequencies by fifty percent. Since the chi square statistic depends on the size of that difference, the size of the statistic is accordingly reduced.

The .05 level of significance or confidence is used in this study to indicate statistical significance. According to Levin, statistical significance is determined by the level of probability that the sample difference is a product of sampling error or chance.<sup>18</sup> The .05 level of significance or confidence is the conventional level used as the level of confidence, i.e., difference obtained has a probability of occurring five times out of a hundred by chance or sampling error. A more stringent confidence level is the .01 level of significance or confidence level which accepts the difference as significant if it only has a probability of occurring one time out of one hundred by sampling error or chance. The less stringent .05 level of significance was used for this study since it is an exploratory study in which relationships are sought for further testing in a future more controlled design. In the chi square table (Table E) in Levin's Appendix B the .05 level of significance occurs with one degree of freedom when the statistic is

at or above 3.841.<sup>19</sup> It occurs with one degree of freedom at the .01 level of significance when the statistic is at or above 6.635. The degree of freedom, according to Levin, is the "freedom of variation among a set of scores".<sup>20</sup> For the chi square statistic using tables of two rows and two columns, such as the ones used for this study, there is one degree of freedom or variation in the set of scores. A trend which suggests difference is defined in this study as a statistic which is at or above 2.00 but below the .05 level of significance. A statistic at or above 2.00 suggests substantial difference between groups even though it is not statistically significant at the .05 level since most of the statistics computed for this study are below 2.00

The groups which were used in this study to test for difference are based on organizational characteristics used as the selection criteria for sampling. The criteria are, top/bottom funding level, public/private sanction, funding source and program type. The criterion of program type was not used in the chi square analysis due to the limited number of organizations represented in some program types. The criterion of funding source also was not used since many organizations had multiple sources of funding.

#### Limitations of the Study

The nominal nature of the data limited the analysis that could be performed for between group differences to chi square statistics which is a weaker statistic than those that can be used on ordinal and interval level data. According to Levin, nonparametric statistics which are used



on nominal and ordinal level data have less power to reject a false null hypothesis and, therefore, are less preferred than the statistics which are used on interval level data.<sup>21</sup> Since, however, this is an exploratory study to explicate and understand possible relationships of interorganizational factors to planning, the researcher did not have the precision in measurement of variables required to obtain interval level data.

Besides limitations related to level of measurement, another limitation of the study is the study's design. The study is based on a case study of one setting to examine the relationship of interorganizational factors to planning in that setting. A preferred research design for examination of propositions is a comparison of interorganizational factors across settings. By comparing factors across several settings a researcher is able to make tentative generalizations based on those factors which are common across settings in the comparative study. By examining one setting, however, with an interorganizational perspective, this study provides data on methodology and on the perspective which will be useful in future research with a cross-setting design.

The final limitation which will be identified in this chapter, although others exist, is the use of assumptions, concepts and propositions from organization-environment models for application to a planning setting. In the process of combining concepts of domain and domain consensus with Evan's organization-set model, the author attempted to remain true to the assumptions present in both frameworks but the

possibility of violating those assumptions exists. The attempt to use an interorganizational perspective to analyze planning is an attempt, as described by Kaplan, to develop knowledge of planning by extension, i.e., an understanding of one region is carried over to an explanation of an adjoining region.<sup>22</sup>

Footnotes for Chapter III

- 1 William I Evan, "The Organization-set: Toward a Theory of Inter-organizational Relations," in Approaches to Organizational Design. James Thompson, (ed.) (Pittsburgh; University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966), p. 173-191.
- 2 H. Fayol, (C. Stours [Trans.]), General and Industrial Management (London: Pittman Pub., 1949), p. 21.
- 3 Claire Selltitz, et. al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), p. 512.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), p. 118.
- 6 Ibid., p. 308.
- 7 Stephen M. Davidson, "Planning and Coordination of Social Services in Multiorganizational Contexts," in Social Service Review 50 1976, p. 117-137.
- 8 James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 85.
- 9 Randolph Bobbitt and Jeffrey Ford, "Decision Maker Choice as a Determinant of Organization Structure," (Reprint and working paper series of OSU College of Administrative Science, 1978), p. 29.
- 10 Lewis A. Dexter, Elite and Specialized Interviewing (Evanston: Northwestern, 1970), p. 59.
- 11 Ibid., p. 56, 57.
- 12 William Reid, "Interagency Coordination in Delinquency Prevention and Control," in Social Service Review 38, 1964, p. 418-428.
- 13 Richard Budd, et. al., Content Analysis and Communication (New York: MacMillan Company, 1967), p. 68.
- 14 Hough, John and James Duncan, "The Observational System for Instructional Analysis: Category Definitions and Descriptions," (OSU College of Education, 1976) Preliminary Draft, unpublished.

- 15 Thompson, op. cit.; James D. Thompson and William McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting as an Interaction Process." in American Sociological Review 23, 1958, p. 23-31.
- 16 Evan, op. cit.; Stuart Schmidt and Thomas A. Kochan, "Interorganizational Relationships: Patterns and Motivations," in Administrative Science Quarterly 22, 1977, p. 220-234.
- 17 Jack Levin, Elementary Statistics in Social Research (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), p. 174.
- 18 Ibid., p. 128.
- 19 Ibid., p. 276.
- 20 Ibid., p. 134.
- 21 Ibid., p. 165.
- 22 Abraham Kaplan. The Conduct of Inquiry (Scranton, Penn: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964), p. 305.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter describes the information obtained from the interviews with the decision makers in the study and from the observations of Commission board meetings. The data is presented relative to the primary concepts in the study's interorganizational propositions. The primary concepts which are used to organize and present the data are:

1. Domain as the products, services, functions, customers or clients an organization's decision makers claim for their organization's area of activity in a geographic area.
2. Domain consensus as the extent of agreement by decision makers in an organization's environment about the appropriateness of its domain for the environment.
3. Organization-set as the organizations which provide resources and decision premises for an organization and/or outlets for products or services of the organization. Input organizations provide the resources and decision premises and output organizations provide the outlets for products or services.
4. Goal-setting as a process of continually adjusting an organization's domain to the organization's environment and more specifically to its organization-set.

To present the information relative to the concepts, groups in the study, and methods of collecting data, the data is described in four parts. The first three parts describe the data from the interviews with

decision makers in reference to the concepts of domain and domain consensus. The fourth part describes the data from the observations of board meetings in reference to the concepts of organization-set and goal setting.

The first part of the presentation describes interview responses obtained from the sample of decision makers in service providing organizations. Tables with frequencies and chi square statistics (chi square =  $\chi^2$ ) are used to describe the data. As explained in chapter three (p. 33), the groups in the sample which were compared using the chi square statistic with the Yates correction are:

Top funded organizations (n=15) with bottom funded organizations (n=15).

Private sanction organizations (n=24) with public sanction organizations (n=6).

Private bottom funded organizations (n=15) with private top funded organizations (n=9).

Private top funded organizations (n=9) with public top funded organizations (n=6).

(Refer to the tables in Appendix C for descriptive information about the sample.)

The responses from the decision makers in the sample of thirty service providing organizations and from the other decision makers, described below, are summarized for each questions in the interview schedule.

The second part of the presentation describes the responses of the decision makers from the two funding organizations, a city official, a county official and the Director of the Commission. For each question their responses were separated from those of the sample of service

providing organizations since their organizations do not provide services and are, therefore, a different type of organization than the ones in the sample, i.e., service providing organizations. As explained in chapter three, the city and county officials and decision makers from the funding organizations were included in the interviews since their organizations are in the organization-set of the Commission as its funding sources. The Director of the Commission was included to obtain his perceptions of the Commission's organization-set, domain and activities for comparison with the responses of the decision makers.

The third part of the presentation provides, when appropriate, examples of the responses of the decision makers. The examples provide elaboration on the summaries presented for each question in parts one and two of the presentation.

The fourth part of the presentation describes the type and level of participation of Commission board members and the priority of the topics in which they participated during board meetings on 1979 objectives. Tables are used to describe the types of participation, number of transactions, sequences of participation and priority of topics.

Although the next chapter interprets the data presented in this chapter with reference to the propositions of the study and theory on planning and organization, it is inconclusive due to the limitations of this data. Given the small number of organizations in the sample, i.e., thirty in the sample of service providing organizations and five in the other group, and limited indicators for the concepts and propositions, i.e.; interview data on perceptions of decision makers and data from

observations of board meetings, the data lends itself to interpretation which suggests rather than tests the merit of the propositions. Since, however, this is a case study, the data does provide indications of questions and research designs which will be useful in future research on interorganizational factors which may affect planning.

To provide an introduction to the data on the concepts of domain and domain consensus, i.e., parts one, two and three of the presentation, the significant differences and trends found between groups in the data are listed below. Differences were found between decision makers in the top and bottom funded groups in their perceptions of:

Community-wide coordination as present (Table 6).

Community-wide coordination as desirable (Table 7).

Legislative/funding requirements as a constraint to desirable coordination (Table 8).

Resource deficit as a constraint to desirable coordination (Table 8).

Service prioritization as a least valuable Commission activity (Table 11).

Participation of their organization's members as board or staff members of the Commission (Table 14).

Participation of their organization and its members as funders or committee members of funding organizations of the Commission (Table 14).

No participation of their organization in the Commission (Table 14).

Participation of their organization's members in the needs assessment/service inventory activity of the Commission (Table 14).

No benefit to their organization from participation in the Commission (Table 15).



No participation from their organization's members or not enough to indicate a benefit (Table 15).

Not enough knowledge on their part of the Commission to assess its effectiveness (Table 16).

Differences were also found between decision makers in the private and public sanctioned organizations in their perceptions of:

Community-wide coordination as desirable (Table 7).

Legislative/funding requirements as a constraint to desirable coordination (Table 8).

None of the activities as of significant value to their organization (Table 10).

Service Prioritization as a least valuable Commission activity (Table 11).

Resource Development as a least valuable Commission activity (Table 11).

Participation of their organization's members in the Commission as board or staff members (Table 14).

Participation by their organization's members in all of the activities of the Commission (Table 14).

Some significant differences and trends were also found between decision makers in the top funded private sanctioned organizations and the bottom funded private sanctioned organizations. Since, however, these correspond to the differences between the top and bottom funded groups, i.e., private and public sanctioned organizations together, they are not listed here but are reported in the text.

After the data is presented on the interviews relative to the concepts of domain and domain consensus, data will be summarized from the board meetings, i.e., fourth part of the presentation, relative to the concepts of organization-set and goal-setting.

Domain and Domain Consensus

The Commission's domain, as described by the Citizen Committee, is comprehensive planning for community-wide coordination of human services in the Columbus metropolitan area. The Committee identified four functions for the Commission to perform to carry out the domain:

1. Needs assessment for human services in the metropolitan area.
2. Problem solving for meeting needs in the community.
3. Program assistance for both development, modification and expansion of human service programs in relation to the needs assessment.
4. Coordination of human service programs with physical development in the area based on the needs assessment data.

During its first two years the Commission worked on the first two functions, i.e., needs assessment and problem solving. A community needs assessment of human services and inventory of human service was sponsored by the Commission along with the development of an information management system to provide community-wide data for planning for human services. Using the needs assessment and service inventory data, a service prioritization activity was sponsored by the Commission as was a goal-setting process for human service planning for the community. A resource development activity was also initiated during the first two years of the Commission.

Applying the concepts of domain and domain consensus to the Commission's domain and activities, the more organizations in the Commission's domain support community-wide coordination and activities

of the Commission to implement the domain, the more the Commission should be able to complete the functions identified for it by the Citizens Committee.

#### Coordination as the Commission's Primary Domain

Data from the interviews with decision makers suggests that the organizations in the Commission's domain, i.e., Columbus metropolitan area, may not support the domain of the Commission, i.e., community-wide coordination of human services. Tables six and seven describe responses by the decision makers in the sample on their perceptions of current and desirable coordination. Reid's typology of coordination, with the additions of information management after ad-hoc and community-wide coordination after program coordination, was used as a list of types of coordination all the interviewees could review for a response to the questions.

The largest percentage of the decision makers, ninety-seven percent (n=29) perceived information management as a type of coordination currently taking place. The next largest percentage, seventy-seven percent (n=23) choose ad hoc, followed by those choosing case and program types, each with seventy percent (n=21). Community wide coordination was perceived as taking place by the smallest group, forty-three percent (n=13). Although the chi square statistics are not significant at the .05 level for between group differences in perceptions of current coordination, trends are suggested in the statistics in Table 6, ( $\chi^2$ , level of significance and trend are defined in chapter three). The

TABLE 6

Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics for Group Responses on Types of Present Coordination

Types of Present Coordination	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom N=15)			Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9) By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction Top Funded (n=6) By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)						
	Yes	No	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>				
Ad hoc	23	7	Top Bottom	12 11	3 4	0	Public Private	4 19	2 5	.0095	Pri.T. Pri.B.	8 11	1 4	.1515	Pub.T. Pri.T.	4 8	2 1	.0156
Information Exchange	29	1	Top Bottom	14 15	1 0	0	Public Private	5 24	1 0	.5815	Pri.T. Pri.B.	9 15	0 0	0	Pub.T. Pri.T.	5 9	1 0	0
Case Coordination	21	9	Top Bottom	13 8	2 6	1.753	Public Private	5 16	1 8	.0892	Pri.T. Pri.B.	8 8	1 7	1.8	Pub.T. Pri.T.	5 8	1 1	.0432
Program Coordination	21	9	Top Bottom	11 10	4 5	0	Public Private	3 18	3 6	.4861	Pri.T. Pri.B.	8 10	1 5	.0533	Pub.T. Pri.T.	3 8	3 1	1.534
Community-Wide Coordination	13	17	Top Bottom	9 4	6 11	2.1719 <sup>✓</sup>	Public Private	3 10	3 14	.0084	Pri.T. Pri.B.	6 4	3 11	2.241 <sup>✓</sup>	Pub.T. Pri.T.	3 6	3 3	.0015

✓ = Trend

\* = .05 Level of Significance

chi square statistics suggest that differences may exist between decision makers in the top and bottom funded groups. A larger proportion in the top funded groups than in the bottom funded groups perceived community-wide coordination as currently taking place ( $\chi^2=2.1719$  and  $2.2400$ ).

The officials from the City of Columbus and Franklin County chose information management as a type of coordination currently taking place. The city official also identified program and community-coordination types as currently taking place. Both of the decision makers in the funding organization chose all of the types as present. The Director of the Commission also identified all of the types as currently taking place.

Comments by the decision makers who identified community-wide coordination as present indicates that different understandings exist between them in regard to what constitutes community-wide coordination. Of the twelve who chose it as present, four identified it with the work of the Commission, four with program and/or problem area joint planning between service providing organizations and four with allocation planning by funding organizations. Examples of their comments are:

"All types of coordination are taking place with funding systems, i.e., United Way does community-wide planning during its allocations."

"All types are done, we have community-wide planning through program coordination with Franklin County Children Services."

"Community-wide takes place already within problem areas, i.e., agencies that work with troubled youth coordinate their efforts."

"There is community-wide through the Commission's effort to have needs assessment data taken into consideration in decision making about allocations."

As Table 7 indicates, program coordination was most frequently chosen as a desirable type of coordination with seventy percent (n=21) of the directors choosing it followed by information management with forty-seven percent (n=14) of the directors choosing it as desirable. Community-wide coordination was the third highest choice with forty percent (n=12) of the decision makers choosing it as desirable. Case coordination with thirty percent (n=9) and ad hoc with thirteen percent (n=4) were the lowest choices of decision makers.

Although there was no significant chi square statistics at the .05 level for between group differences in perceptions of desirable coordination, trends are suggested in the statistics in Table 7. The statistics suggest differences between the top funded and bottom funded groups.

A larger percentage of the top funded group chose community-wide coordination as a desirable type than the bottom funded group ( $\chi^2=2.0110$ ). The statistics also suggest that a larger percentage of the public than the private sanctioned groups chose community-wide coordination as a desirable type ( $\chi^2=3.062$ ).

Both officials chose information management as a desirable coordination type. The city official also chose case and program

TABLE 7

Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Types of Desirable Coordination

Types of Desirable Coordination	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9) By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction Top Funded (n=6) By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>
Ad hoc	4	26	Top Bottom	3 12 1 14	.2885	Public Private	1 5 3 21	.1622	Pri.T. Pri.B.	2 7 1 14	.2286	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 5 2 7	.0156
Information Exchange	14	16	Top Bottom	7 8 7 8	.1340	Public Private	3 3 11 13	.0753	Pri.T. Pri.B.	4 5 7 8	.1007	Pub.T. Pri.T.	3 3 4 5	.0104
Case Coordination	9	11	Top Bottom	5 10 4 11	0	Public Private	2 4 7 17	.0892	Pri.T. Pri.B.	3 6 4 11	.0134	Pub.T. Pri.T.	2 4 3 6	0
Program Coordination	21	9	Top Bottom	9 6 11 4	.1500	Public Private	4 2 16 8	.2343	Pri.T. Pri.B.	5 4 11 4	.2000	Pub.T. Pri.T.	4 2 5 4	.0015
Community-Wide Coordination	12	18	Top Bottom	8 7 4 11	2.0110 <sup>✓</sup>	Public Private	5 1 7 17	3.062 <sup>✓</sup>	Pri.T. Pri.B.	4 5 4 11	.2000	Pub.T. Pri.T.	5 1 4 5	.0938

✓ =Trend

\* =.05 Level of Significance

coordination types as desirable. Both of the funding system directors, as did the Director of the Commission, chose all types as desirable.

#### Constraints To Coordination

Table 8 summarizes the responses of the decision makers to the question which asked them to identify constraints to desirable coordination. Their responses were coded into four areas. Some responses fit into more than one area and were coded accordingly, i.e., two responses instead of one for the question. The areas are: organization domain concerns such as autonomy from the influence of others and control of funding in their domain; legislative and/or funding requirements; resource deficits; no constraints.

The largest percentage of the decision makers, sixty-seven percent (n=19) identified organization domain concerns as a source of constraint. The next largest group identified legislative/funding requirements as sources of constraint, thirty percent (n=9). Resource deficits as a source of constraint was the next choice with twenty-seven percent (n=8) of the decision makers identifying it as a source of constraint. Seven percent (n=2) of the decision makers indicated there was no constraints to desirable coordination. Chi square statistics indicate significant differences in two areas between groups at the .05 level. In the identification of legislative/funding requirements as sources of constraint, a larger percentage of the top funded than the bottom funded group identified the requirements as a source of constraint ( $\chi^2=5.714$ ). In the identification of resource deficits as a



TABLE 8

Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Types of Constraints to Desirable Coordination

Types of Constraints	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			Groups By Sanction (Private n=6: Public n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9) By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>
Domain Concerns	19	11	Top 9 Bottom 10	6 5	0	Public 2 Private 17	4 7	1.516	Pri.T. 7 Pri.B. 10	2 5	.0135	Pub.T. 2 Pri.T. 7	4 2	1.402
Legislative/ Funding Requirements	9	21	Top 8 Bottom 1	7 14	5.714*	Public 4 Private 5	2 19	2.867✓	Pri.T. 4 Pri.B. 1	5 14	2.0030✓	Pub.T. 4 Pri.T. 4	2 5	.0104
Resource Deficits	8	22	Top 1 Bottom 7	14 8	4.261*	Public 0 Private 8	6 16	1.289	Pri.T. 1 Pri.B. 7	8 8	1.800	Pub.T. 0 Pri.T. 1	6 8	0
No Constraint	2	28	Top 2 Bottom 0	13 15	.5555	Public 1 Private 1	5 23	.0334	Pri.T. 1 Pri.B. 0	8 15	.0646	Pub.T. 1 Pri.T. 1	6 8	.0216

✓ = Trend  
\* = .05 Level of Significance

constraint, a larger percentage of the bottom than the top funded group identified it as a source of constraint ( $\chi^2=4.261$ ). Trends are indicated in the statistics between the public and private groups. More public than private organizations identified legislative/funding requirements as a source of constraint ( $\chi^2=2.867$ ). More of the private top funded group than the bottom funded group also identified requirements as a source of constraint ( $\chi^2=2.0030$ ).

Both of the officials identified organizational domain concerns as sources of constraint. The decision makers from the funding organizations also identified domain concerns of organizations as sources of constraint. The Director of the Commission, along with domain concerns, identified a failure of decision makers in public and private sanctioned organizations to understand the importance of their differences as the primary sources of constraint to desirable coordination.

Examples, which follow, of the types of comments by decision makers coded in the domain area of constraint indicate a common concern for autonomy and control of decisions or funding in a domain:

"Each organization has its own definitions of domain and wants others to change but not them to meet needs which makes the whole system rigid, no one wants to give in."

"Each agency wants autonomy and is therefore not willing to give and take because it wants to maintain control."

"A super body would have continual conflict over funding as each organization represented would have its own priorities and try to have those dominate the body."

### Type of Coordinating Organization

Table 9 summarizes the responses of the decision makers to the final question in the interview schedule on coordination. They were asked to choose the type of organization which was in their opinion the most appropriate one to carry out coordination. They were provided with a list of four types of organizations: Service providing organizations; funding organizations; organizations funded by the private and public sectors at the local level (Commission type) and state level public organization. The list represented types of organizations which currently provide coordination.

The largest percentages of the decision makers chose service providing organizations, thirty-three percent (n=10) and Commission type organization, thirty-three percent (n=10). The next largest group chose funding organization, twenty-three percent (n=7) followed by state level, seven percent (n=2) and no organization, seven percent (n=2). Chi square statistics indicate no significant differences between groups at the .05 level. The statistics also do not indicate trends suggesting differences.

The public officials chose the Commission type organization. Decision makers from the two funding organizations, as did the Commission Director, also chose the Commission type organization.

In giving explanations for their choices, eleven decision makers in the sample identified roles for a coordinating organization, five identified constraints the organization would need to overcome.

TABLE 9

Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses On Types Of Coordinating Organizations For Implementing Desired Coordination

Types of Coordinating Organizations	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			x <sup>2</sup>	Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			x <sup>2</sup>	Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9) By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			x <sup>2</sup>	Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)			x <sup>2</sup>
	Yes	No	Yes	No			Yes	No			Yes	No			Yes	No		
Service Provider Organization	10	20	Top	4	11	.1500	Public	1	15	.2343	Pri.T.	3	6	.0119	Pub.T.	1	5	.0014
			Bottom	6	9		Private	9	16		Pri.B.	6	9		Pri.T.	3	6	
Funding Organizations	7	13	Top	5	10	.7453	Public	1	5	.0260	Pri.T.	4	5	1.481	Pub.T.	1	5	.0312
			Bottom	2	3		Private	6	18		Pri.B.	2	13		Pri.T.	4	5	
Private/Public (Commission Type)	10	20	Top	5	10	.1340	Public	3	3	.2343	Pri.T.	2	7	.0134	Pub.T.	3	3	.0312
			Bottom	5	10		Private	7	17		Pri.B.	5	10		Pri.T.	2	7	
State Level Organizations	2	28	Top	1	14	.1340	Public	0	6	.0892	Pri.T.	1	8	.2074	Pub. T.	0	6	0
			Bottom	1	14		Private	2	22		Pri.B.	1	13		Pri. T.	1	8	
No Organization	2	28	Top	1	14	.1340	Public	1	5	.0334	Pri.T.	0	9	.0696	Pub. T.	1	5	.0044
			Bottom	1	14		Private	1	23		Pri.B.	1	14		Pri. T.	0	9	

✓ = Trend  
 \* = .05 Level of Significance

Planning and technical assistance roles were the most frequently mentioned roles with twenty-seven percent (n=8) of the decision makers describing roles in this area for the coordinating organization. Influence of decision making was identified as a role by ten percent (n=3) of the decision makers. Organization domain concerns were identified as sources of constraint for the coordinating organization by ten percent (n=3) of the decision makers. Seven percent (n=2) identified legislative/funding requirements as sources of constraint. Twenty percent (n=6) of the decision makers described creation of a coordinating organization such as the Commission type as needless bureaucracy.

The city official described a community focus role for the organization, i.e., to provide a community vs. special interest analysis of community needs. The county official identified a role of prioritizing needs for decision making by funders about allocations for human services. One of the decision makers in the funding organization described a leadership role for the coordinating organization which consisted of providing a "future vision for social service delivery".

#### Activities to Implement the Commission's Domain

The decision makers were next asked, during the interviews, to give their perceptions of the activities of the Commission during its first two years. Within the interorganizational perspective of this study, activities of an organization are attempts to carry out its domain which for the Commission is community-wide coordination. The

activities of the Commission during its first two years, as described at the beginning of this chapter are:

1. Community needs assessment for human services and inventory of human services.
2. Goal-setting process for human services for the community.
3. Resource development for human services.
4. Information management system for planning for human services.
5. Service prioritization for planning for human services.

In the context of questions about Commission activities, the decision makers were also asked to identify if and how members of their organization participated in the activities and if their participation benefited the organization. They were also asked to assess the effectiveness of the Commission in carrying out the activities.

#### Most Valuable Activity

Table 10 describes the responses of decision makers to the question which asked them to identify the Commission activity or activities which were of the most value to their organization. Resource development was chosen by the largest percentage with fifty-three percent (n=16) of the decision makers choosing it as most valuable to their organization. Information management was the next largest choice with thirty-three percent of the decision makers (n=10) choosing it as most valuable. Needs assessment was next with twenty-three percent (n=7) followed by goal-setting with seventeen percent (n=5) and service

TABLE 10

Frequencies And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses On Commission Activities  
Most Valuable To The Organization

Types of Activities	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top=15: Bottom n=15)			Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9) By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>
Needs Assessment	7	23	Top 4 Bottom 3	11 12	0	Public 0 Private 7	6 17	.1432	Pri.T. 4 Pri.B. 3	5 12	.6588	Pub.T. 0 Pri.T. 4	6 5	.1718
Goal-Setting	5	25	Top 3 Bottom 2	12 13	.1339	Public 1 Private 3	5 21	.4883	Pri.T. 1 Pri.B. 2	8 13	.2286	Pub.T. 1 Pri.T. 1	5 8	.0216
Resource Development	16	14	Top 7 Bottom 9	8 6	.1339	Public 3 Private 15	3 9	.0086	Pri.T. 4 Pri.B. 9	5 6	.1007	Pub.T. 3 Pri.T. 4	3 5	.0104
Information Management	10	20	Top 5 Bottom 5	10 10	.1340	Public 2 Private 8	4 16	.2343	Pri.T. 3 Pri.B. 5	6 10	.2000	Pub.T. 2 Pri.T. 3	4 6	0
Service Prioritization	4	26	Top 2 Bottom 2	13 13	.1340	Public 2 Private 2	4 24	1.059	Pri.T. 1 Pri.B. 2	8 13	.2286	Pub.T. 1 Pri.T. 1	5 8	.0216
None of Significant Value	8	22	Top 4 Bottom 4	11 11	.1340	Public 4 Private 4	2 20	3.845*	Pri.T. 2 Pri.B. 4	7 11	.0593	Pub.T. 2 Pri.T. 2	4 7	.0014

✓ = Trend

\* = .05 Level of Significance

prioritization with thirteen percent (n=5). Twenty-seven percent (n=8) of the decision makers responded that none of the activities were of significant value to their organizations. The chi square statistics indicate, at the .05 level, a significant difference between groups in the response that none of the activities were of significant value. In the public and private sanctioned groups, a larger proportion of the public than private groups responded that none of the activities were of significant value to their organization ( $\chi^2=3.845$ ).

The city official identified goal-setting and service prioritization as the most valuable activities for the city. The county official responded that none of the activities were of value to the county. The decision makers in the funding organizations identified resource development and information management as the most valuable activities for their organizations. The Director of the Commission identified needs assessment, service prioritization and resource development as activities of the Commission which were of most value to human service organizations in the area.

Elaborations by the decision makers on their choices of most valuable activity were in the form of comments about the quality or type of data gathered through the activities. Thirty percent (n=10) chose an activity as most valuable if the data provided through it was specific to the needs, structure and programs of their organization. Fifty-three percent (n=16) described data gathered through the activities which were not chosen as most valuable as inadequate, irrelevant or as



having been collected by a poor process. Examples of their comments indicate that importance is placed on relevancy of data and potential for increasing resources for the organizations:

"Service prioritization is least important, tried to use this but were not able to; Commission may have insufficient data for this; city has priorities we respond to and Commission may not always know about existing services."

"Information management and resource development are potentially useful by increasing cost effectiveness."

"The Commission can potentially help get more resources and have an effect on total resources by preventing cuts from government sources of funds by providing data which supports our programs."

"Needs assessment and information management must be specific to agency needs to be of significant value."

The rationale given by the Director for his choices of needs assessment, service prioritization and resource development was that they have a potential for making an impact on decision-making in human service organizations in the area and that the quality of the process used to carry out the activity was technically as good as can be expected.

#### Least Valuable Activity

Table 11 describes the responses of the decision makers to the next question which asked them to identify the activity or activities which are of least value to their organization. Goal-setting is the most frequent choice with sixty-three percent (n=19) of the decision makers choosing it as least valuable. Service prioritization is next with fifty three percent (n=16) of the decision makers choosing it, followed by needs assessment with fifty percent (n=15) of the decision

TABLE 11

Frequencies And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Commission Activities  
Lent Valuable To The Organization

Types of Activities	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9) By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)						
	Yes	No	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>				
Needs Assessment	15	15	Top Bottom	6 9	9 6	.5333	Public Private	1 14	5 10	1.134	Pri.T. Pri.B.	5 9	4 6	.0457	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 5	5 4	.0842
Goal-Setting	19	11	Top Bottom	8 11	7 4	.5742	Public Private	3 16	3 8	.0807	Pri.T. Pri.B.	5 11	4 4	.2000	Pub.T. Pri.T.	3 5	3 4	.0104
Resource Development	11	19	Top Bottom	4 7	11 8	.5742	Public Private	0 11	6 13	2.592 ✓	Pri.T. Pri.B.	4 7	5 8	.1007	Pub.T. Pri.T.	0 4	6 5	1.718
Information Management	11	19	Top Bottom	5 6	10 0	0	Public Private	1 0	5 14	.4176	Pri.T. Pri.B.	4 6	5 9	.0457	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 4	5 9	.0048
Service Utilization	16	14	Top Bottom	4 12	11 3	6.562*	Public Private	1 15	5 0	2.419 ✓	Pri.T. Pri.B.	3 12	6 3	4.867*	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 3	5 6	.0014
None	2	28	Top Bottom	1 1	14 14	1.340	Public Private	1 1	5 23	.0034	Pri.T. Pri.B.	0 1	9 14	.0696	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 0	5 9	.0044

✓ = Trend

\* = .05 Level of Significance

makers choosing it as least valuable. Resource development and information management each had thirty-seven percent (n=11) of the decision makers choosing them as least valuable. Seven percent (n=2) of the decision makers responded that none of the activities were of value. Chi square statistics indicate significant differences at the .05 level. The statistics also suggest trends. A larger proportion of the bottom than top funded group chose service prioritization as least valuable ( $\chi^2=6.562$ ). More decision makers in the private than the public organizations chose service prioritization as a least valuable activity ( $\chi^2=2.419$ ). A larger proportion of the private than the public also chose resource development as a least valuable activity ( $\chi^2=2.592$ ).

The city official identified resource development as least valuable. The county official indicated that all of the activities were of no value to the county. Decision makers from the funding organizations identified goal-setting and service prioritization as least valuable. The Director of the Commission described the goal-setting and information management activities as of least value to human service organizations in the area.

In giving rationales for their choices of least valuable activities, forty percent (n=12) of the decision makers commented that they did not need the data provided by the activities. The data was already available through their organization's planning section or their funding organization's planning section. Seven percent (n=2) described the data gathered through the activities as community but not agency relevant.

Thirteen percent (n=4) described legislative or funding regulations as restricting the usability of the data in their decision making, i.e., decisions were determined by legislative and funding considerations. The Director's rationale for his choice of goal-setting and information management as least valuable was that they had a low rate of use as a consequence of a combination of poor marketing by the Commission and a lack of staff in organizations with the necessary skills to use the data provided through the activities.

Activities Commission Should Not Have Done

Table 12 describes the responses of the decision makers to the questions which asked them to identify the activities which in their opinion the Commission should not have done. The largest percentage of decision makers, thirty-seven percent (n=11) responded that they could not answer the question. Seventeen percent (n=5) chose goal-setting and seventeen percent (n=5) chose needs assessment, resource development and information management as activities the Commission should not have done. Chi square statistics indicate neither significant differences at the .05 level between groups nor trends suggesting differences.

Neither the public officials nor the decision makers in the funding organizations identified activities the Commission should not have done. The Director responded that the Commission is carrying out the functions given to it by the Citizens Committee.

TABLE 12

Frequencies and Chi Squares Statistics For Group Responses on Commission Activities It Should Not Have Done

Types of Activities	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			x <sup>2</sup>	Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			x <sup>2</sup>	Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9): By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			x <sup>2</sup>	Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)			x <sup>2</sup>
	Yes	No	Top	Bottom			Public	Private			Pri.T.	Pri.B.			Pub.T.	Pri.T.		
Needs Assessment	2	28	Top Bottom	2 0	13 15	.5357	Public Private	0 2	6 4	.0937	Pri.T. Pri.B.	2 0	7 15	.4885	Pub.T. Pri.T.	0 2	6 7	0
Goal-Setting	5	25	Top Bottom	4 1	11 14	.9600	Public Private	2 3	4 21	.3750	Pri.T. Pri.B.	2 1	7 14	.0696	Pub.T. Pri.T.	2 2	4 7	.0014
Resource Development	2	28	Top Bottom	2 0	13 15	.5357	Public Private	1 1	5 23	.0036	Pri.T. Pri.B.	1 0	8 15	.0696	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 1	5 8	.0216
Information Management	2	28	Top Bottom	2 0	13 15	.5357	Public Private	1 1	5 23	.0036	Pri.T. Pri.B.	1 0	8 15	.0696	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 1	5 8	.0216
Service Prioritization	5	25	Top Bottom	3 2	12 13	0	Public Private	1 4	5 20	.1622	Pri.T. Pri.B.	2 2	7 13	.2286	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 2	5 7	.0110
None	11	19	Top	5 6	10 0	0	Public Private	2 9	4 15	.0807	Pri.T. Pri.B.	3 6	6 9	.0119	Pub.T. Pri.T.	2 3	4 6	0

√ = Trend

\* = .05 Level of Significance

Activities Commission Should Do

The next questions, which is summarized in Table 13, asked the decision makers to identify activities the Commission should do which it has not its first two years. Their responses were coded and grouped into six categories:

1. Technical assistance to organizations.
2. Service delivery or program planning for organizations.
3. Involvement of service providing and funding organizations in the activities more than has been done along with public relations with organizations.
4. Coordination of funding organizations accountability requirements to consolidate their accountability requirements to service providing organizations.
5. Advocacy for increased funding for human service organizations in the area.
6. No additions.

The largest percentage of decision makers, forty percent (n=12) described the need for Commission activity in the area of service delivery or program planning for organizations. Forty percent (n=12) also responded that they would suggest no additional activities for the Commission. Seventeen percent (n=5) suggested that the Commission should be more active in involvement of service providers and funders. Ten percent (n=3) described advocacy for funding as an activity the Commission should do. Four percent (n=1) identified technical assistance as an activity the Commission should do. Chi square statistics for between group differences at the .05 level are not significant and they do not suggest trends towards difference.

TABLE 13

Frequency and Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Activities The Commission Should Do

Types of Activities	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9): By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>
Technical Assistance	1	29	Top Bottom	1 14 0 15	0	Public Private	1 5 0 24	.8437	Pri.T. Pri.B.	0 0 0 0	0	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 5 0 9	.0044
Service Delivery Planning	12	18	Top Bottom	6 9 6 9	.1340	Public Private	1 5 11 13	.7031	Pri.T. Pri.B.	5 4 6 9	.1007	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 5 5 4	.0421
Public Relations With Service Providers and Funders	5	25	Top Bottom	1 14 4 11	.9600	Public Private	1 5 4 20	.3750	Pri.T. Pri.B.	0 9 4 11	1.280	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 5 0 9	.0044
Consolidate Funding Organization's Forms/ Procedures to Service Providers	3	27	Top Bottom	3 12 0 15	.1481	Public Private	2 4 1 23	1.875	Pri.T. Pri.B.	1 8 0 15	.0696	Pub.T. Pri.T.	2 4 1 8	.0156
Advocate For Funding	3	27	Top Bottom	2 13 1 14	0	Public Private	0 6 3 21	.0231	Pri.T. Pri.B.	2 7 1 14	.2286	Pub.T. Pri.T.	0 6 2 7	.0216
No Additions	12	18	Top Bottom	6 9 6 9	.1340	Public Private	3 3 9 15	.0236	Pri.T. Pri.B.	3 6 6 9	.0119	Pub.T. Pri.T.	3 3 3 6	.0104

✓ = Trend  
 \* = .05 Level of Significance

Both of the officials recommended service delivery or program planning as an activity the Commission should do. The city official also recommended technical assistance. Neither of the decision makers from the funding organizations recommended additional activities the Commission should do but one did indicate that "to survive the Commission should get the cooperation of funding organizations and service providers". The Director responded to the question by saying that the Commission could not meet the needs of service providers but could only touch on some of their needs since the primary focus of the Commission should be on producing good data for planning by the funding organizations or "system planning".

#### Participation In The Commission

The decision makers were next asked to identify if and how members of their organizations participated in the Commission. Table 14 summarizes their responses. The largest percentage, fifty percent (n=15), of the decision makers identified participation in the needs assessment and service inventory activity. The next highest percentage, thirty percent (n=9) indicated no participation in the activities. Twenty percent (n=6) indicated either that members of their organization were involved in committees of the funding organizations of the Commission or their organization, itself, was a funding organization of the Commission. Twenty percent (n=6) identified members of their organization as participants in the resource development activity of the Commission. Seventeen percent (n=5) indicated either that members of their organization were



TABLE 14

Frequency And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses On Participation  
In The Commission By Organization

Types of Participation	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15): Bottom n=15)			Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9): By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)		
	Yes	No	Top	Bottom	x <sup>2</sup>	Public	Private	x <sup>2</sup>	Pri.T.	Pri.B.	x <sup>2</sup>	Pub.T.	Pri.T.	x <sup>2</sup>
Needs Assessment/ Service Inventory	15	15	10	5	2.133 ✓	3	3	0	7	2	2.844 ✓	3	3	.0312
Goal- Setting	2	28	1	14	.1340	0	6	.0334	1	8	.1455	0	6	0
Resource Development	6	24	1	14	1.134	0	6	.6380	1	8	1.485	0	6	0
All Activities Of Commission	2	28	2	13	.5357	2	4	.051*	0	9	0	2	4	1.178
Board/Staff Member	5	25	5	10	3.841*	3	3	.375 ✓	2	7	1.309	3	3	.0312
Funding Organization For Commission	6	24	6	0	5.208*	2	4	.1171	4	5	5.120*	2	4	.0015
No Participation	9	21	1	14	5.714*	0	6	.683	1	8	2.666 ✓	0	6	0

✓ = Trend  
\* = .05 Level of Significance

board members or staff of the Commission. Six percent (n=2) indicated involvement with the goal-setting activity of the Commission by members of their organization and six percent (n=2) indicated involvement by members of their organization in all of the Commission's activities its first two years. Chi square statistics indicate significance at the .05 level for between group differences in four areas. A larger proportion of public organizations than private indicated participation in all Commission activities ( $\chi^2=4.051$ ). A larger proportion of top funded organizations than bottom funded organizations indicated participation as board or staff members of the Commission ( $\chi^2=3.841$ ). A larger proportion of top funded than bottom funded organizations also indicated involvement with the Commission through its funding organizations either as the funding organization or as a member of its committees ( $\chi^2=5.208$ ). A larger proportion of bottom funded than top funded organizations indicated no participation in the activities of the Commission ( $\chi^2=5.7208$ ). Trends are also suggested by the statistics. One of the trends suggests a difference between public and private sanctioned organizations in participation in the Commission. More members from public organizations than private organizations are board or staff members of the Commission ( $\chi^2=3.375$ ). The other trend suggests a difference between the private top funded and private bottom funded groups. A larger proportion of the private bottom than the private top funded group indicated no participation in the Commission ( $\chi^2=2.666$ ).

Both officials participated as board members and in decisions by their respective governments about funding the Commission. One of the decision makers from the funding organizations indicated that their organization was a funder of the Commission. It also had members on its board and provided staff through a contract for the resource development activity. The other decision maker from the funding organizations indicated that their organization was a potential funder of the Commission and that it had provided staff as well as had members who participated in all of the activities of the Commission

#### Benefits From Participation

The decision makers were asked next to indicate any benefits they perceived their organizations received as a result of participating in the Commission. Table 15 summarizes their responses. The largest percentage, forty-three percent (n=13) indicated no benefit from participation. The next highest group, thirty-seven percent (n=11) indicated no participation or not enough to expect a benefit. Twenty-seven percent (n=8) gave negative comments about the Commission rather than identified benefits and the smallest percentage, thirteen percent (n=4) identified benefits from participation. Chi square statistics indicate significance at the .05 level for between group differences in two responses. For no benefit a larger proportion of top funded than bottom funded and private top than private bottom funded indicated no benefit ( $\chi^2=4.886$  and  $5.5414$  respectively). For no participation as a response a larger proportion of the bottom funded than the top

TABLE 15

Frequencies and Chi Square Statistics for Group Responses on Benefits From Participation

Benefits	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9): By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	x <sup>2</sup>
Benefit Indicated	4	26	Top Bottom	1 14 3 12	.2885	Public Private	0 6 4 20	.1622	Pri.T. Pri.B.	1 8 3 12	0	Pub.T. Pri.T.	0 6 1 8	0
No Benefit	13	17	Top Bottom	10 5 3 12	4.886*	Public Private	4 2 10 14	.4101	Pri.T. Pri.B.	7 2 3 12	5.5314*	Pub.T. Pri.T.	4 2 7 2	.0014
Negative Comment	8	22	Top Bottom	5 10 3 12	.1705	Public Private	3 3 3 19	.8629	Pri.T. Pri.B.	2 7 3 12	.1516	Pub.T. Pri.T.	3 3 2 7	.0312
No Participation	11	19	Top Bottom	2 13 9 6	5.167*	Public Private	1 5 10 14	.4395	Pri.T. Pri.B.	1 8 9 6	3.702 ✓	Pub.T. Pri.T.	1 5 1 8	.0216

✓ =Trend

\* = .05 Level of Significance

funded indicated no participation ( $\chi^2=5.167$ ). A trend is suggested towards difference in the no participation response between private bottom and private top funded groups with the private bottom group indicating no participation more than the top group ( $\chi^2=3.702$ ).

The county official indicated no benefit. The city official responded that the data provided from the Commission's activities along with special material supplied from the Commission to the city upon request has been helpful in decision making at the city level. Both decision makers in the funding organizations responded that there was no benefit from participation of their members in the Commission but both described possible future benefits for their organizations.

Benefits that were indicated by the thirteen percent ( $n=4$ ) of the decision makers were coded and placed into three categories:

1. Data from the activities supports the importance of the organization's programs. ( $n=1$ )
2. Data or Commission work has been helpful in decision making. ( $n=1$ )
3. Data or Commission work gave useful or helpful information e.g., information on how to write proposals. ( $n=2$ )

Negative comments by the decision makers were placed into three categories. Twenty-seven percent ( $n=8$ ) of the decision makers gave negative comments in one of the following categories:

1. Data or data gathering process was not adequate or of poor quality. ( $n=3$ )
2. Data or data gathering process was not helpful or useable. ( $n=3$ ).
3. Data made no impact on decisions or there was no plan for implementing findings from the data. ( $n=2$ )

Future benefits from the Commission identified by the decision makers in the funding organizations were related to increasing cost effectiveness in their organizations and increasing allocations for human services by the government.

#### Effectiveness of The Commission

The last question which the decision makers were asked concerned their perception of the effectiveness of the Commission in carrying out the activities. Table 16 summarizes their responses. The largest percentage, forty-three percent (n=13) of the decision makers responded that they did not have enough knowledge of the Commission to give an assessment of its performance. The next highest percentage, forty percent (n=12) gave negative comments about the Commission. Seventeen percent (n=5) gave positive comments. Chi square statistics suggest trends towards differences between groups in two responses. A larger proportion of the private top than the private bottom group gave negative comments about the Commission ( $\chi^2=2.240$ ). A larger proportion of the bottom funded group than the top funded group indicated lack of knowledge of the Commission and consequent inability to assess its performance ( $\chi^2=2.171$ ). A larger proportion of the private bottom funded group than the private top funded group also indicated lack of knowledge of the Commission and consequent inability to assess its performance ( $\chi^2=3.702$ ).

The county official indicated no effectiveness and also gave a negative comment about the Commission. The city official gave a positive comment about the Commission. The decision makers from the funding

TABLE 16

Frequencies And Chi Square Statistics For Group Responses on Effectiveness And Commission

Effectiveness	Total (n=30)		Groups By Funding Level (Top n=15: Bottom n=15)			x <sup>2</sup>	Groups By Sanction (Public n=6: Private n=24)			x <sup>2</sup>	Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9): By Private Sanction Bottom Funded (n=15)			x <sup>2</sup>	Public Sanction-Top Funded (n=6): By Private Sanction Top Funded (n=9)			x <sup>2</sup>
	Yes	No	Yes	No			Yes	No			Yes	No			Yes	No		
Positive Comments	3	27	Top	1	14	0	Public	1	5	.0148	Pri.T.	0	9	.1455	Pub.T.	1	5	.0044
			Bottom	2	13		Private	2	22		Pri.B.	2	13		Pri.T.	0	9	
Conditional Comments	5	25	Top	4	11	.9600	Public	1	5	.3750	Pri.T.	3	6	1.280	Pub.T.	1	5	.0014
			Bottom	1	14		Private	4	20		Pri.B.	1	14		Pri.T.	3	6	
Negative Comments	12	18	Top	8	7	1.250	Public	2	4	.0086	Pri.T.	6	2	2.240 ✓	Pub.T.	2	4	.0546
			Bottom	4	11		Private	10	14		Pri.B.	4	11		Pri.T.	6	3	
No Knowledge Of Commission	13	17	Top	4	11	2.171 ✓	Public	3	3	.0084	Pri.T.	1	8	3.702 ✓	Pub.T.	3	3	1.150
			Bottom	9	6		Private	10	14		Pri.B.	9	6		Pri.T.	1	8	

✓ = Trend  
 \* = .05 Level of Significance

organizations gave conditional comments and the Director of the Commission indicated he thought it was doing as well as it could in the circumstances.

Decision makers from the sample of service providing organizations who gave positive comments about the effectiveness of the Commission, ten percent (n=3), said either that the staff were good or credible or that the activities or data from the Commission have been useful or helpful. Some of the decision makers who gave negative comments about the Commission, forty percent (n=12), said the data or process for gathering the data was inadequate or questionable. Some of those with negative comments said the Commission has not produced a useful product or change as a result of its activities. Others said the Commission was attempting to do activities that could not be done and/or were inappropriate. Lastly, some said that relations between the decision makers in the funding or service providing organizations and the Commission were poor or inadequate.

Those decision makers who gave conditional comments, seven percent (n=5), said that the Commission was still in the stages of establishing itself, that it was better than nothing or an improvement over the past.

The city official indicated that the effectiveness of the Commission could be documented and that the effective activities consisted mainly of providing information that has been helpful in decision making at the city level. The county official gave a negative comment that there has been no viable product from the Commission's activities.



Both of the decision makers from the funding organizations gave the conditional comments that it was too early to assess the effectiveness of the Commission. The Director assessed the Commission's work as technically good and useful as far as the needs assessment, resource development and service prioritization activities. The goal-setting and information management activities were described by him as useful to organizations as they could be because of the lack of staff in organizations with the necessary skills to use the data from the activities.

Summary of Domain and Domain Consensus Section

The preceding description of the decision makers' perceptions of the primary domain of the Commission, i.e., community-wide coordination, and activities of the Commission to carry out the domain, i.e., needs assessment, goal-setting, etc., suggests low support of the decision makers for the domain and activities of the Commission. The interviews on coordination indicated that community-wide coordination, the domain of the Commission, was the type of coordination perceived as least present by the decision makers. The top funded groups perceived it more often as present than decision makers from the bottom funded groups. Their understanding of what constitutes community-wide coordination was shown to differ. For some it was program or problem area planning between service provider organizations while for others it was planning which takes place in funding organizations or as the result of the Commission's activities.

Domain concerns in organizations was the dominant type of constraint to coordination identified by the decision makers. More of the top funded group identified legislative and funding requirements as constraints whereas more of the bottom funded groups identified resource deficits in their organizations as constraints. Service providing organizations as the implementing organization for coordination were chosen as frequently as a Commission type organization.

The Commission's attempts through its activities to carry out its domain were not perceived, for the most part, by decision makers as important or effective. Resource development was the activity perceived as most valuable followed by information management. Goal-setting, service prioritization and the needs assessment activities were perceived by the decision makers as least valuable to their organizations. More of the decision makers in the public organizations indicated that none of the activities were of value and more in the bottom funded organizations chose service prioritization as a least valuable activity. Resource development as a least valuable activity was chosen more by decision makers in private organizations.

In relation to activities the Commission should do but has not its first two years, the largest percentage of decision makers described service delivery or program planning types of activities.

As far as participation in the Commission, the largest percentage of decision makers indicated participation in the needs assessment/ service prioritization activity and the next largest percentage indicated no participation. Decision makers in the top funded organizations more

frequently were funders and board members of the Commission and a larger proportion of the decision makers in the bottom funded organizations indicated no participation. Relative to benefits from participation, the largest percentage of decision makers indicated no benefit and the next highest percentage indicated no participation or not enough to expect a benefit. More decision makers from the top funded organizations indicated no benefit and more from the bottom funded organizations indicated no participation.

In assessing the effectiveness of the Commission, the largest proportion of the decision makers indicated they did not have enough knowledge of the Commission to give an assessment of its effectiveness. The next highest percentage gave negative comments about its effectiveness. More of the decision makers in the top private funded organizations than the bottom funded organizations gave negative comments. More of the decision makers in the bottom funded organizations, however, indicated insufficient knowledge to assess the effectiveness of the Commission.

Throughout the interviews the county and city officials differed in their perceptions of both coordination and the activities of the Commission. The decision makers in the funding organizations were generally similar in their perceptions of coordination and the Commission's activities. Their comments were generally tentative and conditionally supportive of the Commission. The Director had a generally positive view of his organization and gave good ratings for the activities relative to their usefulness and the process used to carry them out.

Those activities which were perceived by him as not as useful, i.e., goal-setting and information management, were identified as weak in relation to a lack of marketing by the Commission and lack of staff in organizations to use data from the activities.

The next section of this chapter describes the data obtained from observations of the Commission's board meetings on 1979 objectives.

#### Organization-Set and Goal-Setting During Commission Board Meetings

The organization-set of the Commission is all of the human service organizations in the Columbus metropolitan area along with the county and city governments. Given the domain of the Commission, i.e., to provide for community-wide coordination of human services, all human service organizations are potential recipients of activity from the Commission and, therefore, part of its domain as recipients of its products, i.e., output organizations. Those organizations that provide financing, staff and board members for the Commission are part of its domain as input organizations. The Commission receives all of its funding from a few major funders in its local setting, i.e., county and city governments, United Way and CAMACO. Representatives from these funding bodies are represented on the board of the Commission and in some cases have given staff assistance to the Commission.

According to the interorganizational propositions used in this study, since the input organizations for the Commission are few in number and since each controls a major share of the funding, they should be dominant in the Commission's goal-setting.

Goal-setting is the process an organization uses to adjust its domain to its environment and more specifically to its organization-set. The objectives of the Commission are its goals for the coming year. Since decisions about the objectives are made during its board meetings, the meetings provide one occasion to observe a goal-setting process in the Commission. They also provide an opportunity to observe the interactions and roles of representatives from the Commission's input organizations relative to goal-setting in the Commission.

There were two board meetings which primarily dealt with 1979 objectives of the Commission, i.e., January 25, 1979, and February 8, 1979, meetings. At the first meeting, January 25, objectives were presented by the staff to the members of the board. The objectives had not been discussed by the staff with the members, with the exception of the chairperson and two other members, or negotiated with them. At the February 8 meeting, however, most of the objectives had been discussed by the staff with the members and negotiated with them before the meeting. The January 25 meeting, consequently, provided more of an opportunity to observe the influence and dominance of members during goal-setting since the February 8 meeting was more the result of negotiations before the meeting. The objectives which were discussed and voted on at those two meetings are presented in Table 21

Tables 17 to 20 describe the topics and sequences of participation by the board members and staff during the meetings relative to four gross types of participation:

1. Initiate a topic or a point of discussion.
2. Respond to an initiation or question or another participant's response to an initiation or question.
3. Question or request for an answer, opinion or response to an inquiry.
4. Call for a vote on a topic.

As explained in Chapter 3 (p. 40), each of the meetings is described relative to the dominant participants according to the number of transactions they were responsible for during the meetings and according to their type of participation. A transaction is an incident of a gross type of participation. Implicit in the definition is the notion that the incident involves more than one person in some role, i.e., receiving information, communicating, questioning, etc. The priority of the topics the participants are involved in is also indicated. The priority of a topic is defined by the number of transactions and by the number of participants involved in the sequence of transactions about the topic. Those topics with the largest number of transactions and participants in a sequence have the highest priority.

Since data was not obtained about the negotiations by participants outside the meetings, the data on the meetings, presented below, provides only one indicator of the participation of the input organizations in the goal-setting process of the Commission. The data on dominant participants, types and sequences of participation, and priority of topics does provide, however, a focused view of the interactions of the representatives from the input organizations relative to the 1979 goals or objectives of the Commission.

The data, as presented below, suggests that at the January 25 meeting, the county official was a dominant participant as a questioner and responder. The Director was dominant as an initiator and responder, and the community-at-large representative was dominant as a questioner. At the February 8 meeting, the CAMACO representative was dominant as a questioner. The Director was dominant as a responder, and the Community Services Department representative became dominant during the discussion about one of the topics. The top three topics at the January meeting were: call for a vote to table the objectives; objective six, i.e., Commission as convenor of appropriate actors for service delivery planning; petition for endorsement of funding request from guest organization. The top three topics at the February 8 meeting were: objective ten, i.e., development of neighborhood councils through the city council committee on neighborhoods; objective one, i.e., resource development; vote to delete objectives ten from the list of objectives.

#### January 25 Meeting

At the January 25 meeting, as described in Tables 17 and 18, the county official (E) was the dominant board member with seventeen percent (n=8) of the transactions attributed to him. Most of the transactions he was responsible for took place relative to topics that were of top priority. His participation was largely one of questioner and responder in an adversary role opposing the objectives. The highest priority topic was eleven, i.e., tabling of the objectives until the next meeting. During discussion of the motion to table the objectives, the county

TABLE 17

Chart of Participation of Board Members and Staff at January 25 Meeting

Types of Participation	Members											n p	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		
Initiate	1,2,5,7,12	4,9	3,6,8,10		11		11	11				14	.30
Respond	2,4,5,7,11,12	4,9		11	7,9,11	7,7	11			9,11	12	19	.40
Question				2	4,4,7,9			7		5,7,9,12	2	11	.23
Call for a vote								12			11,11	3	.07
n	11	4	4	2	8	2	2	4	0	6	4	47	1.00
P	.23	.09	.09	.04	.17	.04	.04	.09	0	.12	.09	1.00	

Votes (Y=yes: N=no)

Total Vote  
Y N

#11 Table Objectives				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15	0
#12 Endorse Request				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15	0

Members

A=Director  
 B=Staff #1  
 C=Staff #2  
 D=United Way Representative  
 E=County Official

F=City Official  
 G=County Welfare Department Representative  
 H=CAMACO Representative  
 I=Community Service Representative (City Department)

J=Community-at-large Representative  
 K=Other board members and one guest (n=8)



TABLE 18

## Topic, Sequence and Priority of Participation at January 25 Meeting

Topic*	Sequence of participation	Priority (Based on # of Transactions and # of Participants)
1. Introduction to 1979 objectives	1 - no discussion	8
2. Presentation of objective one	2A - 2D - 2K - 2A	6
3. Presentation of objective two	3 - no discussion	8
4. Presentation of objective three	4B - 4E - 4B - 4E - 4A	5
5. Presentation of objective four	5A - 5J - 5A	7
6. Presentation of objective five	6 - no discussion	8
7. Presentation of objective six	7A-7J-7F-7E-7F-7E-7H-7A	2
8. Presentation of objective seven	8 - no discussion	8
9. Presentation of objective eight	9B - 9J - 9B - 9E - 9J	4
10. Presentation of objective nine	10 - no discussion	8
11. Call for vote on objectives (Table objectives)	11K-11E-11J-11E-11D-11H 11K-11A-11G-11K	1
12. Request for endorsement of funding request from guest organization	12A-12J-12K-12K-12H	3

\* List of objectives is in Table 21

official initiated discussion to table the objectives and responded in support of other members negative comments about the objective. Other topics the official was a participant in are: topic seven, second priority; topic nine, fourth priority; topic four, fifth priority. In each of the topics he questioned an objective presented by staff and in one instance, topic seven, responded negatively to another board member, city official (F), who responded in favor of an objective he objected to.

The community-at-large representative (J) with responsibility for twelve percent (n=6) of the transactions during the meeting followed the county official in dominance at the meeting. The representative was primarily a questioner during the meeting and like the county official opposed the objectives presented by the staff. The community-at-large representative also was involved with many of the top priority topics, i.e., topic eleven, top priority; topic seven, second priority; topic twelve, third priority; topic nine, fourth priority; topic five, seventh priority. The Director (A) as the principal presenter of the objectives and responder to questions about them was the most dominant participant at the meeting with twenty-three percent (n=11) of the transactions attributed to him. The other representatives from the input organizations of the Commission beside the county official, i.e., city official (F), United Way representative (D) and CAMACO representative (H) were not as dominant as the county official or community-at-large representative. The city official (F) was responsible for four

percent (n=2) of the transactions and participated as a responder in support of the objectives as presented by the Director. The United Way representative (D) was responsible for four percent (n=2) of the transactions and participated as a questioner and responder. The United Way representative questioned the viability of one objective and supported the motion to table the objectives until the next meeting. The CAMACO representative was responsible for eight percent (n=4) of the transactions. The representative engaged in each type of participation and was not supportive of the objectives. The CAMACO representative did support the last topic to endorse a guest organization's request for funding by calling for the vote and voting in favor of the request. The representative from the county welfare department (G) who was responsible for four percent (n=2) of the transactions supported the motion to table the objectives until the next meeting.

The rationale given by the county official for opposing the objectives during the meeting was that they were too broad and would, therefore, not meet the need for the Commission to have products by the end of 1979 to prove its worth to funders. The county official was primarily concerned throughout the meeting with the Commission's accountability to its funders, especially to the county as its funder. The United Way representative was also concerned about the need for the Commission to have products by the end of 1979 and raised this issue in the question in topic two. The CAMACO representative was concerned about the criteria the staff used to decide on the objectives and especially

on the staff's rationale for objective eight in topic nine, i.e., neighborhood council development through assistance to the city committee on neighborhoods. The CAMACO representative was concerned about the representativeness of the objectives relative to the Commission's needs assessment and service prioritization data, i.e., how did they reflect that data? The community-at-large representative had the same concerns as the CAMACO representative. The other members of the board (K) were responsible for eight percent (n=4) of the transactions and were generally neutral in their assessment of the objectives. The motion to table the objectives passed unanimously as did the motion to endorse the request of the guest organization for funding.

In summary the county official (E) participated in most of the priority topics during the January 25 meeting. The official's participation was largely as a questioner and responder in an adversary role opposing the objectives. The primary concern of the official was that the Commission needed to provide its worth to its funders, especially the county as one of its funders, by having products that proved its worth by the end of 1979. The Director (A) was a dominant member as the presenter and responder relative to the staff's presentation of the objectives. The community-at-large representative (J) also was dominant as a questioner and was opposed to the objectives on the basis that the criteria used by the staff to develop the objectives was neither clear nor in some cases acceptable. The other representatives from the input organizations of the Commission beside the county, i.e., city (F),

United Way (D) and CAMACO (H) were not as dominant as the county or community-at-large members. The city official (F) is the only representative who supported an objective by responding in favor of objective six in topic seven in response to an objection by the county official (E) to the objective. In general, the representatives did not support the objectives, and the objectives were tabled unanimously until the next meeting.

#### February 8 Meeting

At the February 8 meeting, as described in Tables 18 and 19, the CAMACO representative (H) was the dominant board member. The representative was responsible for sixteen percent (n=5) of the transactions which took place. The representative participated as a questioner in an adversary role opposing three of the objectives which were presented. The topics the representative participated in were in the top priority: topic one, priority one, topic four, fourth priority and topic five, third priority. Topic one and topic five are both on objective ten, neighborhood councils. Although the CAMACO representative opposed the objective in his questions during the discussion, on the vote to delete the objective, i.e., topic five, he voted against deletion. The Community Services Department representative (I) was next in dominance at the meeting with responsibility for thirteen percent (n=4) of the transactions but these all took place relative to topic two, objective one, which was a priority two topic because of the number of transactions between the representative and the Director, i.e., seven. The

TABLE 19

Chart of Participation of Board Members and Staff at February 8 Meeting

Types of Participation	Members											n	p
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		
Initiate	1,7								2			3	1.0
Respond	2,2,2,4	3,5			1,5	1	1		2,2,2		1	14	.47
Question				3				1,1,4,5	1,1,4	5,6		10	.33
Call for vote								7			5,6	3	.10
n	6	2	0	1	2	1	1	5	4	3	5	30	1.00
p	.20	.07	0	.03	.07	.03	.03	.17	.13	.10	.17	1.00	

Votes (Y=yes; N=no)												Total vote	
												y	n
#5 deletion of Objective 10				N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	2	13
#6 Pass objectives as modified				Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	13	2
#7 pass 1979 budget				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15	0

Members

A=Director  
B=Staff #1  
C=Staff#2  
D=United Way Representative

E=County Official  
F=City Official  
G=County Welfare Department Representative  
H=CAMACO Representative

I=Community Service Representative (City Dept.)  
J=Community-at-large Representative  
K=Other Board Members and Guests (n=7)

TABLE 20

## Topic, Sequence and Priority of Participation at February 8 Meeting

Topic *	Sequence of participation	Priority (based on # of transactions and # of participants)
1. Introduction of objectives in modified form plus objective ten	1A-1H-1J-1F-1J-1G-1K	1
2. Objective one	2I-2A-2I-2A-2I-2A-2I	2
3. Objective four	3D - 3B	5
4. Objective five	4H - 4J - 4A	4
5. Objective ten (vote to delete objective)	5H-5B-5E-5K-5K	3
6. Objectives brought to vote	6K - 6K	6
7. Presentation of 1979 budget	7A - 7H	5

\* List of Objectives in Table 21

TABLE 21

Objectives Presented At January 25 and February 8 Board Meetings

January 25 Meeting (Not Prioritized)	February 8 Meeting (Prioritized)
*1. Development of compatible program and fiscal management requirements between funding organizations.	*1 <sub>1</sub> Maintain current resource development effort.
2. Development of management support center for organizations.	2 <sub>1</sub> Implement transportation project.
*3. Resource Development.	3 <sub>1</sub> Undertake financing of transportation strategies.
*4. Implementation of Pilot transportation program.	*4 <sub>1</sub> Compatible program and fiscal reporting requirements.
5. Provision of policy support for funding organizations.	*5 <sub>1</sub> Initiate development of management support center.
*6. Convenor of appropriate actors to develop program plans for service delivery in areas of: domestic violence, group homes, alcoholism treatment.	6 <sub>1</sub> Fill gaps in service inventory and do 648 board survey.
7. Maintain an information services bureau.	7 <sub>1</sub> Provide mid-year human service report for funders.
*8. Initiate development of neighborhood based service delivery to include assistance to city council committee on neighborhoods.	8 <sub>1</sub> Provide allocation focused assistance.
9. Provide sound management and administrative support for performance of Commission activities.	9 <sub>1</sub> Maintain information service bureau.
	*10 <sub>1</sub> Neighborhood based service delivery system, etc.
	11 <sub>1</sub> Alcoholism program planning.
	12 <sub>1</sub> Complete statements of goals and objectives.
	13 <sub>1</sub> Group home program planning.
	14 <sub>1</sub> Domestic violence program planning.
	15 <sub>1</sub> Service access system.

\* Discussed At Meetings.



representative brought up a domain issue relative to possible future resource development planning activity of the Commission. In the past the Department had disagreed with the Commission's attempts to plan for the use of new federal money coming into the area and had successfully blocked the Commission's effort. The representative questioned the Director on the possibility of the Commission attempting to do such planning in the future. The Director left the issue unresolved.

The community-at-large representative was responsible for ten percent (n=3) of the transactions. The representative participated in a questioning role relative to topics one, priority one and four, priority four. The other representatives from the input organizations beside CAMACO, i.e., county (E), city (F), United Way (D), raised questions or responded relative to one or two of the objectives. The county and United Way members each had one transaction and the City official had two transactions. The county official was generally opposed to the Commission's involvement with the city's committee on neighborhoods in objective ten while the city official supported the Commission's involvement as a vehicle for the Commission to meet its objective of developing neighborhood councils. The city official supported the Commission's objectives as did the United Way member. The CAMACO representative questioned the objectives relative to the neighborhood councils and management support center, topics one, five and four. The CAMACO representative, however, did not vote to delete

the neighborhood council objective, topic five, as did the county and community-at-large members.

In summary, the CAMACO representative (H) was dominant during the meeting as a questioner and the Community Services Department representative (I) was dominant during the meeting at one point concerning a domain issue, i.e., planning for use of funds as a possible resource development role of the Commission and subsequent domain issue with the Department. The community-at-large representative (J) was active relative to a questioning role in two objectives. The representatives from the county (E), city (F), United Way (D) raised questions or responded relative to one or two of the objectives. The objectives as presented by the staff passed in spite of the no votes of the county official (E) and community-at-large representative (J). The 1979 budget passed unanimously and the motion to delete the objective on neighborhood councils (objective ten) failed in spite of the yes votes of the county official (E) and neighborhood representative (J).

#### Summary of Chapter

Tables twenty-two, twenty-three and twenty-four summarize the data presented in this chapter relative to: most frequent choices of decision makers in their responses to interview questions, important differences between groups in the choices, and dominant participants in board meetings on 1979 objectives. The summary is provided as a framework for the presentation in the next chapter of

possible interpretations and explanations of the findings presented in this chapter.

#### Domain and Domain Consensus

In Table 22 and Table 23, data on the top funded groups by sanction was not provided since important differences between them, i.e., .05 level of significance for  $\chi^2$  or trend of 2.00 and over for  $\chi^2$ , were not found in the study. Data on private sanction groups by top and bottom funding levels also was not described since in only one case, which is noted in Table 23, was an important difference found that was not also found in the general top and bottom funded level groups.

#### Coordination

The data summarized in Table 22 indicates that for the domain of coordination decision makers in all of the groups most frequently perceived information management as taking place and program coordination as desirable. Relative to important differences more of the top funded group perceived community-wide coordination as present and desirable and more of the public group perceived it as desirable. The most frequently identified constraint to desirable coordination by all of the groups, except the public group, was domain concerns of organizations. The public group identified legislative/funding requirements most often as a constraint. Relative to important differences the top group

TABLE 22

Summary of Findings on Domain and Domain Consensus  
(Perceptions of Decision Makers On Coordination, Part I)

Table Title	Response	Groups			
		Top Funded (n=15)	Bottom Funded (n=15)	Public Sanction (n=6)	Private Sanction (n=24)
Present Type Of Coordin- ation (Table 6)	Most Fre- quent n Important Differ- ence x <sup>2</sup>	Info Man- agement 14	Info Man- agement 15	Info Man- agement 5	Info Man- agement 24
		Community-Wide 2.179 (Top) ✓			
Desirable Type of Coordination (Table 7)	Most Fre- quent n Important Differ- ence x <sup>2</sup>	Program 9	Program 11	Program 4	Program 16
		Community-Wide 2.0110 (Top) ✓    Community-Wide 3.062 (Public) ✓			
Constraints (Table 8)	Most Fre- quent n Important Differ- ence x <sup>2</sup>	Domain Concerns 9	Domain Concerns 10	Legislative/ Funding 4	Domain Concerns 17
		Legislative/Funding (Top) 5.714*		Legislative/Funding (Public) 2.867 ✓	
		Resource Deficits (Bottom) 4.261*			
Type of Organization (Table 9)	Most Frequent n	Funding Organiza- tions 5	Service Providing 6	Commission Type 3	Service Providing 9
		Commission Type 5			

Degree of Importance

✓ = Trend

\* = .05 Level of Significance

( ) = Group With Larger Proportion of Response in Group.

identified legislative/funding requirements as a constraint more than the bottom, and the bottom group identified resource deficits more than the top group. The public group identified legislative/funding requirements more often than the private group. For type of organization to facilitate coordination, the Commission type of organization was the most frequent choice of the top and public groups, although the top group choose funding organizations as frequently as a Commission type organization. The bottom and private groups most frequently chose service providing organizations. There were no important differences between groups in their choice of type of organization to facilitate coordination.

#### Activities

The data summarized in Table 23 indicated that in reference to the activities of the Commission, resource development, with the exception of the public group, was most frequently chosen by the groups as the most valuable activity for their organization. The public group most frequently indicated that none of the activities were of significant value. An important difference is indicated between the public and private groups in the choice of no activity (more of the public group). Goal-setting, with the exception of the bottom group, is the most frequent choice of the groups as the least valuable activity for their organization. The bottom group most frequently indicated that service prioritization was least valuable. An important difference is indicated between the bottom and top groups

TABLE 23

Summary of Findings on Domain and Domain Consensus  
(Perceptions of Decision Makers On Activities  
Of The Commission, Part II).

Table Title	Response	Goals		Public Sanction (n=6)	Private Sanction (n=24)
		Top Funded (n=15)	Bottom Funded (n=15)		
Most Valuable Activities (Table 10)	Most Frequent n Important Difference x <sup>2</sup>	Resource Development 7	Resource Development 9	None 4 None (Public) 3.845*	Resource Development 15
Least Valuable Activities (Table 11)	Most Frequent n Important Difference x <sup>2</sup>	Goal Setting 8 Service Prioritization (Bottom) 6.522*	Service Priorities 12	Goal-Setting 3 Service Prioritization (Private) 2.419 ✓ Resource Development (Private) 2.592 ✓	Goal-Setting 16
Activities Should Not Do (Table 12)	Most Frequent n	No Answer 5 Goal Setting 4	No Answer 6 Service Priorities 2	Goal-Setting 2 No Answer 2	No Answer 9 Service Priorities 4
Activities Should Do (Table 13)	Most Frequent n	Service Delivery Planning 6 No Additions 6	Service Delivery Planning 6 No Additions 6	No Additions 3 Consolidate Funding Forms 2	Service Delivery Planning 11
Participation in Commission (Table 14)	Most Frequent n Important Difference x <sup>2</sup>	Needs Assessment 10 Board/ Staff (Top) 3.841* No Participation (Bottom) 5.714*	No Participa- tion 8 Needs Assess- ment 5 Resource Development 5	Needs Assess- ment 3 Board/Staff 3 All Activities (Public) 4.051* Board/Staff (Public) 3.375 ✓	No Participa- tion 9 Resource Development 6

TABLE 23 (continued)

Summary of Findings on Domain and Domain Consensus  
(Perceptions of Decision Makers On Activities  
Of The Commission, Part II).

Table Title	Response	Goals			
		Top Funded (n=15)	Bottom Funded (n=15)	Public Sanction (n=6)	Private Sanction (n=24)
Benefit From Participation (Table 15)	Most Frequent Important Difference $x^2$	No Benefit 10	No Participation 9	No Benefit 4	No Benefit 10
		Other Choices 3 each			No Participation 10
		No Benefit (Top) 4.886*			
		No Participation (Bottom) 5.167*			
Effectiveness of Commission (Table 16)	Most Frequent Important Difference $x^2$	Negative Comments 8	No Knowledge 9	No Knowledge 3	Negative Comments 10
		Negative Comments 4		Negative Comments 2	No Knowledge 10
		Negative Comments (Private Top) 2.240 ✓			
		No Participation (Bottom) 2.171 ✓			

Degrees of Importance

✓ = Trend

\* = .05 Level of Significance

( ) = Group with Larger Preparation of Response in Group

in the choice of service prioritization (more of the bottom group). Important differences are also indicated between the public and private groups in the choice of service prioritization and resource development (more of the private group) as least valuable activities.

The most frequent response of the groups (except for the public group) for activities the Commission should not have done, was no answer. The public group chose goal-setting as frequently as no answer. Goal-setting was the next most frequent response for the top group, and service prioritization was the next most frequent response for the bottom and private groups. Service delivery planning, with the exception of the public group, was the most frequent response of the groups for activities the Commission should do. The public group most frequently responded with no additional activities. Their next most frequent response was consolidation of funding forms and procedures of funding organizations for service providing organizations. Important differences between groups were not indicated for activities the Commission should not do or should do.

Both the top and public groups most frequently indicated participation in the needs assessment/service inventory activity of the Commission. The bottom and private groups most frequently indicated no participation. The next most frequent choice of the bottom group was, equally, needs assessment and resource development. The next



most frequent choice of the private group was resource development. Important differences were found between the top and bottom groups in the choice of participation as board or staff members of the Commission (more of the top group) and no participation (more of the bottom group). Important differences were also found between the public and private groups with more of the public group indicating participation in all activities and participation as board or staff members of the Commission.

No benefit from participation was the most frequent response by all groups, with the exception of the bottom group which most frequently indicated no participation or not enough to indicate benefit. The next most frequent choice of the bottom group was distributed equally throughout the remaining choices, i.e., benefit indicated, negative comments, and no benefit. The private group chose no participation as frequently as no benefit. Important differences are indicated between the bottom and top funded groups in the choice of no benefit (more of the top) and no participation (more of the bottom).

Data on the last question on the activities, i.e., effectiveness of the Commission in carrying out the activities, indicates the most frequent response for the top and private groups was negative comments. The bottom and public groups most frequently indicated not enough knowledge to assess the effectiveness of the Commission. The next most frequent response for both was negative comments.

Important differences are indicated between the top and bottom groups in the response of no participation (more of the bottom) and negative comments. The last, i.e., negative comments, is the only instance when a difference between the top private sanctioned group and the bottom private group was not present in the general top and bottom funding level groups.

#### Organization-Set and Goal-Setting

Table 24 summarizes the data presented in reference to board meetings on 1979 objectives relative to dominant participants in the meetings. The Director, county official, and community-at-large representative were the dominant participants at the January 25 meeting. The Director participated as an initiator and for the most part responded to questions about his initiations. The county official, for the most part, participated as a questioner relative to the topics initiated by the Director and his staff. The community-at-large representative was also, for the most part, a questioner relative to the initiations of the Director and his staff. Eleven topics were presented at the meeting, and the Director initiated five of those. At the February 8 meeting the Director was dominant as a responder with initiation as a secondary role. The CAMACO representative was dominant as a questioner relative to the topics which were introduced as a package by the Director in the first initiation. The representative from the Community Services Department became dominant as a responder

TABLE 24

Summary of Findings On Organization-Set And Goal-Setting (Data On Observations of Board Meetings)

Meetings And Number of Topics	Types of Observation	Dominant Participants				
		A	E	J	H	I
January 25 11 Topics (Tables 17 and 18)	Types of Participation	Initiator Responder	Questioner Responder	Questioner Responder	Once Each Role	0
	Priority Of Topics	1,2,3,5, 6,7,8	1,2,4,5	1,2,3,4, 7	1,2, 3	0
	Number of Topics	7	4	5	3	0
	Number and % of Transactions	11 .23	8 .17	6 .12	4 .09	0 .0
February 8 7 Topics (Tables 19 and 20)	Types of Participation	Responder Initiator	Responder	Questioner	Questioner Call For A Vote	Responder Initiator
	Priority Of Topics	1,2,4,5	1,3	1,4	1,3,4	2
	Number of Topics	4	2	2	3	1
	Number and % of Transactions	6 .20	2 .07	3 .10	5 .17	4 .13

Participants

A= Director

E= County Official

J= Community-at-Large Representative

H= CAMACO Representative

I= Community Services Department Representative

and initiator relative to one topic. The county official and community-at-large representative were moderately active in the meeting as questioners. Seven topics were presented at the meeting, and the Director initiated two of them. Since one of the initiations resulted in responses to parts of the initiation throughout the meeting, it accounts for more than one initiation. The other members of the board were moderately active in the meetings as questioners and responders.

The next chapter examines the data presented in this chapter relative to the interorganizational propositions described in the preceding chapters and theory on planning and organizations.

## CHAPTER V

### INTERPRETATION

The data which was described and summarized in the last chapter is interpreted in this chapter relative to the propositions from the interorganizational perspective of this study and related analyses of interorganizational relationships in organization and planning literature. Since the propositions from this study are general and the data limited by the small sample size and small number of indicators, the interpretation is tentative and speculative. Implications, however, are developed in chapter six from the interpretation for further research and for planning practice and theory.

The format used by the author for this chapter is to present the interorganizational propositions of the study, as described in earlier chapters, with their primary concepts and then to describe selected findings which relate to the propositions. The rationale for the selection of the findings is given below. To provide interpretation, analyses from organization and planning literature are described and related to the findings for each grouping of propositions. When

appropriate during the interpretation, linkages between the two literatures are identified for inclusion in the summary at the end of the chapter.

The findings were selected for interpretation relative to the major question explored in this study, i.e., the extent to which planning for social services reflects the interorganizational or organization-environment, domain and resource issues identified in the literature. The primary domain and resource issues identified are; the extent to which the level of agreement or disagreement between decision makers concerning the definitions of their respective domains, and the extent to which the locus of control of resources for domains affect the ability of an organization's members to function in its domain and, specifically, a planner's ability to implement plans.

Although the data contains many interesting findings that could be identified for interpretation, the author chose those, that from the author's perspective, related to the major question of this study. From Table 22 and Table 23 those findings were selected which related to the agreement or disagreement among decision makers about the primary domain of the focal organization of this study, i.e., community-wide coordination of human services by the Metropolitan Human Service Commission. Findings from Table 23 were selected relative to participation and roles of the representatives from the major input organizations of the Commission during board meetings on 1979 objectives, i.e., goal-setting process. The apparent dominant role of a board member who

is not from a major input organization, i.e., community-at-large representative, is also examined since according to the propositions of this study the representative should not have been dominant. The findings which were selected for interpretation in this chapter are:

Table 22: Findings relative to propositions on Domain Consensus, i.e., community-wide coordination

Community-wide coordination is not the most frequent choice of any group of decision makers as a present or desirable type of coordination.

There is an important difference between the top and bottom funded groups in the choice of community-wide coordination as present and desirable (more of the top group) and between the public and private groups in the choice of community-wide coordination as desirable (more of the public group).

Domain concerns as a constraint to coordination is the most frequent choice of all groups except the public group which chose legislative/funding requirements most frequently as a constraint.

The bottom funded and private groups chose service providing organizations as the type of organization to facilitate coordination and the top funded chose funding organizations as frequently as Commission type organizations.

Table 23: Findings relative to propositions on Domain consensus, i.e., activities of the Commission.

The activities of the Commission directly related to planning for coordination, i.e., needs assessment, goal-setting, service prioritization, were not chosen by any of the groups as most valuable for their organizations. They were in fact chosen as least valuable and/or an activity that the Commission should not do.

Service delivery or program planning was the most frequent choice of all groups as an activity the Commission should do.

The bottom funded and private groups indicated no participation/no knowledge as their most frequent response relative to the participation, benefit and effectiveness questions.

The top funded and public groups indicated no benefit and negative comments in their response relative to benefit and effectiveness questions.

Table 24: Findings relative to propositions on Organization-Set and Location of Input Resources, i.e., observations of board meetings.

The apparent domination of two representatives from two of the four major input organizations of the Commission, i.e., county official and CAMACO representative during the board meetings.

The apparent lack of participation of one of the input organizations representatives during the board meetings.

The apparent dominant role of the community-at-large representative during the board meetings.

The overall lack of support for the objectives as presented by the Director and staff of the Commission during the January board meeting.

The apparent supportive role of the city official relative to the presentation of the objectives by the Director and staff during the meetings.

As described in chapter one, the propositions for this study are organized into three groups, domain consensus, organization-set and location of input resources. The groupings do not indicate distinct groups of propositions but, rather, emphases in the propositions. The propositions in groups two and three are a further elaboration of the relationships described in the propositions in the preceding groups, i.e., propositions in group three on location of input resources provide further elaboration of the relationships described in the propositions in the domain consensus and organization-set groups. Since the groups



are not distinct, data which is related to one group of propositions also is relevant for the other propositions.

#### Group I Domain Consensus

The first group of propositions are organized relative to the concept of domain.

- 1.1 The more decision makers of organization in the domain of an organization agree with and support its domain, i.e., domain consensus, the more members in the organization are able to carry out its domain functions.
- 1.2 The more there is not domain consensus by decision makers of organizations in the domain of an organization, the less members of the organization will be able to carry out its domain functions.

Domain is defined in the preceding chapters, using Thompson's framework, as the products, services, functions, customers or clients an organization's decision makers claim for their organization's area of activity in a geographic area.<sup>1</sup> Agreements or lack of agreements between decision makers in an organization's domain about the domain of the organization, i.e., domain consensus, are related by Thompson to the ability of its members to carry out the domain.<sup>2</sup>

The primary domain of the Commission is defined by the Citizen Committee, which created the Commission, as the function of community-wide coordination of human services in Columbus metropolitan area. Given this domain, all human service organizations in the Columbus metropolitan area are in the domain of the Commission. They are recipients and/or providers of resources relative to the activities of the Commission to develop community-wide coordination of human services.

In relation to the propositions on domain consensus, the more decision makers in human service organizations in the area agree with and support community-wide coordination of human services through the activities of the Commission, the more the Commission will be able to carry out its functions and consequently develop community-wide coordination of human services.

The summary of the interview data with the decision makers in Table 22 suggests that community-wide coordination is not the type of coordination supported by most of the decision makers. Neither is the Commission the type of organization most frequently chosen by all groups of decision makers as the type of organization to carry out coordination. The activities of the Commission directly related to community-wide planning, i.e., needs assessment, goal-setting and service prioritization, were not the most frequent choice as most valuable Commission activity for the organizations. Goal-setting and service prioritization were actually identified as least valuable and activities the Commission should not have done.

This apparent lack of support for the domain of the Commission and its activities is reflected, perhaps, in the decision makers assessments of no benefits for their organizations from participation in the activities and also in their negative comments about the effectiveness of the Commission in carrying out the activities (Table 23). The most frequent response for the question on benefits was no benefit and not enough participation to indicate a benefit and for the question on

effectiveness, negative comments or not enough knowledge to assess effectiveness. Although other variables, such as poor implementation of activities and lack of marketing, as suggested by respondents, may also account for the decision makers perception of the Commission as ineffective, a general lack of support for community-wide coordination may equally influence their assessments. Domain concerns in Table 22 were identified most frequently by all groups of decision makers, except the public group, as the factor which placed constraints on attempts to coordinate activities of human service organizations, particularly program and community-wide types of coordination. The public group most frequently chose legislative/funding requirements as a source of constraint.

Given the low level of support for community-wide coordination and for the Commission type of organization and for the activities of the Commission to carry out coordination, the propositions predict that the Commission may not be able to function in its domain, i.e., provide community-wide coordination of human services. The decision makers' assessments of benefits from participation and of the effectiveness of the Commission may reflect an inability of the Commission to function in its domain. Domain concerns, as identified by the decision makers, may be one of the primary constraints to the Commission's attempt to implement community-wide type of coordination. The findings, therefore, suggest support of the propositions about domain consensus, but since the data is limited, the findings are inconclusive. They do, however,

suggest that for future research there may be merit in including domain consensus as a variable that potentially affects planning practice.

#### Relationship of Findings to Organization And Planning Literature

Domain is a central concept in organization literature both in reference to definitions of organizations and in reference to identifying interorganizational issues. Emerson in a power-dependency model of interorganizational relations posits that competition for control of resources for domains is a central dynamic underlying all interorganizational relations.<sup>3</sup> In this study, given the decision makers identification of domain concerns as a primary constraint to coordination, Emerson's model may reflect the dynamics present in the Columbus setting and perhaps in other settings.

The focus in the model is on the balancing operations or activities of dependent organizations in power-dependency exchanges of resources with other organizations to equalize or balance the exchange, i.e., cost reduction. Two of the primary balancing operations are withdrawal from the relationship and coalition formation of lesser organizations to increase their bargaining ability. In a study of exchanges of resources among health organizations, Levine and White identified domain consensus as one of the primary determinants of the exchanges along with the level of equality of benefits from the exchange.<sup>4</sup> Coordination, according to Reid, involves some level of resource exchange.<sup>5</sup> The level or amount and quality of resources involved, according to Reid,

determines the type of coordination. Types of coordination, such as community-wide coordination, which involve high levels of resource investments are more difficult to implement because of the potential loss of resources without reciprocal or greater benefits, i.e., unequal exchange. Benefits of equal or greater worth must be assured for investments of high levels of resources. In Emerson's model, change which results from coordination must either assure a balanced exchange of resources between organizations, or the lesser organizations in the exchange will initiate balancing operations, i.e., withdrawal from the exchange or coalition formation with other organizations.

One explanation from Emerson's framework, therefore, for the decision makers in the bottom and private groups choice of service providing organizations as the organization to provide coordination and their apparent lack of participation may be a withdrawal from the exchange with the Commission and/or support of coalition formation with other service providing organizations. The decision makers in the bottom and private groups, from Emerson's framework, may perceive their position as a lesser one relative to the Commission and/or perceive no benefits from participation in the Commission activities and as a consequence may initiate balancing operations.

Analyses of planning have also addressed domain issues but usually in the context of a focus on decision makers' perceptions of change, resistances to change and resources of planners to implement change relative to the resistances. In the analyses attention is

usually given to the planner as an individual actor attempting to create change relative to possible roles for the planner and/or for the individual or multiple organizations which must be changed to implement the plans.

Specht in an article on tactics for creating change describes a response to an issue, i.e., proposed change, as the product of the perceptions of those involved with the change.<sup>6</sup> Those involved with change are described as the target system, i.e., the object of change, the action system, i.e., those undertaking the change, and the client system, i.e., those on whose behalf change is sought. The level of consensus between the parties about the change is directly related to their level of agreement about the change. The key factor in Specht's model is how the parties perceive their resources to be affected by the change, i.e., rearranged within the existing system, redistributed to others within the system, or change of the structure of the system (change of status relationships or social arrangements for awarding rights and responsibilities, etc.). The more the change is perceived as moving toward redistribution and structural changes, the more it is perceived as a threat by the target of the change with a consequent contest situation set up between the action/client systems and the target system. The more it is perceived as a rearrangement of resources within the existing system with consequent maintenance of the present arrangements for control of resources, the more it is perceived as non-threatening by the target system. The consequent situation between

the action, target and client systems is cooperative. The client system, according to Specht, is often not a participant in a change involving rearrangement within the existing system as the target and action system are often the same actors.

Morris and Binstock also analyze planning relative to resistances to change, but their analysis focuses on resistances to change in individual organizations. Their analysis is of attempts to create community-wide planning for programs and services for the elderly with a focus on planning as an attempt by a planner to change the policies of organizations. Domain concerns are identified by them as a source of organizational resistance to be overcome by the planner. Domain concerns within their framework are concerns by the decision makers for the practices, culture or ethos and autonomy of the organization. Change which is perceived by the decision makers as disrupting some or all of these is viewed as a threat and resisted. The planner's influence to be effective must match the level of the resistance, i.e., the greater the threat and consequent resistance, the greater the influence the planner must have. As an example, control of resources and political leverage are types of influence needed by the planner when attempting to create change that is perceived as a major threat to an organization's domain.

Spergel, like Specht and Morris and Binstock, stresses both the importance of the perceptions of the parties involved with a change and the importance of creating a viable match between resistances to change

and resources to implement change.<sup>8</sup> In a description of a community problem solving model for change, Spergel, describes "interorganizing" as a method of community work or community problem solving. Spergel characterizes community problem solving as "purposeful intervention by people within an organization context in relation to a specific community problem", and interorganizing as "efforts at enhancement, modification or change in intergroup or interorganization relationships to cope with a community problem".<sup>9</sup> Perceptions of relevant actors, i.e., those who control organizational resources relative to the problem, are important in Spergel's model in the problem identification part of problem solving, i.e., the process by which some part of the environment is defined as a problem by individuals, groups or organizations in the environment.

The key to the model which makes perceptions in problem identification essential is the description of community problem solving as essentially interactive, i.e., each component of an intervention reflects alternate values, perceptions, behavior and structured relationships in the community. Interorganizing, as an intervention in this interactive context, to be effective, according to Spergel, must operate from some "coalescence or centralization of resources". Without that centralization, planning, according to Spergel, is "worth nothing" since the power to implement the plans is not available. The centralization of power usually takes the form of public sanction in Spergel's model. Public sanction is characterized by public power with legal sanction and resources to implement community-wide objectives. Kahn's



lead agency as described in chapter two would perhaps be characterized by the centralization of resources Spergel describes as necessary for community-wide planning.

Two roles, advocate and enabler, are described by Spergel for the planner. They are described relative to the decision makers perceptions of the problem, goals of planning, resistances to the goals and resources for coercing or inducing organizations to change in the desired direction. The advocate role is characterized by a community-wide focus on a problem with the goal of significant change or innovation in multiple organizations relative to their domains and structures. Centralization or coalescence of resources is required to implement the plans relative to potentially strong organizational resistances rising from alternate perceptions of the problem, i.e., organizational rather than community-wide analysis of problem. The enabling role is characterized by an organization development or maintenance focus on a problem with the goal to enhance or maintain the programs of organizations. To the extent the planner's activities are perceived as enhancing the programs of organizations or at least not creating more costs than benefits for organizations, the activities of the planner will be supported or receive, at the most, minimal resistance. In Spergel's analysis, most planners perform a limited maintenance function due to limited influence, i.e., limited legal sanction and limited control of resources, and limited technical competence.

According to Specht's, Morris and Binstock's and Spergel's frameworks, community-wide coordination potentially may be an approach

to problem solving that may be viewed by decision makers as not in the best interests of their organizations. Community-wide coordination may be perceived by them as potentially threatening their control of domains and/or resources for the domains of their organizations.

According to the dimensions Reid uses to differentiate types of coordination, community-wide coordination could involve more than program coordination in the amount of resources, frequency of contact and formalization of agreements required of organizations and their members.

If this is the case and/or it was perceived this way by the decision makers in this study, then, of the choices of coordination types given to the decision makers, community-wide coordination could have been perceived by them as the greatest threat to the domains of their organizations. For those that more frequently chose community-wide as a desirable type of coordination, i.e., top funded and public groups, it may have been perceived by them as an opportunity to obtain more resources for the domains of their organizations. A value of cost savings during the interviews had been associated with community-wide coordination by the county official and one of the decision makers in the funding organizations. Cost-savings was described by them as a product of elimination of unnecessary duplications of programs and services through the community-wide coordination. A by-product of cost savings, not mentioned by the official or decision maker during the interview, may be more dollars for their organizations as a consequence

of the elimination of smaller organizations that are offering programs and services similar to the larger organizations. An alternative perspective to duplication of services from that of cost-savings is offered by Spergel and others.<sup>10</sup> The alternative perspective values the maintenance of duplication of programs and services in service delivery. The rationale for maintaining duplication is both that it gives the consumer a choice and that it provides for experimentation and quality control through competition among organizations for financing, sanction, consumers, etc.

The potential threat of community-wide coordination, according to Emerson's framework, comes from the possible unequal exchange of resources among organizations. The threat, according to Morris and Binstock's framework, comes from the possible loss of autonomy, traditional practices, culture or ethos of the organization through the arrangements required for community-wide coordination, i.e., possible control of domain by forces outside of the organization. Utilizing Morris and Binstock's framework, one explanation for the decision makers' apparent perception of the Commission as ineffective may be the planner's lack of influence to overcome resistances by decision makers in organizations to perceived threats to the domain of their organizations. An explanation, from Specht's and Spergel's frameworks for the decision makers' apparent lack of support for community-wide coordination and for the Commission type of organization and Commission activities may be their perceptions that the change sought by the

Commission could threaten resources for the domains of their organizations.

Service delivery or program planning was and should have been the most frequent response relative to an activity the Commission should do, from Morris and Binstock's framework, because it supports and/or expands present domains. From Specht's and Spergel's frameworks, it was and should be the most frequent choice because it is a type of change that would rearrange resources within the present system or maintain the system rather than redistribute resources or change the status structure and is, thus, less threatening to the domains of organizations.

#### Groups II and III Organization-Set And Location of Input Resources

Propositions in groups two and three are organized relative to the organization-set model developed by Evan.<sup>11</sup>

- 2.1 The greater the size of the input organizations in an organization-set of an organization, the more the input organization's decision makers control the goal-setting in the organization.
- 2.2 The higher the concentration of input for an organization in a few organizations, the more the input organization's decision makers control the goal-setting in the organization.
- 2.3 The greater the overlap in membership between the organization and its organization-set the more the decision makers in the organization-set control the organization's goal-setting.
- 3.1 The more an organization receives input resources from organizations in the setting of the organization, the more decision makers in the organizations in the setting will influence goal-setting in the organization.

- 3.2 The more an organization receives input resources from organizations outside of the setting of the organization, the less decision makers in the organizations in the setting will influence goal-setting in the organization.

Goal-setting is a primary concept in organization literature to describe the "sounding out process" used by decision makers in an organization to learn about and adapt to the environment. Miles, Snow and Pfeffer refer to goal-setting as organizational adaptations to environment according to decision points.<sup>12</sup> Thompson and McEwen describes it as a process of learning about the environment relative to the availability and willingness of other organizations to form or change relations with the organizations in reference to present and future goals.<sup>13</sup>

In Evan's model the characteristics of the organization-set and specifically input organizations of an organization are related to goal-setting or decision-making in the organization.

Since those board members who were dominant during the meetings were from the four major input organizations of the Commission, the data from the observations of board meetings suggests partial support for the propositions. However, one of the input organization's representatives was not dominant during the meetings and the community-at-large representative, who is not from one of the major input organizations, was apparently dominant. The county official, CAMACO representative and Community Services Department representative (city department) were particularly dominant during the meetings and represent three of the four major input organizations. The county official successfully led

the vote to table the objectives in the January meeting (Table 17 and Table 18). However, the data, as explained in chapter four, only suggests support rather than provides a test of the propositions because of the limited indicators used in this study, i.e., participation in meetings on 1979 objectives.

#### Relationship of Findings to Organization And Planning Literature

Analyses from organization literature suggest that the position of an organization is a major determinant of its influence relative to decision-making about domain and resource allocation issues between organizations. The position of an organization is defined by Benson as the level of control by an organization of the resources for its own and other organizations' domains.<sup>14</sup> Benson describes control of resources in the resource linkages between organizations as the substructure of interorganizational resource exchanges which determines the nature of the contacts between organizations or the superstructure, i.e., sentiments and level of interactions between organizations. Four of the characteristics of the control of resources or substructure identified by Benson which are of particular importance in determination of the nature of contacts between organizations or the superstructure are, the level of resources concentration, the level of power concentration, the level of dependence on external environment (outside of setting), and the level of resource scarcity.

Hirsch also defines organization position relative to control of important environmental factors which affect the domain of the

organization but defines those factors in a broader sense than Benson.<sup>15</sup> In a study of pharmaceutical manufacturing firms and phonograph firms, Hirsch found organizational effectiveness to be directly related to the control by an organization of its institutional environment and of its bargaining position relative to valued resources. Institutional environment was identified by Hirsch as those organizations and individuals which determined the funding regulations and marketing guidelines and prices for the products of the organization's domain. The pharmaceutical firms had higher profits as a result of their control over distribution and wholesale prices of products and determination and administration of patent and copyright statutes, along with an ability of their decision makers to predict the level of adoption of products by brokers and opinion leaders.

One explanation from Benson's and Hirsch's frameworks for the county official's apparent dominance in the January meeting is the position of the county relative to control of resources for the Commission and for the domains of other human service organizations in the metropolitan area. The county contributes, as do the other major input organizations, one fourth of the Commission's administrative budget and, in addition, contributes staff assistance and additional financing for some of the Commission's activities. The county, however, also is the vehicle through which a large proportion of public money, i.e., federal, state and local, for social services is channeled to human service organizations in the metropolitan area. The city controls some public money for social services, i.e., principally revenue

sharing and CETA funds (county also shares responsibility for CETA), but the county controls the largest proportion of public money.

Public money, as is shown in Table 5 in Appendix C, is a part of almost two-thirds of the budgets of organizations in the study.

The city official's apparent support of the Commission during the interviews and during the board meetings is explained partially by city governments' traditional lack of technical expertise for planning for social services. Humphreys describes revenue sharing as placing pressure on local governments to develop criteria for allocating funds for social services.<sup>16</sup> As the result of the city's technical planning needs, assistance from the Commission is perceived by the city official as a needed resource. A further explanation is provided by Benson's and Hirsch's frameworks, i.e., the city's position relative to control of resources and control of the institutional environment. Since the city determines how it will use data and planning assistance provided by the Commission it may perceive itself as able to direct the Commission according to its planning needs. The county may not have similar needs for technical assistance in the planning area because of the types of funding it administers, i.e., Title XX and county funds, although it is similar to the city relative to control of resources and the institutional environment. Revenue sharing funds come to the city with less regulations and guidelines from the state and federal levels than Title XX funds which have both federal and state regulations and guidelines for distribution of the funds.

One explanation, from Benson's and Hirsch's frameworks, for the



identification by decision makers in public organizations of legislative/funding requirements rather than domain concerns as a constraint to coordination is the position of their organizations relative to the institutional environment. Decision makers in public organizations identified legislative/funding requirements as a constraint more frequently than those in private organizations perhaps because of their direct dependence on legislative decisions for delineation of the domains for their organizations. Decision makers in private organizations also are dependent on legislative decisions relative to the domains of their organizations and resources since most of the private organizations receive some public funding. Organizations in the bottom funded groups, however, are a large portion of the private group, i.e., over half. Decision makers in the bottom groups identified, most frequently, autonomy concerns in the domain concern category perhaps as a function of a possible lack of influence in the institutional environment, i.e., public and private sources of regulation and funding for domains of the organizations. Their lack of influence, the literature suggests, may be a function of the small size of their organizations and consequent control of only a small proportion of resources in the community.

Like analyses in organization literature, analyses of planning describe the position of an organization, i.e., control of resources and/or regulations, as a central issue. It is central in planning literature relative to a planner's attempt to implement change.

In an analysis of United Way organizations, Wenocur describes United Way organizations relative to their position with their member

organizations.<sup>17</sup> They are, within Wenocur's perspective, in a "precarious balance with a politicized external environment" which is made up of member organizations. The precarious balance is characterized by member organizations not implementing change in United Way allocating criteria due to their domain interests to maintain current resource allocation patterns and by the United Way organization not implementing change due its dependence on member organizations. As a result of their precarious position, United Way Organizations are not in a position to suggest or implement change other than, in Specht's framework, at the level of rearranging resources within the existing system. A politicized environment is, from Evan's organization-set framework, a focal organization controlled by its output organizations which are also its input organizations, i.e., the organizations which receive funding from United Way also function relative to participation in its fund raising and policy making. Some are more powerful than others in the policy making, but all have the opportunity to affect in some way the United Way's fund raising drives.

In the previous description of Spergel's model, the position of the planning organization was a central issue. It was central relative to conditions necessary for effective planning, i.e., coalescence or centralization of power in the planning organization.

Warren in an analysis of model city programs found that organizations which controlled resources for their organization's and other organizations' domains maintained the current patterns of resource

distribution which were favorable to their domains. Change that was perceived as a threat to the domains of these organizations, i.e., Community Decision Organizations, was redirected or blocked by their decision makers to protect the current arrangements.

One explanation, from Wenocur's framework, for the apparent lack of participation of the United Way representative in the meetings compared to the other representatives from the input organizations, i.e., city county and CAMACO, is the lack of influence of the United Way in its organization-environment, i.e., with member organizations. Since United Way funds one-fourth of the administrative budget of the Commission, as the county does, and contributes, additionally, through staff assistance and contracts, as the county does, an assumption from the propositions on goal-setting is that United Way would be as dominant in the goal-setting process as the county. Since, however, it exists in a politicized environment with its member organizations, it is not in a position to publicly take sides on issues. It is possible, however, that United Way influences the Commission informally, i.e., contacts with the Director and staff outside of public meetings.

Warren's framework provides an explanation for the lack of support of the objectives as presented by the Director and staff during the January meeting. The initiations by the Director and the staff may have been perceived by the representatives from the major input organizations as a threat to their domains and/or resources for their domains, with the exception of the city official who generally supported the

staff. The threat may have come from the content of the objectives or the role the staff was taking as initiators during the meeting, i.e., dominant role relative to defining the planning goals of the Commission and subsequent direction of the coordination activities for 1979. At the next meeting, February (Tables 19 and 20), the staff took less of an initiating role and responded to questions, initiations and responses of the board members.

The community-at-large representative's unexpected dominant role in the meetings relative to the propositions is not explained by the position of the community-at-large in reference to control of resources but from the actual narrative of the meetings not described in the Tables. Although the community-at-large representative had a high number of transactions in priority topics, the representative's contributions, as observed by the author, were largely ignored and/or not acted on by the other board members and staff. The county official's contributions, however, were attended to and acted on during the meetings. The county official was often on the same side of an issue as the community-at-large representative but relative to a different rationale, e.g., the county official was against the objectives as presented by staff ostensibly because they did not meet the "product need" of the Commission whereas the community-at-large representative was against them ostensibly because they did not reflect the data from the needs assessment and service prioritization activities of the Commission. The community-at-large representative's lack of impact on the meetings is

explained by their low position in the environment, i.e., lack of control of resources for the domains of organizations.

#### Summary of Chapter

Although not all of the findings from the study were interpreted in this chapter, those that were interpreted in reference to the propositions indicate that interorganizational issues relative to domain consensus and control of resources for domains may have an important influence on human service planning. They also suggest that the Commission is perhaps not in a position relative to the human service organizational environment, i.e., control of resources for domains, to implement the community-wide type of coordination. The Commission may be more in a position to implement types of coordination which involve lower levels of resources than the community-wide type, i.e., ad-hoc, case and program types of coordination.

Linkages were identified between analyses in organization and planning literature in two primary interorganizational areas, i.e., domain and control of resources for domain and position of organizations in an organization-environment relative to control of resources. Analyses in both organization and planning literature used domain as a central concept. In organization literature it is used to define organizations and identify interorganizational issues relative to domain consensus and control of resources for domains. In planning literature, domain is used for analysis of decision makers' perceptions, resistances to change and resources for implementing change relative to a focus on

planners as individual actors and/or relative to a focus on individual organizations or multiple organizations to be changed.

Position of an organization relative to control of resources is a major issue identified in both organization and planning literature. In organization literature the position of an organization determines its influence relative to decision-making about domain and resource allocation issues among organizations. In planning literature the position of an organization from which a planner operates is identified as potentially determining the planner's ability to implement change, i.e., significant change may require control of major resources and legal sanction.

The primary concepts, issues and models identified in the organization and planning literature for interpretation of the selected findings are:

#### Organization Literature

Resource-dependency model of interorganizational relations (Emerson).

Coordination types by level or amount and quality of resources exchanged (Reid).

Position of an organization relative to substructure of interorganizational relations, i.e., control of resources (Benson).

Position of an organization relative to organizational effectiveness, i.e., control of institutional environment (Hirsch).

#### Planning Literature

Tactics for creating change relative to perceptions of change as a threat to resources (Specht).

Community problem-solving model of change with problem-solving as essentially interactive (Spergel).

Planner influence level relative to the level of resistance to change in organizations (Morris and Binstock).

Planning related to position of an organization in its environment (Wenocur).

Community Decision Organizations' control of change relative to their domain interests (Warren).

Planning needs of local government relative to new role in human service delivery as allocators of revenue sharing funds (Humphreys).

The next chapter describes possible implications from this study for both planning and research and specifically for the focal organization of this study, i.e., Metropolitan Human Service Commission. The limitations of this study and recommendations for further research are also identified.

Footnotes for Chapter V

- 1 James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 29.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Richard M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations," in American Sociological Review, 27, 1962, p. 31-41.
- 4 Sol Levine and Paul White, "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," in Administrative Science Quarterly, 5, 1961, p. 583-601.
- 5 William Reid, "Interagency Coordination in Delinquency Prevention and Control," in Social Service Review, 38, 1964, p. 418-428.
- 6 Harry Specht, "Disruptive Tactics," in Social Work, 14, 1969, p. 5-15.
- 7 Robert Morris and Robert Binstock, Feasible Planning For Social Change. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).
- 8 Irving A. Spergel, Community Problem Solving: The Delinquency Example. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.)
- 9 Ibid., p. 3 and 20.
- 10 Spergel, op. cit., p. 241.
- 11 William Evan, "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory of Inter-organizational Relations," in Approach To Organizational Design. James D. Thompson (ed.) (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966), p. 173-191.
- 12 Raymond Miles, et. al "Organization-Environment Concepts and Issues," in Industrial Relations, 13, 1974, p. 244-264.
- 13 James D. Thompson and William McEwen, "Organization Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting as an Interaction Process," in American Sociological Review, 23, 1958, p. 23-31.
- 14 Kenneth J. Bensen, "The Interorganizational Network as a Political Economy," in Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 1975, p. 229-249.



- 15 Paul M. Hirsch, "Organizational Effectiveness And The Institutional Environment," in Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 1975, p. 327-338.
- 16 Nancy Humphreys, "Competing for Revenue-Sharing Funds: A Coalition Approach," in Social Work, 24, 1979, p. 14-19.
- 17 Stanley Wenocur, "A Political View of The United Way," in Social Work, 20, 1975, p. 223-230.

## CHAPTER VI

### IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

What implications do the findings of this study have for the focal organization of the study and for planning in general? In this final chapter the author will attempt to provide a response to this question by culling from the findings, summarized at the end of chapter four and beginning of chapter five, possible implications and recommendations (relative to strategies and research) for the Metropolitan Human Service Commission and for theory and research on planning. Major limitations of the study are described at the end of the chapter relative to the constraints they place on the findings and on the implications developed from the findings.

#### Implications and Recommendations for Metropolitan Human Services Commission Relative to Strategies And Future Research

In the interorganizational perspective of this study domain consensus and the locus of control of resources for domains in an organization-set are primary issues which affect both the ability of members in an organization to function in its domain and goal-setting in an organization (refer to chapter one for further description). The findings

and interpretation of the findings in chapters four and five suggest that relative to its organization-set, the Commission lacks both domain consensus and support for its activities in community-wide coordination and is in a weak position relative to control of resources to induce or coerce support for its domain, i.e., community-wide coordination of human services.

A possible implication for the Commission relative to its apparent weak position in its organization-set, i.e., lack of domain support and lack of control of resources, is that unless it either changes its domain or position, i.e., position relative to control of resources and control of legal sanctions, its chances for survival may be questionable.

If the Commission changes its domain, the responses of the decision makers to the question about activities the Commission should do, i.e., Table 13, suggest that it should move in the direction of providing service delivery program planning and technical assistance to organizations. The goal-setting process and outcomes during the board meetings on 1979 objectives suggest that the Commission may be moving in the direction of adjusting its domain, as proposed above, to its organization-set. The top five objectives passed at the February 8 meeting, as identified in Table 21, reflect an emphasis on short range program and technical assistance objectives.

If the Commission changes its position in its organization-set, i.e., control of resources and control of legal sanctions, literature

on interorganizational relations in chapters two and five suggest that to induce or coerce organizations, i.e., both private and public sanctioned, to move in the desired direction, i.e., community-wide coordination, the Commission may need to control important resources for the domains of the organizations and/or to have legal sanctions that affect the domains of the organizations. Spergel and others suggest that the Commission, in order to be in that position, would need to be a public organization, i.e., mandated by a public body (state, city or county), with legal sanctions.<sup>1</sup> In the Columbus setting the county government may be the most appropriate public body to mandate such an organization since it is in an apparently dominant position relative to control of resources for the domains of organizations. The question arises, however, whether the county officials have a commitment to the domain of community-wide coordination. During the goal-setting process and interviews their interest in the Commission seemed to be focused on the problems and program needs of their departments rather than comprehensive service plans for the metropolitan area relative to human service needs. For example, the transportation project, objective two on the February 8 list in Table 20, is the result of a county request for assistance in coordinating transportation for welfare recipients as a cost-saving device for their Welfare Department. Another question is, even if the officials supported community-wide coordination, would the county have the level of dominance, relative to control of resources, required for implementing

community-wide coordination since the human service organizations in the area, even some of the bottom funded ones, use multiple sources of funding (Table 5 in Appendix C). It may be that even public organizations in Columbus do not have the control of resources required to induce or coerce decision makers in organizations to participate as needed in community-wide planning and in the implementation of those plans. An alternative to implementing community-wide coordination with both private and public sanctioned organizations may be a county plan relative to just public organizations over which the county may have more direct influence through legal sanctions and control of resources.

Future research on the Commission could extend this case study of the Commission by examining the Commission over a period of three to five years. The Commission could be examined relative to the issues, raised above, concerning the possible adaptation of its domain to its organization-set and/or the possible change of its position in its organization-set relative to control of resources and legal sanctions to implement community-wide coordination. Comparative research could also be conducted to examine the Commission in reference to similar types of organizations in other settings with similar domains, i.e., private/public funded organizations, which have neither control of resources nor legal sanctions, created to provide community-wide coordination of human services. The comparative study could control for factors of community context, e.g., size, planning experience and citizen participation, organization characteristics, e.g., type of

organizations and number and size of organizations involved, and staff characteristics, e.g., style of Director, number and professional background of staff. These factors could then be examined for their possible influence on domain consensus or support in the organization-set for community-wide coordination as alternative explanations to the ones developed in this study. The Commission could also be compared with public coordinating organizations, i.e., those mandated by a public body with legal sanctions, controlling for the factors described above, to examine whether the position of a planning organization in its set does perhaps affect the ability of its members, i.e., planners, to function in a domain, e.g., implement community-wide coordination. The assumption in the above comparison is that public organizations would likely be in a more dominant position than the Commission relative to control of resources and legal sanctions.

#### Implications and Recommendations for Theory And Research on Planning

The implications of the findings for theory and research on planning follow from the implications and recommendations described above for the Commission. The study suggests that an interorganizational perspective with the concepts of domain, domain consensus, goal-setting and organization-set may be useful as a way to understand and conceptualize planning. Additionally, the perspective may provide a guide for decisions by planners about possible roles for themselves

and their organizations relative to the organization-set in which they are involved.

Along with the technical components presented in rational models of planning as described in Kahn's model in chapter one, this study suggests that a more inclusive model of planning may need to incorporate as essential components the interorganizational/political issues identified in interorganizational perspectives on planning, e.g., level of domain consensus or support and locus of control of resources for domains. Although some existing models and analyses of planning do incorporate interorganizational and organizational elements, e.g., Warren, Specht, Spergel, Morris and Binstock, there is minimal explicit use in their analyses and models of analyses on interorganizational relationships from organization literature. This study suggests that interorganizational concepts and models from organization literature such as those developed by Thompson, Evan, Schmidt and Kochan, Emerson and Benson, may be useful in analyses of planning by sharpening and increasing the conceptual tools available for understanding an important aspect of the social terrain which influences planning and which planning must influence, i.e., organization-environment.

This study also suggests that research on the interorganizational aspects of planning should be conducted using both case study and comparative designs. The case study design allows for an in-depth examination of possible interorganizational issues operating in one setting. The comparative design allows for a comparison across settings

to examine interorganizational issues while controlling for factors such as community, organization and staff characteristics as possible alternative explanations for the planning process and outcomes.

A substantive research question that may need to be addressed in future research is how community-wide coordination affects service delivery relative to consumers' perceptions of service needs, inter-organizational relationships, human service organization decision makers' perceptions of service needs and the perceptions of service needs in the community-at-large. The assumption implicit in decisions to attempt community-wide coordination is that it will increase both the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery and in the process solve certain social problems, e.g., dependency, neglect and abuse. These assumptions seemed to be present in the city council resolution which called for a Commission type organization to provide for Community-wide coordination and in the Citizen Council's recommendations to the Commission relative to community-wide coordination.<sup>2</sup> The question remains, however, whether community-wide coordination addresses any or all of these expectations. A further question is whether these expectations may conflict and/or compete with one another, and, if this is the case, whether one strategy, i.e., community-wide coordination, should be used for all of them. Future research on the interorganizational aspects of planning may need to address this substantive question and others related to planning goals along with the interorganizational/



political issues identified in an interorganizational perspective on planning.

Relative to the political or power issues identified in this study, the concepts of power and authority, as defined by Weber and other social scientists, may be useful concepts to apply and use in future interorganizational research. As an example, Weber distinguishes three types of legitimate authority, traditional, i.e., group confers status based on precedence, rational-legal, i.e., group confers right to govern and charismatic, i.e., group follows because of personal qualities of leader or "gift of grace". Authority is defined by Weber as "The probability of securing obedience to specific commands on the part of a given group of persons".<sup>4</sup> The case study of the Commission seems to suggest that the Commission may not be in a strong position of legitimate authority relative to any of Weber's type of authority, in fact its authority may be questionable relative to each of the types of authority.

#### Limitations of Study

The limitations of the study, identified below, placed constraints on both the strength of the findings and on the range of implications that could be developed from the findings. Although other limitations are present in this study, the three which were chosen by this author for identification in this chapter are, in the author's opinion, the basis of other limitations, e.g., strength of analysis. The three limitations, which for the author are primary, are:

1. The case study design.
2. Small sample size.

3. Small number of indicators.

The case study design by limiting the sample to one setting restricts the applicability of the findings, i.e., only tentatively can relationships identified in the case study be applied to other settings and to theory development. It also limits possible explanations for the findings, i.e., characteristics of the setting, which in a comparative design can be used for alternative explanations, can not be controlled in the case study design. What a case study does is allow the researcher to relatively closely examine one social terrain in order to explore and/or discover relationships whose generalizability can be tested in comparative designs. A case study, also, according to Davidson, "can be used to illustrate points which were either developed independently or suggested by the case itself".<sup>3</sup> It was this later use of the case study which was primarily used in this study relative to the interorganizational perspective developed from the literature.

The smallness of the sample size, i.e., sample of decision makers (n=35) and sample of board meetings (n=2), and number of indicators, i.e., perceptions of decision makers, participation and roles of board members during meetings on 1979 objectives, did not permit the author to fully utilize one of the major strengths of the case study design, i.e., to permit an in-depth examination of one case. Due to limitations of the author's resources this was not feasible at the time of the research and, as a consequence, the findings from the study do not adequately represent the richness which is possible from a more extensive utilization of the case study. The findings do, however,

suggest possibilities not only for further research using a comparative design but for future research using the case study design with a larger sample, a larger number of indicators and over a longer period of time, such as a three to five year period.

- 1 Irving A. Spergel. Community Problem Solving: The Delinquency Example (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969). p. 241; Sheldon P. Gans and Gerald T. Horton, Integration of Human Services (New York: Prager Publishing, 1975), p. 20.
- 2 Final Report and Recommendations of Citizens Committee (Columbus, Ohio: Citizens' Committee, 1976) p. B-1, Appendix B and p. 8-13.
- 3 Stephen M. Davidson. "Planning and Coordination of Social Services In Multiorganizational Contexts," in Social Service Review, 50, 1976, p. 136.
- 4 Max Weber in Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action (New York: Free Press, 1968), p. 656.

APPENDIX A  
Interview Schedule And Lists Of  
Service Systems And Commission Activities

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>Organization#</u>	<u>Descriptive Information</u>
1. Sanction	-Public, Private, Combination
2. Type	-Funding System or Service Provider
3. Programs	-3 or 4 primary ones funded or provided on list
4. Level of Funding	-Amount of funds controlled

Questions

1. What type of coordination do you think is possible between service providers and funders in Franklin County?  
Ad hoc case coordination  
Information exchange  
Planned case coordination  
Program coordination  
Community-wide social service allocation planning
2. What type of coordination do you think is desirable?  
None  
Ad hoc case coordination  
Information exchange  
Planned case coordination  
Program coordination  
Community-wide social service allocation planning
3. Do you think constraints to desirable coordination exist in Franklin County?  
If so what are they?
4. What type of organization do you think should carry out coordination?  
Funders  
Service providers  
Consumer groups  
Coordinating organizations jointly funded by private and public sector  
Coordinating organizations funded by the state or federal level  
Other

5. Of the activities the Commission has engaged in the last two years as described on the list in front of you which do you think are of the most value to your organization?

Review list of activities

6. Which do you think are of the least value?

What are your reasons for the choices?

7. Should the Commission in your opinion be carrying out the activities?

8. What activities not listed here should the Commission undertake if any?

9. Has your organization participated in any of the activities?

If so how?

10. In your opinion was the cost, i.e. staff time, other resources expanded, worth any benefit your received from participation?
11. What is your assessment of the effectiveness of the Commission in carrying out the activity or activities?

SERVICE SYSTEMS

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

EMPLOYMENT

INCOME MAINTENANCE

PROTECTIVE SERVICES

MENTAL HEALTH

FOOD AND NUTRITION

FAMILY SUBSTITUTE SERVICES

INDIVIDUAL AND FAMILY LIFE

PUBLIC PROTECTION, JUSTICE AND SAFETY

PHYSICAL HEALTH MAINTENANCE AND CARE

HOUSING

EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ENRICHMENT

TRANSPORTATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

EMERGENCY BASIC MATERIAL NEEDS

COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

MENTAL RETARDATION

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL RECREATION AND SOCIAL USEFULNESS

CLOTHING AND APPAREL

CULTURAL AND HUMANISTIC ENRICHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT



## DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

These are activities the Commission has been involved with over the past two years with a brief description of their content and process for use in the completion of answers to questions asked in the interview.

### 1. Community Needs Assessment and Services Inventory

The Commission sponsored a survey undertaken by O.S.U. to obtain information on the existence of problems, the severity of problems, their location and interrelationships. The Commission selected the United Community Council to conduct a survey of what services were currently being offered in Franklin County at the same time with funding levels. The needs assessment and service inventory were completed September 1977. There are plans to update both in 1978-79.

### 2. Goal Setting Process

The Commission, using panels of selected citizen participants, defined goals for Franklin County in twelve human service areas through a set of questionnaires sent to the panels during the summer of 1978.

### 3. Resource Development

The Commission, to provide advocacy for Franklin County human service funding needs at the state and federal levels as well as technical assistance on grantsmanship to agencies, contracted with United Way for use of their staff in this area.

### 4. Information Management System

The Commission is currently working with the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission to develop information centralization for needs assessment and service inventory data for use by agencies in their planning and decision-making.

### 5. Service Prioritization

Using the needs assessment and service inventory data the Commission developed a priority setting process in conjunction with Battelle Labs using panels of service providers, funders and consumers who prioritized services.

APPENDIX B  
Coding Rules

Coding Rules

Question#1 Var. 19-29

Var. 19=24 Types of Present Coordination

- 19 Ad Hoc
  - 20 Information Exchange
  - 21 Case Coordination
  - 22 Program Coordination
  - 23 Community-Wide Coord.\*
  - 24 Other
- A. Place number above type if listed
  - B. If All, Takes Place, or another work or phrase indicating all types take place is listed, place all types' letters above  
ex. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23  
All are . . . . .
  - C. Other--for type that is not listed on the left  
ex. informal and formal

Var. 25-29 \*Types of Community-Wide Coordination if respondent elaborates on 23

- 26 Within Funding Systems (U.W. 648, Public, i.e. city, county state
  - 26 Within Problem Area, ex. Alcoholism groups.
  - 27 Within Program Area, ex. Alcoholism Education
  - 28 Through Commission Effort/Use of Comm. Data
  - 29 Other
- A. Place number above if type is listed. If more than one type place letters above all listed.
  - B. Other--for type that is not listed on left.  
ex. volunteers

Question #2 Var. 30-37

Var. 30-37 Types of Desirable Coordination

- 30 Ad Hoc
  - 31 Information Exchange
  - 32 Case Coordination
  - 33 Program Coordination
  - 34 Community-Wide Coordination
  - 35 Community-Wide Coordination Qualified
  - 36 None
  - 37 Other
- A. Place number above type or types listed. Follow directions B in question 1 if All is listed.
  - B. If Community-Wide is listed with a qualification place 35 above response, ex. ... if it means .....
  - C. Other--for type that is not listed on the left ex. neighborhood

Question #3 Var. 38-43

Var. 38-43 Constraints to Coordination

- 38 Political/Domain/Autonomy in Decision Making/Mistrust
- 39 Lack of Resources (staff, time, money)
- 40 Legislative, funding system regulations/ restrictions
- 41 Competition for funds
- 42 none/no response
- 43 other

- A. Place number above if type is listed, if more than one is listed place letters above all that are listed.
- B. Note that 38 contains three areas of constraint under one type (political) in variable listing--any mention of decision making, domain, political, trust concerns is listed as 38.
- C. Any elaboration on a type by a respondent is not coded unless it contains an additional type beside the one s/he is elaborating on.
- D. Other--for a type that is not listed on the left.  
ex. do it ourselves

Question #4 Var. 44-58

Var. 44-49 Types of Coordinating Organizations

- 44 Service Providers
- 45 Funders
- 46 Private and Public Together--private means social service sector not business
- 47 State
- 48 None/no response
- 49 Other

- A. Place number above if type is listed. If more than one type is listed place letters above each.
- B. If the reply is "it is not possible or no organization is needed, we can do it ourselves...", etc. place 48 for none above response.

- C. Other--for a type that is not listed on the left.  
ex. Churches

Var. 50-53 Constraints to Coordination

- 50 Political/Domain/Autonomy in Decision Making/Mistrust
- 51 Legislative/funding regulations
- 52 Needless Bureaucracy/Another Layer
- 53 Other
  - A. Place number above if type is listed, if more than one type is listed place letters above each listed.
  - B. Other--for type listed not on left.  
ex. lack of knowledge

Var. 54-58 Roles of Coordinating Organizations

- 54 Community-view/broad viewpoint/advocate for community
- 55 Planning function/research/data provision
- 56 Decision making assistance, incentives, function
- 57 Technical assistance/service delivery assistance, i.e.,  
interfaces between providers, referral facilitation.
- 58 Other
  - A. Place number above type or types listed.
  - B. Note that 54 and 57 contain more than one area within the type (community-view and technical assistance) listed. Whenever any of the concepts are included in the response under the type put the type's letter above the response.
  - C. Other--for a type that is not listed on left.  
ex. neighborhood level coordination

Question #5 Var. 59-69

Var. 59-65 Activities of Most Value

- 59 Needs Assessment
- 60 Goal Setting
- 61 Resource Development
- 62 Information Management
- 63 Service Prioritization
- 64 None of Value
- 65 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed. If all is listed follow instructions in question 1 for all.
- B. Since this is Most value if activities are listed and one or more is mentioned as more valuable than the others only put letters above those mentioned as more or most valuable.
- C. None--if response is they are not useable, not good process, agency already has, etc.
- D. Other--type not listed on the left.  
ex. all indirectly.

Var. 66-68 Qualifications to Activities

- 66 Data needs to be specific to agency/system needs/programs
- 67 No Knowledge of activities/process/Commission
- 68 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. Note that 67 contains concerns about relevancy of data for agency/system/program, i.e., need to make it specific to their needs. 67 contains any mention of data characteristics as a qualification to activities; usefulness.
- C. Other--type not listed on left.  
ex. process is important.

Question #6 Var. 69-81

Var. 69-75 Activities of Least Value

- 69 Needs Assessment
- 70 Goal Setting
- 71 Resource Development
- 72 Information Development
- 73 Service Prioritization
- 74 None of Value
- 75 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. If all is listed as of no value place letter 74 above for no value response.
- C. Other--type not listed on left.  
ex. all have some value.

Var. 76-81 Qualifications to Activities

- 76 Data/Data gathering process is poor/inadequate
- 77 Data is not useable/lacks implementation plan/irrelevant
- 78 Agency has own data/data process/goals/resource dev.
- 79 Community but not agency relevant/useful
- 80 Legislative/funding regulations/restrictions
- 81 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. Note that 76 and 77 have more than one area under one type. Any concern about quality of data or data gathering process such as sampling is listed under 76. Any concern about relevancy of data, useability and implementation is listed under 77.
- C. Other--for type not listed on left.  
ex. lack of agency technical ability.

Question #7 Var. 82-93

Var. 82-89 Activities Commission should not do

- 82 Needs Assessment
- 83 Goal Setting
- 84 Resource Development
- 85 Information Management
- 86 Service Prioritization
- 87 No answer/cannot answer/no opinion
- 88 Should do all/yes response
- 89 Other

- A. Place letter above type or types listed. Answer may be qualified. Place letter above any activity questioned as not necessary, hard to handle, already done by agency, questionable, not needed or not possible.

- B. Place letter 87 above any response that indicates lack of knowledge, involvement, opinion, or it is too early to tell.
- C. Other--type not listed on left.  
ex. plan for public sector.

Var. 90-93 Qualifications to Activities

- 90 Data/Data gathering process is poor/inadequate/can't be done
- 91 Lack of knowledge about process
- 92 Data needs to be specific for agency/useable for agency purposes/  
need implementation plan
- 93 Other

- A. Place letter above response or types listed.
- B. Note that 90 and 92 have more than one area under one type. Place concerns about adequacy or quality of data and data gathering or questions about feasibility under 90. Place concerns about useability of data by agency, use of implementation plan, comments about agency use of data that refers to relevancy under 92.
- C. Other--types not listed on left.  
ex. creates another layer/bureaucracy.

Question #8 Var. 94-100

Var. 94-100 Activities Commission Should no not listed in Question #7

- 94 Technical Assistance/Individualize data for agencies
- 95 Service Delivery Program Planning/Evaluation of current services  
and self
- 96 Communicate/P.R./Coordinate/Involve Providers and Funders
- 97 Coordinate Funding System regulations, i.e., budget forms,  
audits, requirements
- 98 Advocacy/Grantsmanship for Social Service Funding
- 99 No Additions/no response
- 100 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.



- B. Note that 95 and 96 involve more than one area under one type. 95 is a broad type which includes comments about the need for the Commission to be involved in planning for service delivery level problems ex. group homes, coordination of alcoholism services. Any concerns about problem assessment/evaluation and planning for program areas and agency needs is under 95. 96 includes comments about working with providers and/or funders in a cooperative way by more communication, or more attempts at involving them.
- C. If no additions are recommended or there is no response, no opinion, or just no the letter 99 is the correct code.
- D. Other--type not listed on left.  
ex. define what is public/private.

Question #9 Var. 101-110

Var. 101-110 Participation in Commission

- 101 Needs Assessment
- 102 Goal Setting
- 103 Resource Development/Grantsmanship Workshops
- 104 Information Management
- 105 Service prioritization
- 106 Board member/Attend board meetings
- 107 Funder/U.W. PAC/UCC-Citizen Commission
- 108 All Activities
- 109 Not involved/no participation/no knowledge
- 110 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. If answer is All place number 108 above response.
- C. Service Inventory is included under needs assessment. Responses indicating completion of questionnaires are coded under 101 unless other activities are indicated with questionnaires.

Question #10 Var. 111-123

Var. 111-115 Benefits From Participation

- 111 Benefit Indicated
- 112 No Benefit Indicated
- 113 No Participation/No Knowledge
- 114 Negative Comments/Deficits Noted
- 115 Other

- A. Place number above type or types of responses listed.
- B. If Benefit indicated such as helpfulness, positive comment about quality, usefulness, place 111 above response. Look at var. 116-119 for coding of types of benefits.
- C. If a critical comment is made or comment about possible improvements, deficits, needs of the Commission or activities place 113 above response. Look at var. 120-123 for types of negative comments.
- D. Every 113 is also coded as a 112 response. Place both codes above response.
- E. Other--type of response not listed on left.  
ex. credible but not done by staff.

Var. 116-119 Types of Benefits listed

- 116 Supported agency program/clients/position, i.e., data or Commission supported
- 117 Data or Commission Work helpful in Decision making
- 118 Data or Commission Work, i.e., workshops, luncheons, gave useful, helpful information
- 119 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed and coded as 111.
- B. Place 116 above responses indicating Commission or data helped justify agency programs/services or helped clients get services.

- C. Place 117 above responses indicating data or Commission Work was helpful or useable in decision making. Place 118 above responses concerning general helpfulness of information received from data or Commission Work, i.e., workshops, luncheons.
- D. Other--types not listed above.  
ex. staff development

Var. 120-123 Types of negative comments

- 120 Data/data gathering process not adequate/poor/no feedback
- 121 Data/data process not helpful/not useable
- 122 Data is not used/made no impact/no implementation/no product
- 123 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed and coded as 114.
- B. 120 contains critical comments about the adequacy of data gathering, i.e., sampling, validity. It also contains critical comments about the quality of data, feedback about results and adequacy in general.
- C. 123 contains comments about the lack of impact of the data, i.e., its of no use by providers/funders and no product produced types of comments.
- D. 121 contains comments about the useability of data, i.e., it is not useable in its present form, the process is not helpful or the data in general is not helpful.
- E. Other--types not listed on the left.  
ex. need to create more dollars.

Question #11 Var. 124-140

Var. 124-128 Effectiveness of Commission

- 124 Positive Comments
- 125 Conditional Comments
- 126 Negative Comments
- 127 No Participation/No knowledge/No opinion

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. Var. 129-132 give types of positive comments codes as 124--look on next list after coding any positive response as 124. Var. 129-131 give types of positive comments.
- C. 125 contains conditional comments that give qualifications. Var. 133-135 give types of conditional comments on next list.
- D. Other--types not listed on left.  
ex. did not work in other places.

Var. 129-131 Positive Comment Types

- 129 Staff are credible/good
- 130 Activities or data have been useful or helpful
- 131 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. Other--types not listed on left.  
ex. well done but contracted out.

Var. 131-133 Conditional Comment Types

- 131 Too early to evaluate/jury is out
- 132 Needs to establish itself
- 133 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. Other--types not listed on left.  
ex. tried in other cities but untried in all aspects.

Var. 134-138 Negative Comment Types

- 134 Data/Data gathering process not adequate/questionnable
- 135 No product/no change
- 136 Inappropriate activity/can't be done
- 137 Relations with providers/funders is inadequate/poor
- 138 Other

- A. Place number above type or types listed.
- B. Other--types not listed on left.  
ex. right now it is a mish mash.

APPENDIX C

Tables With Descriptive Data On The Sample

TABLE 1

Summary Data On Organizations (n=30): Sanction, Funding Source And  
Programs On Commission Service Priority List

Sanction	f	p	Funding Source	f	p	Programs	f	p
Public	6	.20	United Way	11	.37	Employment	5	.17
Private	24	.80	648 Board	6	.20	Income Maint.	1	.03
			Public	20	.67	Mental Health	8	.27
			Private	22	.73	Physical Hlth.	7	.23
						Housing	3	.10
						Education Sup.	7	.23
						Communication	5	.17
						Mental Retard.	5	.17
						Social Dev.	10	.33

TABLE 2

Summary Data on Organizations (n=15) in Top Funded Group:  
Sanction, Funding Source and Programs on Commission Service Priority List

Sanction	f	p	Funding Source	f	p	Programs	f	p
Public	6	.40	United Way	5	.30	Employment	4	.27
Private	9	.60	648 Board	5	.30	Income Maint.	1	.07
			Public	14	.93	Mental Hlth.	5	.30
			Private	10	.66	Physical Hlth.	4	.27
						Housing	3	.20
						Educational Sup.	4	.27
						Communication	2	.14
						Mental Retard.	5	.30
						Social Dev.	7	.47

TABLE 3

Summary Data on Organizations (n=15) in Bottom Funded Group,  
Sanction, Funding Source, Programs on  
Commission Service Priority List

Sanction	f	p	Funding Source	f	p	Programs	f	p
Public	0	0	United Way	6	.40	Employment	1	.07
Private	15	.100	648 Board	1	.07	Income Maint	0	0
			Public	6	.40	Mental Hlth.	3	.20
			Private	12	.80	Physical Hlth.	3	.20
						Housing	0	0
						Educational Sup.	3	.20
						Communication	3	.20
						Mental Retard	0	0
						Social Dev.	3	.20



TABLE 4

Types of Programs in Organizations (n=30) By Sanction And Function Level.

Programs	Number of Organizations	Public Sanction (n=6)		Private Sanction (n=24)	
		Top Funding Level (n=6) f	Bottom Funding Level (n=0) f	Top Funding Level (n=9) f	Bottom Funding Level (n=15) f
Employment	5	2	0	2	1
Income Maint.	1	1	0	0	0
Mental Hlth.	8	0	0	5	3
Physical Hlth.	7	2	0	2	3
Housing	3	2	0	1	0
Educational Sup.	7	2	0	2	3
Communication	5	2	0	0	3
Mental Retard.	5	2	0	3	0
Social Dev.	10	4	0	3	3
Total	66	17		18	16
Mean	0	2.83		2.0	1.06
Range	0	1-6		1-3	1-2

TABLE 5

Data on Funding Source For Organizations (n=30) by Sanction And Funding Level

Funding Source	Number of Organizations	Public Sanction (n=6)		Private Sanction (n=24)	
		Top Funding Level (n=6)	Bottom Funding Level (n=0)	Top Funding Level (n=9)	Bottom Funding Level (n=15)
United Way	(n=11)	0	0	5	6
648 Board	(n=6)	0	0	5	1
Public	(n=20)	6	0	8	6
Private	(n=22)	5	0	5	12
Total	(n=66)	10	0	23	33
Mean		1.6	0	2.55	2.2
Range		1-2	0	1-4	1-3

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Organizational Literature

- Aharoni, Yair, et. al. "Performance and Autonomy in Organizations: Determining Dominant Environmental Components," Management Science 24, 1978, p. 949-959.
- Aldrich, Howard E. "An Interorganizational Dependency Perspective On Relations Between The Employment Service And Its Organization-Set," in The Management of Organizational Design. Ralph Kilman, et. al. (eds.). New York: Heath Holland, 1976, p. 231-266.
- Aldrich, Howard E. and Jeffrey Pfeffer. "Environments of Organizations", Annual Review of Sociology 2, 1976, p. 79-105.
- Assel, Henry. "Constructive Role of Interorganizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly 14, 1969, p. 573-583.
- Baker, Henry (ed.). Organizational Systems. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1973.
- Bobbitt, Randolph and Jeffrey Ford. "Decision Maker Choice as a Determinant of Organizational Structure," Reprint and Working Paper Series: College of Administrative Sciences at Ohio State University, March, 1978.
- Braito, Rita, et. al. "Domain Consensus: A Key Variable in Inter-organizational Analysis," in Complex Organizations and Their Environments. Brinker Hoff, et. al. (eds.) Dubuque, Iowa: Brown Publishing Company, 1972, p. 176-192.
- Duncan, Robert B. "Characteristics of Organization Environments and Perceived Environmental University," Administrative Science Quarterly 17, 1972, p. 313-327.
- Emerson, Richard M. "Power-Dependency Relations," American Sociological Review 27, 1962, p. 31-41

- Evan, William I. "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory Of Inter-Organizational Relations," in Approaches To Organizational Design. James D. Thompson (ed.) Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966, p. 173-191.
- Farris, Buford E. "Toward a More Adequate Concept of Organization in Social Work Practice," Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 3, 1975, p. 21-33.
- Fayel H. General and Industrial Management. (C. Stours. [Trans.]) London: Pittman Publishing Company, 1949.
- Ford, Jeffrey and John Slocum. "Size, Technology, Environment and Structure of Organizations," Reprint and Working Paper Series, College of Administrative Sciences at Ohio State University, January, 1976.
- Foreland, Garlie and Gilmer Haller. "Environmental Variation in Studies of Organizational Behavior," Psychological Bulletin 62, 1964, p. 361-382.
- Georgiou, Petro. "The Goal Paradigm and Notes Toward a Counter Paradigm" Administrative Science Quarterly 18, 1973, p. 291-310.
- Gillespie, David F. and Ronald W. Perry. "The Influence of an Organization Environment on Interorganizational Relations," American Journal of Economics and Sociology 34, 1975, p. 29-42.
- Guetzkow, Harold, "Relations Among Organizations," in Studies On Behavior In Organizations. Raymond V. Bowers (ed.) Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1966, p. 13-44.
- Gummer, Burton. "A Power-Politics Approach To Social Welfare Organizations," Social Service Review 52, 1978, p. 349-361.
- Gummer, Burton. "The Interorganizational Relationships of a Public Welfare Agency," Journal of Sociology And Social Welfare 3, 1975, p. 33-47.
- Hall, Richard and John P. Clark, et. al. "Patterns of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly 22, 1977, p. 457-474.
- Hannan, Michael. "The Population Ecology of Organizations," American Journal of Sociology 82, 1977, p. 929-964.

- Hasenfeld, Yeheskel and Richard English. Human Service Organizations. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1974.
- Hirsch, Paul M. "Organizational Effectiveness and The Institutional Environment," Administrative Science Quarterly 20, 1975, p. 327-338.
- Hooyman, Nancy R. "The Practice Implications For Interorganizational Theory For Services Intergration," Journal of Sociology And Social Welfare 3, 1976, p. 558-590.
- Jurkovitch, Ray. "A Core Typology of Organization Environment," Administrative Science Quarterly 19, 1974, p. 380-394.
- Kochan, Thomas A. and Lee Dyer. "A Model of Organization Change in The Context of Union-Management Relations," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 12, 1976, p. 59-78.
- Kochan, Thomas, et. al. "Determinants of Interorganizational Conflict in Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector," Administrative Science Quarterly 20, 1975, p. 10-23.
- Kochan, Thomas A. "Determinants of the Power of Boundary Units in An Interorganizational Bargaining Relation," Administrative Science Quarterly, 20, 1975, p. 434-452.
- Klonglan, Gerald E., et. al. "Interorganizational Measurement in the Social Services Sector: Differences by Hierarchical Level," Administrative Science Quarterly 21, 1976, p. 675-687.
- Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay Lersch. Developing Organizations: Diagnosis and Action. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Levine, Sol and Paul White. "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework For The Study of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly 5, 1961, p. 583-601.
- Marrett, Cora B. "On The Specification of Interorganizational Dimensions," Sociology and Social Research 56, 1971, p. 83-99.
- Miles, Raymond, et. al. "Organization-Environment Concepts and Issues," Industrial Relations 13, 1974, p. 244-264.
- Minolin, Sergio and Howard Aldrich. "Interorganizational Dependence," A Review of the Concept And Re-examination of the Findings of the Aston Group," Administrative Science Quarterly 20, 1975, p. 382-392.

- Ord, Elliot and Howard Fronkim. "Designing A Community Organization: Toward Interorganizational Influence," In The Management Of Organization Design Vol. II. Ralph Kilman, et. al. New York: North Holland, 1976, p. 267-288.
- Paulson, Steve K. "A Theory and Comparative Analysis of Interorganizational Dyads," Rural Sociology 4, 1976, p. 311-329.
- Pondy, Louis R. "Varieties of Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly 14, 1969, p. 499-582.
- Pugh, D. S. et. al. "The Context of Organizational Structures," Administrative Science Quarterly 14, 1969, p. 91-114.
- Randall, R. "Influence of Environmental Support and Policy on Organizational Behavior," Administrative Science Quarterly 18, 1973, p. 236-247.
- Rogers, David. "Towards A Scale Of Interorganizational Relations (IOR) Among Public Agencies," Sociology and Social Research 59, 1974, p. 61-70.
- Schmidt, Stuart M. and Thomas A. Kochan. "Interorganizational Relationships: Patterns and Motivations," Administrative Science Quarterly 22, 1977, p. 220-234.
- Simon, Herbert. "On The Concept of Organizational Goal," Administrative Science Quarterly 9, 1964, p. 1-22.
- Steers, Richard M. "Problems in Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly 20, 1975, p. 546-558.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur L. "Social Structure and Organizations," in Handbook of Organizations. James G. March (ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965, p. 142-193.
- Thompson, J.D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Thompson, J.D. and William McEwen. "Organization Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting as an Inter-Action Process," American Sociological Review 23, 1958, p. 23-31.
- Tuite, Matthew. "The Concept of Interorganizational Decision Making," in Interorganizational Decision Making. Matthew Tuite, et. al. Chicago: Aldine Publich Company, 1972, p. 1-7.

- Tuite, Matthew F. "Toward A Theory of Joint Decision-Making," in Interorganizational Decision Making. Matthew Tuite, et. al. Chicago: Aldine, 1972, p. 9-19.
- Turk, Herman. "Comparative Urban Structure From an Interorganizational Perspective," Administrative Science Quarterly 18, 1973, p. 37-55.
- Turk, Herman. "Interorganizational Networks in Urban Society: An Initial Perspective and Comparative Reserach," American Sociological Review 35, 1970, p. 1-19.
- Turk, Herman. "Interorganizational Actiation in Urban Community: Deductions From The Concept of System," Washington, D. C.: Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series, American Sociological Association, 1973.
- Walton, Richard E. "Interorganizational Decision Making and Identity Conflict," in Interorganizational Decision Making. Matthew Tuite (ed.) Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1972.
- Walton, Richard E. "Two Strategies of Social Change and Their Dilemmas," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 1, 1965, p. 167-169.
- Warren, Ronald. "Alternative Strategies of Interagency Planning," in Interorganizational Research in Health Conference Proceedings. Washington, D. C.: National Center For Health Services Research And Development H.E.W., 1970.
- Warren, Roland. "Sociology of Knowledge And The Problems of The Inner City," Social Service Quarterly 52, 1971.
- Warren, Roland. "The Concerting of Decisions as a Variable in Organization Interaction," in Interorganizational Decision Making. Matthew Tuite, et. al. (ed.) Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1972, p. 20-32.
- Warren, Roland and Stephen Rose, et. al. The Structure of Urban Reform. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1974.
- Warren Roland. Truth, Love and Social Change. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.
- White, Paul, et. al. "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework For Understanding Interorganizational Application to Non Profit Organizations," in Modern Organizational Theory. Anant Negandhi, (ed.) Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, 1973, p. 174-178.

Zald, Mayer M. "Organization as Politics: An Analysis of Community Organization Agencies," Social Work 11, 1966, p.56-65.

Social Service Planning

Adams, Dwight. "Fund Executives and Social Change: A Study", Social Work 17, 1972, p. 68-75.

Bennis, Warren, Et. Al. The Planning of Change. 2nd edition, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1977.

Cox, Fred M. and John E. Trepman. "Community Planning Organizations Coping With Their Problems: The Case of The Welfare Council," Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 3, 1976, p. 524-540.

Davidson, Stephen M. "Planning and Coordination of Social Services in Multiorganizational Contexts," Social Service Review 50, 1976, p. 117-137.

Gans, Sheldon P. and Gerald Horton. Integration of Human Services. New York, Praeger Publishing Company, 1975.

Gilbert, Neil and Harry Specht. Coordinating Social Services: An Analysis of Community Organizations and Staff Characteristics. New York: Praeger Publishing Company, 1977.

Gilbert, Neil and Harry Specht. Planning For Social Welfare Issues, Models and Tasks. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Kahn, Alfred J. and Sheila Kamerman. Social Services in The United States. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1976.

Kahn, Alfred J. Theory and Practice of Social Planning. New York: Russell Sage Foundations, 1969.

Marris, Rein and Martin Rein. Dilemmas of Social Reform. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Morris, Robert and Robert Binstock. Feasible Planning For Social Change. New York: Columbia, University Press, 1966.

Reid, William. "Interagency Coordination in Delinquency Prevention And Control," Social Service Review 38, 1964, p. 418-428.

Rein, Martin. Social Policy: Issues of Choice and Change. New York: Random House, 1970.



- Rosengren, William and Mark Lefton, Organizations and Clients: Essays in The Sociology of Knowledge. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.
- Simmons, Leonard. "Agency Financing And Social Change," Social Work 17, 1972, p. 62-67.
- Specht, Harry. "Disruptive Tactics," Social Work 14, 1969, p. 5-15.
- Spergel, Irving A. Community Problem Solving: The Delinquency Example. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Wenocur, Stanley. "A Political View of The United Way," Social Work 20, 1975, p. 223-230.
- Wenocur, Stanley. "A Pluralistic Planning Model For United Way Organizations," Social Service Review 50, 1976, p. 586-600.
- Methodology
- Budd, Richard W. et. al., Content Analysis And Communication, New York: Mac Millan and Company, 1967.
- Dexter, Lewis A. Elite And Specialized Interviewing. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1970.
- Filstead, William J. (ed) Qualitative Methodology. Chicato: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.
- Holsti, Ole. Content Analysis For The Social Sciences And Humanities. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Hough, John, et. al., "The Observational System For Instructional Analysis: Category Definitions and Descriptions," Unpublished Preliminary Draft: Ohio State University, College of Education, 1976.
- Kerlinger, Fred M. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2nd ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Levin, Jack. Elementary Statistics in Social Research. 2nd ed., New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Pennings, Johannes. "Measures of Organizational Structure: A Methodological Note," American Journal of Sociology 79, 1973, p. 686-704.
- Sellitz, Clarie, et. al., Research Methods In Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Commission Documents

Final Report and Recommendations of Citizens Committee. Columbus, Ohio: Citizens Committee, 1976.

First Year Report Of Metropolitan Human Services Commission. Columbus, Ohio: Davon Management Company, 1977.

Minutes of The 1979 January 25 and February 8 Metropolitan Human Service Commission Board Meetings. Columbus, Ohio: Metropolitan Human Service Commission, 1979, unpublished.

Documents and Reports of The Commission For The Years 1977 to 1979. (as kept in the files of the Commission). Columbus, Ohio: Metropolitan Human Service Commission, 1979, unpublished.