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COOPERATION AND COORDINATION BETWEEN INTERDEPENENT ORGANIZATIONS: JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP AGENCIES AND OREGON EMPLOYMENT DIVISION LOCAL OFFICES

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

The states in conjunction with the federal government have developed sophisticated employment and training systems to assist citizens in gaining employment. To this end training and labor market exchange services are provided. In Oregon, like most states much of the training services are provided by federally funded Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) organizations. The Oregon Employment Division utilizing federal and state funding serve as the primary labor exchange organization in the state. Close coordination between these two types of organizations seems necessary if resources are to be effectively utilized to provide employment assistance to citizens. This study investigates organizational coordination at the local level between the Oregon Employment Division and Job Training Partnership organizations.

My interest in this subject are both personal and professional. Most of my late father's employment was with the State of Oregon Employment Division commonly referred to as the Employment Service (ES) and I worked for nine years in a number of different federally-funded employment and training programs. I therefore have been interested in employment and training issues for several years.
I knew little if anything about the nature or quality of the relationship between ES and other employment and training organizations until I began my first full time position with a Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) organization in the late seventies.

As an eager young job developer looking for jobs for economically disadvantaged youth I knew that the local employment office would be a good source of job referrals for my clients. Borrowing on my father's reputation I was able to secure a meeting with the local ES manager. Not only was I excited about developing a potential referral source for my clients, I was also excited to have the opportunity to work with some of my father's former colleagues.

At the meeting, after some brief inquiries regarding my family, the manager informed me that the quality of staff and clients where I was working was highly questionable. He went on to berate the professionalism of the organization and questioned if any of those "welfare kids and juvenile delinquents" were employable. He did say however that he hoped maybe I could "shape up" the organization and get them on the right track.

This personal episode was my first introduction to the long standing problems that have existed between employment service offices and employment and training organizations. Through extensive conversations with employment and training professionals from both systems, I have learned that my
employment and training organization's relationship with ES was typical of equivalent relationships to those which occurred during this time period in other parts of the state as well. Typically, either or both parties often questioned the intentions, motives and/or competence of the other systems' members.

This disagreement may have dated back to the 1960s when the federal government first allowed organizations other than state employment agencies to operate employment and training programs in Oregon and other parts of the country (Herman & Munk, 1968).

In the last decade (the eighties) the ES-JTPA relationship appears to have improved in comparison to the turbulent relations of the sixties and seventies. The recent Stars' Report indicates that, although problems remain, improvements have been made in the ES-JTPA relationship. The draft report prepared by representatives of the Employment Service and Job Training Partnership systems, concludes "that, for the most part, relationships are "good" and improving at the local level" (Stars' Report 1989, pp. 5). Still the data suggests that in some communities there are several specific issues which merit further inquiry.

During the sixties and seventies state employment offices were the frequent object of analysis by organizational scholars (Aldrich 1976; Schmidt and Kochan 1977; Blau 1971; Van de Ven and Delbecq 1974; Whetten 1974, 1979;
Whetten and Aldrich 1979 and Whetten and Leung 1979). Much of this work focused on the interactions of local employment offices with other employment and training organizations.

During the 1970s Aldrich (1976) found that state employment offices were the focal point of employment and training organizational networks. Included in the networks were the many community based organizations (CBOs) receiving federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) funds. Aldrich found that CBO staff depended on members of state employment offices to refer their (CBO) clients to the better paying jobs in the community.

In 1980 a new federally-funded employment and training program replaced the much aligned CETA program: the Job Training Partnership Act. This program mandates oversight to the private sector and also strongly encourages joint coordination between local JTPA programs and the state ES by requiring JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) to review and approve the ES's yearly plan of service in each local area. After approval at the local level, the plans are combined into a single state wide document which must be

'Most of the literature from the 1970s uses the term "manpower" to describe organizations involved in worker placement and training activities. I have elected to utilize the non-gender specific term "employment and training" instead.

'For an excellent description of the demise of the CETA program as well as a comparison of the relative effectiveness of CETA versus JTPA see Levitan and Gallo's, A Second Chance: Training for Jobs.
ratified by the State Job Training Coordinating Council.

With the enactment of Job Training Partnership Act the relationship between federally-funded employment and training organizations and state employment services became more equal. Now state ES agencies were somewhat dependent on JTPA organizations for the legal legitimacy to receive funds. If the memberships of the local PICs and State Job Training Coordinating Councils refused to sign off on the ES plan, the state employment division would not receive federal Wagner-Peyser funds.

Since the inception of JTPA in Oregon, every local office and state plan has been approved by the local area Private Industry Councils and by the State Job Training Coordinating Council. One might assume approval of the local ES office plan by the PIC indicates that the relationship between the two agencies is well coordinated and that a relatively high level of cooperation exists between the two organizations. As previously discussed there is evidence to the contrary. The JTPA organizations through the PIC sign-off process have strong leverage to encourage high levels of coordination and cooperation between the two systems. Yet as previously cited members of both systems indicate the relationship still has some problems.

There is little doubt that Congress' motivation in implementing the PIC sign-off process was to increase coordination between the two systems (ES and JTPA). However,
the effects of two decades of limited coordination and cooperation and in some cases open hostility are not erased by an act of Congress. Neither are the significant differences in the two systems' philosophies, goals and missions which have frequently been a source of conflict between ES and JTPA organizations.

The Oregon Employment Service serves as the primary labor exchange agency in the state, linking applicants with employers and it also administers the state and federally funded Unemployment Insurance Compensation program. The client population base of the Employment Service covers a wide continuum of income, skill and employment levels, with little if any specific client characteristic or economic eligibility requirements. In contrast, the primary goals of JTPA organizations are to train and place narrowly defined population groups, with eligibility for services determined by participant characteristics such as income level, handicapped status and/or reasons for unemployment.

Although the legislative intent and funding mechanisms of these two types of organizations differ, they frequently serve the same clients, both job seekers and employers alike. In order to serve these two populations at an optimum level and facilitate the cost effective use of scarce economic and staff resources, a close working relationship between the two organizations is essential. Unfortunately, the findings of the "Stars Group" and personal conversations
with both JTPA and Employment Service staff indicate that in some locales, mistrust, a lack of cooperation and coordination, and disagreements over "turf" are frequent. Mistrust and uncoordinated efforts result in the unnecessary waste of resources and gaps in service delivery to employers and the unemployed alike.

There are several benefits to be derived from a more closely coordinated relationship. First of all better service and an increase in opportunities for everyone served by the two systems; clients, employers and taxpayers. For the employer access to individuals who are qualified for substantial training dollars, a reduction in the number of agency staff attempting to sell applicants and a larger labor pool from which to draw potential employees. Secondly, for clients an increase in coordination could result in exposure to more training and job opportunities and a reduction in the amount of confusion which often arises from dealing with two overlapping and often duplicative bureaucracies. Lastly, taxpayers would get what they have thought they have been paying for all along; a well coordinated employment and training system which adequately serves the needs of both job seekers and employers.

Some organizational staff members and administrators of the two types of agencies may perceive increased coordination as a threat; forcing them to give up a certain amount of autonomy and independence. However, the "Stars
Group" (Star's Report, 1989, p. 2) listed fourteen benefits which could be derived from increased coordination levels between the two; improved service delivery, an enhanced public image, higher levels of client and employer satisfaction, reductions in duplications and dollar savings are just a few of the many mentioned.
RESEARCH FOCUS

The Stars Group's efforts were a good start at determining some of the issues which effect the relationship. However, the methods utilized in gathering the data for the study were informal with few controls present justifying further and more rigid research efforts.

This research has two separate goals. First, to provide practitioners with useable information which will assist them to better serve the multitude of clients and employers who depend on their organizations for assistance. A secondary, although important focus of this project is to contribute to the growing body of empirically based interorganizational research.

The research will examine a number of issues in several specific areas including: respondent demographics; agency, professional, client and employer contacts; interlocking directorates; subcontracting of services; joint program operation; general levels of organization and cooperation and several other significant relationship issues.

In addition to discussing these coordination issues the study will consider specifically the following research questions:

(1) What is the overall level of coordination and cooperation between the two systems in the State of Oregon?

(2) What specific controversies exist in local ES and JTPA relationships?
(3) Are there differences in the amount of coordination and cooperation which exists between the two types of organizations in different communities?

(4) If there are various levels from one community to the next are there specifics which may account for the differences?

(5) What is the relationship between coordination and cooperation and interdependence; overlapping directorates; subcontracting; referral processes; interagency agreements; and/or the joint operation of programs?

This investigation is conducted and written for a multifaceted audience; primarily employment and training practitioners, administrators, and policy makers. Two aspirations have guided this analysis: First, that the discussion will stimulate new ideas and innovative approaches for those participating in interagency coordination activities. Second and more importantly, is that members of the specific organizations involved in this effort, as well as members of other employment and training programs and agencies may find the conclusions useful in their ongoing efforts to find new ways to better serve their respective clients and employers.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will examine interorganizational coordination and cooperation strategies. Areas addressed include definitions of coordination and cooperation; and general theories and motivations for coordination and cooperation. The chapter concludes with a discussion and explanation of some of the more prevalent coordination linkages found in social service organizations. Although this chapter commentary primarily deals with the public sector in general and social service organizations specifically; many of the same concepts, issues and structures relate to private sector organizations as well.

Overview of Interorganizational Studies

Within the field of interorganizational relations, a number of scholars have conducted investigations of social service coordination both private and public (Aiken and Dewar 1975; Aldrich 1976; Gans and Horton 1975; Weed 1986; Weiss 1987). Rogers and Whetten (1982) have noted that "Research on interorganizational coordination began to appear in the late 1950s and early 1960s, primarily in the form of case studies . . . written by administrators (p. 5)." Many of these case studies contained anecdotal information regarding specific examples of coordination and/or failures to coordinate. These articles were rarely
based on interorganizational coordination theories, but instead were simply observations reported by the participants. Rogers and Whetten (1982) have cited the work of Black and Kase (1963), who studied an unsuccessful joint venture between a welfare department and a rehabilitation agency as an example of this type of research. Further examples can be found in Mosher's (1967) extensive collection of case studies dealing with governmental reorganizations.

During the 1960s significant changes occurred in social services coordination. Like many other facets of society which came under scrutiny, so, too, did the role of the nation's social service providers. Traditional social agencies operated by the state and federal governments were challenged to expand their services and pay closer attention to the needs and demands of clients and local communities. The federal government began to take a much more active role in the coordination of service delivery systems. Such programs as the Economic Opportunity Act, Manpower Planning and Development Act and the Model Cities Program all had strong community coordination components.

Organizational scholars during this period began to examine the issue of coordination in the context of organizational sets, a more comprehensive manner than the traditional dyadic case study approach. Based on the 1950s "role set" work of Merton (1957, p. 369), "organizational sets"
are groups of organizations which have direct links with a single focal organization (Evan 1966). Studying organizational sets requires examining the flow of information, goods and services, and or other resources (Aldrich, 1979b, p. 280). In the case of social service organizations one would also examine resources such as client referrals and political legitimacy. Aldrich further suggests the possibility of utilizing contacts between boundary spanning organizational members to examine organizational sets. Focusing on contacts and resource flows allows researchers to examine and identify interorganizational activities, which in turn allows for the assessment of the amount of formalization, intensity, standardization and intensity (Aldrich, 1979b, p. 280).

Since the 1970s, work in the field of interorganizational coordination and relations has continued at a rapid pace with many new and different models and theories generated. As the discipline has matured scholars have identified appropriate methods of assessing and analyzing levels of organizational coordination (Van De Ven and Ferry 1980); developed various contexts from which to study the phenomenon such as Benson's deep structuring typology (1982); postulated the relative effectiveness of informal versus

3 Boundary spanning organizational members are those who have contact or interaction with individuals who are external to the organization.
formal coordination strategies in an organizational set (Chisholm 1989); and developed a typology of interorganizational conflict (Molnar and Rogers 1979).

Research in the field of interorganizational relations will undoubtedly continue as scholars and social service analysts raise new and exciting issues in their quest for answers and explanations to the many ongoing questions which surround the study of interorganizational relations in general and social service delivery coordination specifically.

**Organization Defined**

The term "organization" for the purposes of this analysis is a reference to the "natural or open system perspective" described by Thompson (1967) in his landmark treatise on organizations. Unlike organizational behavior which focuses on the impact of the organization's members, organization theory features the organization itself; specifically the dimensions of the organizations structure (internal characteristics) and context (the organization as a whole). (Daft, 1986, p. 32)

Structural dimensions include: (1) the degree of formalization; (2) the amount of task specialization; (3) standardization or routinization of the organizations' activities; (4) structure of authority; (5) complexity of the organization (vertical, horizontal and spatial);
(6) professionalism - the level of formal training and/or education required by members to accomplish the organization's tasks; and (7) the occupational diversification ratio of the organization's members.

Contextual dimensions involve such things as (1) size; (2) technology utilized by the organization; (3) the external environment of the organization; (4) and the purpose(s) or goal(s) of the organization.

The Organizational Environment

In the mid 1970s a new perspective of organizational theory emerged that emphasized the "social and cultural" interdependence of organizations and their environments. (Aldrich 1979a, pp., 9-22) (Scott, 1983, p. 156) Interorganizational theory with its focus on the interactions by and between organizations in the environment, become an integral part of this movement.

A number of scholars note the link between organizational environment and interorganizational theory. Brinkerhoff and Kunz (1972) describe the environment as "... consisting of other organizations, culture, natural resources, ecology, individual, etc." (p. 245) Sullivan (1977) notes that, "An organization's environment may be considered as everything not within its organizational boundary." (p. 186) Katz and Kahn (1978) also comment on the environment's relevance to the organization, "Open
systems theory assumes continuing interaction of an organization with its environment; such interactions are what is meant for a system to be open." They further state; "The concept of environment is itself a kind of arbitrary, organization-centered formulation, which involves a convenient and misleading implication. Everything in the universe except the organization to be studied is treated under the single category of environment." (p. 122)

Aldrich (1979a), after reviewing the organizational literature, offers six environmental dimensions:

(1) **Capacity**: the amount of resources which are available to the organization - typically characterized from rich to lean.

(2) **Homogeneity-Heterogeneity**: how much similarity exists in the environment with regard to types of organizations, individuals, and cultural and organizational norms or social values.

(3) **Stability-instability**: the relative degree of change in the environment i.e., the amount of turnover of the environmental elements.

(4) **Concentration-dispersion**: the degree to which resources are distributed across the environment.

(5) **Domain consensus-dissensus**: The level of agreement or disagreement between other environmental members regarding an organization's claim to a specific domain.

(6) **Turbulence**: the amount of interconnections between other organizations within the environment.

In later work Aldrich (1980) adds a seventh dimension - mutability/immutability, which he describes as "the extent to which the environment is open to manipulation and change
by means of organizational activities." Aldrich ascertains that this dimension is unique in that "... other dimensions carry the implication that the environment is doing something to the organization, whereas this dimension calls our attention to the fact that a great deal of organizational activity is directed toward changing certain aspects of the environment, of doing something (Aldrich's emphasis) to the environment." (pp. 61-62)

Aldrich stresses that environmental dimensions should be treated as continuums as opposed to a dichotomies. In other words the dimensions are not black or white, but are usually somewhere in between.

"Task environment" constitutes another important environmental concept (Mulford and Rogers 1982, p. 10). Task environments or domains are the specific entities, individuals, organizations and/or groups with whom the organization's members interact; come into contact with; directly affect, or are directly affected by. Regulating agencies, customers, suppliers, trade associations and competitors are just a few of the many entities found in an organization's task environment. When other organizations agree with the specific tasks an organization has claimed for its self there is said to be "domain consensus" (Mulford and Rogers 1982). Katz and Kahn (1978), although they do not refer to it as "domain consensus" described the same process; "The first impact of the environment is direct feedback of a
positive or negative kind regarding support for an organization's major function." (p. 131)

**Intraorganizational versus Interorganizational**

The study of "interorganizational" relations is frequently confused with the field of "intraorganizational relations." Despite the similarities such as shared interdependence and the quest for autonomy there are two primary differences between the respective disciplines:

"Interorganizational analyses suggest two important facets of analysis which differ somewhat from intraorganizational: (1) the operation of social behavior under conditions of partial conflict and (2) the stress on factors which derive equally from all units of interaction rather than being differentially weighted by authority structure" (Litwak and Hylton 1980 p. 270).

Litwak and Hylton's first assertion is that within a single organization (intraorganizational) the presence of continual conflict usually indicates a certain amount of inefficiency in the organization. Continual conflict in an organization can lead to a reduction in efficiency and even to its ultimate destruction; therefore attempts are made by organizational administrators to reduce conflict between members and units as much as possible. In contrast conflict within the interorganizational system is typical and is usually encouraged. Conflicts in an interorganizational system over how a product is to be designed or a service delivered are the basis for interorganizational competition.
Competition in turn provides customer and/or service recipients with choice as the various organizations compete for the customer. When competition is present it fosters innovation and the ongoing design and improvement of new products and services.

Litwak and Hylton in their second assertion regarding the difference between inter and intraorganizational are referring to the differing amount of centralized control which is found in the two types of systems. In an intraorganizational system there is an ultimate authority structure; a board of directors, chief executive officer or other administrative entity which coordinates the activities of the various organizational units in an effort to achieve organizations' goals. In contrast, interorganizational systems rarely have a single administrative structure which coordinates the ongoing activities of the system's member organizations.

As organizations increase in size the line between the two types of systems can become somewhat vague. An example are the large multi-national organizations which have many and various subsidiaries. These various corporate divisions often have varying and nondependent goals making a distinction between the two unclear and arbitrary (Aldrich, 1979b, p. 24).

Although there are substantial differences between the two areas of study there are also strong similarities.
These similarities between the two becomes especially evident when the focus of intraorganizational analysis is at the departmental or division interface. Interorganizational research on issues such as interdependence, exchange, cooperation and coordination also has much to offer to the intraorganizational scholar. Cheng's (1984) work on cooperation is an example of intraorganizational work that is relevant to interorganizational studies.

**Interorganizational Coordination and Interdependence**

One of the most frequently studied organizational activities by interorganizational scholars is coordination (Aiken, Dewar, DiTomaso, Hage and Zeitz 1975; Aldrich 1976; Chisholm 1989; Davidson 1986; Galaskiewicz 1985; Litwak and Hylton 1966; Mulford and Rogers 1982; Redburn 1977).

A work which discusses coordination in the context of decision making is *The Intelligence of Democracy* (1965), written by the noted economist and political scientist Charles E. Lindblom. Lindblom (1965) offers the following definition:

"A set of interdependent decisions is coordinated if each decision is adapted to the others in such a way that for each adjusted decision, the adjustment is thought to be better than no adjustment in the eyes of at least one decision maker." (p. 22)

Interorganizational coordination according to Mulford and Rogers (1982) is "the process whereby two or more organizations create and/or use existing decision rules that have been established to deal collectively with their shared task
environment." (p. 12) Davidson (1976) offers a definition specific to social service organizations: "Coordination may occur in planning and in the delivery of services. In planning it is the process by which two or more organizations make decisions together. In the delivery of social services it is the integration of the activities of two or more organizations." (p. 118)

Critical to a definition of coordination is the concept of interdependence (Thompson 1967). Thompson's landmark, albeit brief discussion of interdependence (1967) is helpful in understanding the concept of interdependence. Although he was referring to intraorganizational activities, the concept is useful in understanding interdependence between organizations as well. Organizations (and I would add organizational systems) according to Thompson, are composed of interdependent parts, though this does not necessarily mean they are dependent upon each other. State government exemplifies this concept in action. In a state system the veterans department and the state police do not typically interact with each other, yet they are both members of a larger organizational system in this case state government. If one of the two agencies develops a public relations problem the other may also be impacted by association. Both of the two organizations are contributors to the overall image of the state and if one is damaged the view of all organizations in the system is potentially damaged to a
certain degree. Thompson has termed this type of interdependence as "pooled".

Thompson's second type of interdependence, termed serial or "sequential", is characterized by multiple organizations contributing to a process one after another. To return to the state model, when federal discretionary job training dollars are awarded to the state employment service the agency cannot access the resources until the state legislature formally appropriates the money to the employment service.

The third and final type of interdependence Thompson discusses is referred to as reciprocal; it involves entities which produce or provide inputs and outputs for each other. For example, a state job training office's annual report to the legislature may in turn be used by the legislature in the formulation and development of the legislature's appropriation bill for the job training agencies operating capital for the following biennium.

The level of difficulty required to coordinate Thompson's three types of interdependence parallel the above order of discussion. "Pooled" is the easiest, serial the next most difficult and reciprocal the hardest of the three types of interdependencies to coordinate.

Coordination Defined

Building on the previously mentioned definitions and
the discussion on the importance of interdependence it would seem that a working definition of coordination should recognize and incorporate the following at a minimum:

(1) Recognition that in many cases resources for goal attainment must come from the organization's external environment. Most all organizations must import some resources from the environment in order to produce or sell their product or service.

(2) Coordination is characterized by joint decision making and developed rules which are typically agreed upon before the actual exchange(s) occurs. In other words the respective organizations' administrators typically negotiate exchange rules and formalize the relationship either by affirmation or a written agreement.

(3) Coordination may occur at all levels but is typically initiated at the administrative level.

(4) Some level of interdependence must be present in order for coordination to occur. If members of the organizations involved do not perceive a relationship between the attainment of their goals with that of the other organizations involved little if any coordination is likely to occur.

(5) All coordination is not based upon an immediate and/or equal exchange but in the event there is not equal exchange their is an implicit if not an explicit agreement that the debt will be paid at a later date. Depending on the degree of formalization the future "debt" may or not be identified.

Based on the above criteria I would offer the following definition of coordination:

"Members of organizations, typically administrators who are part of an interdependent, multi-organizational domain, in an attempt to maximize their potential for goal attainment will enter into varying degrees of formal and/or informal agreements with other organizations and/or its individual members to develop standardized reciprocal mechanisms and systems which will assist the parties to fulfill their organization's goal requirements either immediately or in the future."
In other words, organizational members in their attempt to make a profit, produce a product, deliver a service or reach other kinds of organizational goals will enter into various exchange relationships with external parties to obtain necessary resources. In exchange for the needed resources, organizations exchange other commodities with the external organizations. Resources include such things as raw materials, information, political legitimacy, funds and/or the direct or implied promise to provide resources in the future. Typically, specific policies for exchanges are established in particular those which occur frequently.

Exchange and Other Explanations for Coordination

As mentioned in the above definition, coordination is dependent upon an "exchange" of resource between two or more organizations. Exchange theory posits that organizations are dependent upon one another for various resources that are unavailable internally and as a result must be imported from other organizations. Exchanges can either be equal or unequal depending on the amount of resources exchanged and the amount of interdependence found in the relationship.

An example of an equal exchange between two social service organizations, can be explained using the referral process of clients between two agencies, Organizations A and B. If A is dependent upon B for the referral of clients, and B is dependent upon A as an entity to refer its clients
to for additional services, which B can not provide, we would say the relationship is equal. Organization A's needs are met because it needs clients, and Organization B's needs are met because it needs to send its clients to organizations which can provide services Organization B is unable to offer. In essence, the two organizations are dependent upon each other for survival (Guetzkow 1966). In other words; the two agencies are interdependent.

In the above example, if Organization B had other outlets for its clients, then it could be said that a power dependence relationship or unequal exchange exists between the two, with Organization B being the more powerful of the two, since A is solely dependent upon B for a critical external resource - clients.

Mulford and Rogers (1982) strongly intimate that coordination is not the same as resource exchange as defined by Levine and White. Levine and White (1961) define resource exchange as: "... any voluntary activity between two organizations which has consequences, actual or anticipated, for the realization of their respective goals or objectives." (p. 259) Mulford and Rogers exception seems to be two-fold; first a concern that "resources" are only one of four elements which can be exchanged and secondly that all resource exchanges must be "voluntary."

Exchange based on Levine and White's definition does not appear to be synonymous with coordination since, accord-
ing to their definition, all exchange is voluntary. However, the problem appears to be with the definition set forth by Levine and White, not with the concept of exchange per se'.

There are countless incidences of organizations who are unwillingly forced to seek resources from a single source in order for their organization to survive. For example, organizations typically must secure appropriate permits, (i.e., political legitimacy - a resource) from regulatory organizations in order to operate. Failure to do so can result in a cessation of production and ultimate death of the organization. In the previous chapter, the requirement by state employment division offices to secure sign off from the local JTPA private industry council was discussed. Sometimes the JTPA organization may request some service or resource in exchange for its sign off, resulting in an exchange of resources. An unequal exchange, but an exchange none the less. Many organizational scholars have come to the conclusion that organizational leaders typically resist any attempts which constraint their organizations autonomy, but in this case does the employment agency have a choice in refusing the constraints offered by the exchange? The answer is "no", not if they want to be in compliance with the law and receive funds for operation.

All coordination exchanges are for resources of some kind, whether they are traditional resources i.e.; capital,
clients, etc. or not so traditional resources such as authority or political legitimacy.

Consequently, Mulford and Rogers' statement that resources are only one of four dimensions of coordination seems incorrect. Mulford and Rogers offer four elements of coordination based on the work of Aiken and his associates (1975). Specifically, the four elements of coordination mentioned are:

(1) Securing resources and funding
(2) Programs
(3) Clients and recipients
(4) Information

Although the above schema is an illustrative taxonomy for understanding and classifying different types of coordination elements, they are all clearly resources. Aldrich's (1980 p. 52) comments on Yuchtman and Seashores' definition and his own categorization of "resources" supports this claim:

"A general definition of resources is "the generalized means, or facilities, that are potentially controllable by social organizations, and that are potentially usable - however indirectly - in relationships between the organization and its environment" (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967:900)." . . this definition does not limit the concept of resource to physical or economic objects or states; hence information can be a resource. . . I have found it useful to think of four types of resources: (1) personnel; (2) information; (3) products and services; (4) operating funds, including accumulations of capital."

Benson's definition of "resources" (1980 p. 351) is quite similar to Aldrich's and Yuchtman and Seashore's with one
addition; he also cites authority as a resource.

Closely related to exchange theory, is the concept of functionalism (Weiss 1987), whereby organizations will participate in a given exchange relation only as long as it serves a critical need. In situations where coordination is mandated, and where the required coordination activity offers little or no real benefit to the organizations involved and not monitored by the mandating agency, little if any coordination will occur (O'Toole & Montjoy 1984).

Still another reason why organizations coordinate is called "homophily" (Lincoln and McBride 1985). Homophilic coordination based relationships are characterized by organizations whose respective members have a strong mutual alliance with each other due to similarities in the organizations and members' goals and/or operating philosophies.

Private rehabilitation organizations (PROs) in the State of Oregon offer an example of homophilic coordination activities. Many PROs in the state share a strong, similar, operating belief that worker compensation rehabilitation services should be provided by private for profit organizations as opposed to the state. To speak with a strong unified voice the PROs have formed their own professional organization dedicated to lobbying the legislature and the state agency which oversees worker compensation programs in Oregon in an attempt to retain as much autonomy for the PROs as possible.
Cooperation

Coordination is frequently confused with the term cooperation. Aiken and Haige (1972), for example, do not differentiate at all between coordination and cooperation. Their description lumps both processes under the term "cooperative activities" and even go so far as to include the operation of joint programs by multiple organizations within the "cooperative" framework.

Weiss (1987) also uses the "cooperative activities" label. She offers the following reasons which motivate organizational administrators to participate in "cooperative activities":

"a calculation that additional net resources will flow from the cooperation, the professional norms and values of agency staff about cooperation with outside agencies, the search for political advantage over other agencies, the need to ameliorate internal problems of the organization or effectiveness, . . . . and a legal requirement to coordinate." (p. 95)

Gray (1985) combines the two activities under a slightly different label, that of "collaboration". Gray defines collaboration as follows:

"(1) The pooling of appreciations and/or tangible resources, e.g., information, money, labor, etc., (2) by two or more stakeholders, (3) to solve a set of problems which neither can solve individually." (p. 912)

Despite these claims there is a difference between coordination and cooperation. Mulford and Rogers (1982) indicate that although cooperation is similar to coordi-
nation it is never the less a different process; "cooperation is more likely to be characterized by informal trade
offs and by attempts to establish some reciprocity in the
reviewing the cooperation and coordination literature
offered the following:

"It has been shown that cooperation and coordi-
nation differ in terms of the presence of decision
rules, degree of formalization present, kinds of
goals emphasized, amount of resources involved,
primary actors, relative threat to autonomy and
implication for vertical and horizontal ties." (p. 12)

Interorganizational cooperation can occur at all
levels, but most often occurs at the line staff level, and
is characterized as an exchange of favors that occurs
between members (actors) of different organizations.
Frequently the favor is not repaid immediately, but the
favor granting actor assumes that at some future date a
similar favor will be returned. Cooperation, unlike coordi-
nation, has no formalized rules regarding exchange. Actors,
however, typically negotiate informal rules which vary,
depending on the situation. Both coordination and cooper-
ation can occur either between two organizations, (a dyad)
or between several organizations (a network), in a given
organizational set or sector.

The major differences between cooperation and coordi-
nation are as follows; coordination is characterized by
joint decision making, formalized rules and tends to have
more substantial impacts on the operation of the agency's involved. Coordination typically requires substantial amounts of resources and/or commitments and is usually initiated at the administrative level. In contrast, cooperation is an informal exchange, usually amongst individual actors, with information the most frequent resource exchanged. Other than implied reciprocity, there are few if any established rules, however over time some standardization between individual actors may evolve. There are typically, few if any agency resources committed, however, in illegitimate coordination, individual actors may sometimes may violate their organization's rules, sometimes even risking their jobs in order to cooperate.

Coordination and Cooperation Models

Coordination according to Mulford and Rogers falls into two general categories; managed and unmanaged (1982). Unmanaged coordination exists fairly randomly with little attention or intention by the parties involved. Mulford and Roger's offer the market place as an example of unmanaged coordination. In comparison, managed coordination is the process whereby the actors involved purposely attempt to engage in the development of coordinated strategies (Mulford and Rogers 1982).

Mulford and Rogers (1982) describe three hierarchial types of managed coordination. First, is "mutual adjustment
strategy," which generally occurs between professional staff members. It is based on informal negotiated rules with the ultimate goals designed to provide a positive outcome for the organizations, actors and/or clients involved. The coordination focus in mutual adjustment is on specific clients or groups of clients and/or the individual agencies involved, with power in the relationship typically remaining at the line staff level.

The next level of coordination in Mulford and Rogers' schema are "alliance strategies" and focus on the agency and/or the interagency system, involving either line staff or administrators. Alliance strategies feature a much greater degree of formality and a highly centralized power focus, in comparison to mutual adjustment strategies. The amount of resources committed to alliance coordination strategies, as well as the amount of regulations and rules, are also much higher than found in the mutual adjustment strategies.

The final level in Mulford and Roger's model is termed "corporate strategy." In comparison to the other two levels, corporate strategies are much more formalized and hierarchial in nature. This is especially true, with regard to rules, the actors involved and the focus of the coordination relationship. Resource commitments are typically high, with a major thrust being the development of collective goals, which will positively affect the entire service
Stephen Davidson (1976) offers an alternative system of categorizing coordination/cooperation relationships. Like Mulford and Roger's model, Davidson's is also hierarchical in nature ranging from "communication" to "mergers".

Davidson's model is both evolutionary and cyclical. He posits that organizational relationships may start at any level and proceed up the hierarchical strata to the highest level. According to Davidson, the primary resource exchange at the communication level involves information regarding the organizations and/or their environments. This "communication" often leads to discussions of "working together" on projects leading to the next level, which Davidson calls "cooperation." He characterizes cooperation as working on relatively small joint tasks with few if any rules. As cooperation begins to take on a more formalized nature, developing agreed upon rules, it proceeds to the next level called "confederation." Confederation is still relatively informal and has only vague goals or objectives. Organizations at the confederation level, whether in networks or dyadic relations, are not sanctioned or regulated by external entities for their failure to coordinate.

As the actors begin to agree upon specific rules, roles, and goals, and the parties develop a formalized structure to achieve these goals, the relationship becomes a "federation." Crucial to the definition of federation is
that the respective organizations must be willing to give up a certain amount of their own autonomy for the sake of the relationship.

The highest level relationship between two organizations in Davidson's model, is the "merger." In mergers, the organizations are willing to shed their own autonomy in order to create a new organization.

As the new organization is formed, the process begins again, with the new entity developing new ties with other organizations. The newly created relationships with other organizations may evolve to the point where the entity merges with still another organization, and the cycle has come full circle.

Davidson specifies that "substantive coordination" primarily occurs in the levels found from cooperation to federation. He further states that the process can devolve through the various levels as well. For example, an organization could spin off of another organization and gradually decrease its relationship with the parent organization to one of communication.

I favor Davidson's taxonomy over Mulford and Roger's for two reasons: one, he links cooperation with coordination, yet still differentiates between the two. Secondly, he places the processes within a hierarchial and cyclical framework. This strata recognizes that the process of coordination and/or cooperation are rarely static, but
instead are usually in a state of flux, continually modified and affected by the changing needs and requirements of the organizations and their members, as well as the environment.

Dimensional Impacts on Coordination

As mentioned earlier, dimensions of coordination include such things as the object of coordination; the individuals or actors involved; the degree of formalization; the concentration of power within the coordination relationship; the focus of control; and the goals of the relationship and/or exchange (Mulford and Rogers 1982). Still, another key attribute of coordinated relationships is the amount of resources each organization commits to the coordination process.

At lower levels of coordination where the focus is typically on individual clients, the issues are fairly clear cut and simple, however as the focus moves upward to higher and broader goals, the issues become more complex. As the focus escalates to include an entire delivery system, such as the mental health or employment and training systems of a state or large municipality it will involve many more environmental factors which can severely impact the outcome and nature of the coordination process. When one is attempting to coordinate an entire delivery system, many more actors become involved with the process including representatives of client groups, demand groups such as advisory boards,
legislative and/or administrative groups (Benson 1982). These groups most likely have their own individual agendas and expectations which must be dealt with and attended to.

Individual actors can greatly impact the outcome of a coordination attempt. Davidson, (1976) for example, found in his study of six organizations involved in the delivery of protection services for the aged, that leadership has a substantial impact on the quality and amount of coordination existing between organizations. He determined that the presence of actors with strong leadership skills greatly reduced the amount of time it took the organizations to accomplish their coordination goals.

By definition, much of coordination focuses on the relationship between organizations. Ultimately, however, it is the individuals involved, complete with their unique interpersonal talents and liabilities, who are responsible for developing and carrying out coordination efforts. The previous interpersonal interactions and experiences of the actors involved can greatly affect the outcomes of coordination (Davidson 1976; Rogers and Whetten 1982).

This author was associated with a social service organization, which was formed by the merging of several smaller organizations. Many of the administrative actors of the smaller organizations had attended graduate school together and shared similar personal and professional values. Certainly, there were other environmental considerations for
the merger, but undoubtedly, their previous relationships impacted their willingness to cooperate and coordinate with one another, with the merger being the final outcome of their initial cooperation.

High levels of formalization occur when similar exchanges are repeated on a regular basis. This affects coordination in such areas as the amount of latitude individual actors have and the frequency of interactions. For example, Aldrich (1976) in his study of employment and training organizations in New York, found that as organizations increase the routinization of their referral process there is a negative affect on the amount of case by case interaction. In other words, individual cases receive less attention from staff members when there is a highly formalized coordination process than in a less formal environment.

Greater formalization and routinization of exchanges are found in highly centralized, coordinated relationships. In contrast, few if any rules regarding interactions are found in informal relationships. A lack of rules typically indicates that the focus will be on areas such as individual clients or actors, which usually have little impact on the overall well being of the organizations and systems involved.

Another important dimension, resource commitment has been found to have a high correlation with regard to the effectiveness of coordination activities. The greater the
amount of resources committed, especially in the planning and implementation stages, the greater the chances of a successful coordination activity being carried out (O'Toole and Montjoy 1984). As mentioned earlier, resource investment is directly related to the type of coordination strategy implemented. In mutual adjustment there is little if any resource commitment - in contrast to corporate strategy, where there is a much greater resource commitment by individual organizations.

Closing Literature Thoughts

From case workers advocating for their individual client's needs to high level administrators and agency heads attempting to secure legitimacy and minimize political interference, attempts at interagency coordination can be found at all organizational levels, in both public and private human services organizations on a daily basis. This chapter has addressed some of the more pressing cooperation and coordination themes and issues affecting social service organizations' as they interact with other agencies in their search for needed resources. Although the focus of this chapter has been primarily been on the coordination of human services, the basic theories and premises hold true for other organizational sets as well.

Specific areas covered in this chapter included: an overview of the field of interorganizational analysis; the
relevance of the environment to organizations; the relationship between interdependence and coordination; a discussion of the definitions of cooperation and coordination; exchange as relationships as a basis for coordination; various coordination models and lastly a review of selected dimensional impacts on coordination.

In addition to serving as the theoretical underpinning of the author's research efforts it has also been designed to examine pertinent existing themes as well as offering some new insights on the phenomenon. The field of interorganizational relations in general and coordination specifically, are relatively new and emerging disciplines which are continually maturing and evolving. The potential is exciting and timely; for as human services allocations continually shrink, while at the same time new and increasing demands are placed upon social service delivery systems, the importance of new coordination research efforts takes on an even greater significance.
METHODOLOGY

In order to obtain information on the current status of relations between Employment Service (ES) offices and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) organizations a direct survey instrument was developed (See Appendix B). The forty-four item instrument featured open-ended, multiple choice and dichotomous questions.

The Survey

Although ES and JTPA organizations have many similarities, it was necessary to compensate for the differing occupations, organizational structures and terminologies which exist between the two types of organizations. Consequently, two slightly different questionnaires were developed; one was developed for ES respondents and one for the JTPA population group. Doing so also established clarity for respondents when the instrument referred to the comparing agency. As a result ES respondents were asked to rate the overall relationship with their local "Job Training Partnership organization", while JTPA respondents considered their relationship with the "local Employment Division office." It seemed that the affect of these differences on the survey outcomes were negligible, if any at all.

A variety of scaling questions were used in the construction of the instrument. The most prevalent type used
featured itemized rankings. Likert and rank-ordered scales were also utilized in several of the questions. To check the validity and reliability of the overall data some of the same issues were addressed in different questions.

Pretesting

Informal, limited pretesting was done with respondents who had current or previous affiliations with the two types of sample groups but would not be part of the actual research population. Pretest participants included both management and non management staff who had an affiliation with the two types of organizations in the sample.

Validity and Reliability

Given the potential volatility of the subject matter special attention was given to the design and placement of questions in an attempt to reduce the perceived threat level to respondents.

During the data analysis phase of the project two instances of potential question bias were discovered. In the first incident, the order of two questions; one regarding competition for resources and the other concerning barriers to working closer, had been inadvertently reversed in the ES and JTPA questionnaires. The second incident was also found in the "competition" question where the order of two items had accidentally been reversed for the two dif-
ferent population groups. The effect on the responses to the questions involved is thought to be minimal.

The Sample

The 193 person sample was comprised of 101 ES staff and 92 JTPA personnel. The sample was selected from the personnel of one ES and one JTPA office in one specific community in each of the five urban Oregon JTPA service delivery areas (SDAs). Due to its large geographic service delivery area, three communities were also selected from Oregon's balance of state, 27 county SDA. The eight communities were chosen using the following criteria:

(1) In order to assess the level of coordination throughout the state at least one community pair from the largest community (to allow for a larger sample size) from each of the six SDAs in Oregon was selected.

(2) To develop as wide of a cross sample as possible and also compensate for any geographical differences, communities were selected from as many regions of the state as possible.

(3) A mix of both rural and urban communities to ensure that the sample accurately represents the diversity of communities found in the state.

Agency pairs were selected from Bend, Coos Bay, Eugene,

‘JTPA services in the five urban SDAs are administered and delivered by five separate organizations. Services in the rural SDA are administered by a single administrative agency and delivered by nine subcontractors each of which provides full services in one of nine service districts.
Initially I had planned only to survey individuals who had direct contact with the other organization's staff members. After discussions with several ES and JTPA staff I learned that in many cases despite little if any contact with the other organization's staff members, personnel frequently refer clients and/or employers to the other agency for services. As a result the sample evolved to include all staff who were members of management or had contact with

5In order to protect the anonymity of the respondents, communities were arbitrarily assigned a number from one to eight for reference purposes.
clients and/or employers.° Increasing the size and breadth of the sample also eliminated the need for ES managers and JTPA Directors to select participants, thereby avoiding any management bias in the sample selection.

There were two notable exceptions to the described sample selection process. In one community the local ES Manager elected to limit the number of staff who would be allowed to participate in the project. The manager's explanation was that "personnel who had little or no contact with the JTPA organization" would not have any information to provide and also it would not be a productive use of their time. The manager further stated that the personnel who were participating "should give you a good sampling."

The second sampling deviation was due to the presence of the subcontracting of two programs by one of the JTPA organizations. In the community involved, two substantial components are subcontracted to two other organizations. Since staff of the two subcontractors who work with JTPA clients have a strong potential for contact with the ES office they (the staff) were also included in the sample.

Survey Administration

Letters were sent to the administrator of the

°There were two exceptions; clerical staff from both organizations and unemployment insurance adjudicators from ES were not included in the sample.
Employment Division and the Directors of each of the eight JTPA organizations involved requesting their participation in the research effort. All organizations contacted agreed to participate in the research. Local administrators were then contacted by phone to further discuss the project and/or answer any questions regarding the project and/or their organization's participation.

During the months of July and August of 1989 the questionnaires were distributed in individually addressed envelopes through each of the 16 organizations' internal mail systems. Each of the individual packets contained a copy of the survey, a pre-addressed, stamped return envelope and a cover letter explaining the project in general and the survey specifically.'

The return envelopes were included for respondents in order to protect their anonymity and the confidentiality of their answers from management staff in their organization. There were two organizations where management instructed respondents to return their questionnaires to a clerical staff person for a batch mailing of the surveys. In both cases it was stressed to me that respondents had been told that their completed surveys would not be reviewed by management. Judging by the frankness of the answers from the two groups affected it does not appear that this

'Copies of the instruction letters are in Appendix A.
impacted the responses.

The response rate was fairly high for the two populations overall as well as for the individual organizations. The ES response rate was 63.92% and for JTPA 74.19%. The overall response rate for the two samples combined was 68.44%. The organizational response rates for the two groups ranged from a low of 45.71% to a high of 92%.

Each of the returned surveys was given an individual identification number which specified population type (ES or JTPA), community of origin and an individual number. Individual responses were then entered into a computerized database program. After the data was entered all records were checked by hand against the computerized listing to detect possible data entry errors.

Data Analysis

Due to the nature of the data a limited amount of statistical analysis was done. Methods of analysis included frequency distributions, mean determination and weighted averaging and rank order.

Where appropriate simple frequency distributions were utilized to compare ES and JTPA responses. Some frequency distributions were also performed at the organization level to compare how different ES or JTPA organizations in a given community responded to a question.

With rank order questions, frequency distributions were
employed to determine the category respondents identified most frequently as being their number one choice. Frequency distributions also indicated the category cited most frequently regardless of ranking. Lastly, weighted averaging was used on rank order questions. This type of analysis measured the gross frequencies and also considered the ranking assigned by individuals to each of the items.

Where open-ended questions asked for a number or percentage the responses were averaged and compared at the system level (ES and JTPA). Open-ended questions requesting a non-numerical response were coded into discrete categories and then the distribution of frequencies was analyzed for trends at the system and/or organizational level.

In order to determine coordination and cooperation levels likert-type scales were used. First the distribution of responses for the two sample groups were analyzed to locate differences between ED and JTPA respondents. Next, respondent averages for the two respective groups were calculated and compared. A second level of averaged analysis utilized the individual responses of each community organization in order to determine two sets (ES and JTPA) of eight organizational averages. These averages were then ranked in comparison with the seven other ES or JTPA agencies to give a ranking of communities on specific issues for each system.

Lastly, several intra-system comparisons were made between like system (ES or JTPA) agencies using individual
organizational averages on several, single, questions. For example, how organizations ranked on the question regarding mutual goal attainment was compared to how they ranked in overall cooperation and coordination.
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This chapter will focus on some of the significant results, analysis and interpretation of data obtained from the ES/JTPA survey. The discussion will focus on seven major areas:

1. Respondent Demographics
2. Organizational and Individual Contacts
3. Client Contacts and Referrals
4. Employer Contacts and Referrals
5. Management Specific Issues
6. Coordination and Cooperation - All Respondents
7. Other Significant Relationship Issues

The 44 question survey instrument appears in Appendix A. Appendix B contains related graphs and charts.

Respondent Demographics

Demographic data gathered from the respondents included gender, age and years of education. The ratio of females to males was substantially different between the two types of organizations (See Table 1A). For ES respondents the ratio was about equal with 51 percent of the sample identifying themselves as female and 49 percent as males. In contrast, the JTPA gender ratio was 70 percent female to 30 percent male. The ES sample group was older than the JTPA respondents; 64 percent of the ES respondents were over 40 years of age in comparison to only 48 percent of the JTPA respondents who were over the age of 40 (See Table 2A). There was also a significant difference in the educational levels of
the two sample populations (See Table 3A). Just over 45 percent of the JTPA respondents had in excess of sixteen years of education in comparison to only 27.7 percent of the ES respondents.

The most likely explanation for the differences in gender ratios can be attributed to ES being a unionized, state agency. As a state organization, ES's women and minority levels are closely monitored by the federal government, the employees' union, various women and minority interest groups, the executive branch and the legislature. As a result of this scrutiny ES administrators have an ongoing effort to insure that appropriate affirmative action goals are met. In contrast, JTPA organizations' affirmative action levels, (with the exception of some urban programs) receive relatively little scrutiny from external groups.

The fact that many JTPA programs have a strong social service orientation, and women have long been the predominate gender employed in social service agencies, may explain why such a high percentage of women were found in the JTPA sample.

The reported disparity in educational levels between the two types of organizations is best explained by the differing occupations found in the two systems. JTPA agencies employ a large number of counselors and trainers (about 25%), whereas ES has not had these types of employees for several years. Since counselors and trainers are typically
college educated this would tend to increase the average JTPA education level. The JTPA sample also had more administrators. Administrators like counselors and trainers are more likely to have a college degree than other occupations, which would further increase the JTPA education level.

Demographic data also revealed type of occupation and length of service. As mentioned earlier a greater percentage of the JTPA individuals identified themselves as management and/or administrative types than did the ES sample group (See Table 4A). Of the JTPA respondents who answered the question, 36 percent indicated they were management or administrative staff. In comparison, 21 percent of the ES group identified themselves as management and/or administrative personnel. The difference found in the amounts of management and/or administrative staff between the two systems may be artificial. ES "administrative staff" such as planners, analysts and grant writers are stationed in the Employment Service's Central Office in Salem. Since they rarely have contact with local JTPA staff they were not included in the survey. In contrast, individual local JTPA agencies have their own "administrative staffs", who often have contact with local ES employees and as a result were

The 36% includes 8% who were directors and 28% who were other miscellaneous management staff. Of the 21% ES management group 8% were managers and the other 13% were other miscellaneous management staff.
Length of service was substantially longer for ES staff than for JTPA (See Table 5A). JTPA respondents were also asked to count their time working in CETA programs, the JTPA predecessor. Since the Employment Service was authorized by federal statute in 1933 and the CETA/JTPA organizations have only operated employment and training programs since the 1970s, ES respondents collectively and individually generally have more years of service. The average number of work years for ES staff was 10.64 and for JTPA staff 7.56. The longest ES and JTPA tenures were 34 and 16 years respectively. One could also attribute the higher average age of ES respondents to the ES organizations longer existence.

Organizational and Individual Contacts

Initially, I assumed that the object of most staff communication between the two types of organizations would concern placement issues. To the contrary, not all or even the majority of communication revolved around predictable.

9A The Oregon Consortium (TOC) JTPA subcontractors involved in the sample have their own local "administrative staff" in addition to the 15 "administrative staff" at TOC. TOC employees, however, were not included in the sample.

10Most JTPA organizations in Oregon also delivered services funded by JTPA's predecessor - the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).
placement issues such as employers or job orders. Nor were communication linkages limited to just managers or placement staff. Contacts crossed virtually all occupational lines and hierarchial levels.

A large majority of both groups indicated they had some contact with the other organization. However, there was a substantial difference found when the two groups were asked to compare their contact in comparison to the amount they have with other community organizations (See Table 6A).

The local JTPA organization was identified by the largest number of ES staff (39 percent) as the agency they had the most contact with. 84 percent of the ES group indicated they had some contact with the local JTPA organization.

In contrast, JTPA staff members cited the local ES office as the third most frequent organization they have contact within their respective communities with 20.2 percent of the JTPA staff citing the ES office as the organization they have the most frequent contact with. However, 97.75 percent of the JTPA population indicated they had some contact with the local office of the Oregon Employment Service.

The organization which was cited most often by JTPA staff as the one with which they have the most frequent contact with was local office of Oregon's welfare organi-
This is not surprising since JTPA organizations are required to serve a certain level of AFS clients. The data are further explained by noting that in six of the eight communities, the local JTPA organizations are under contract with AFS to provide special training services for AFS client levels over and above their usual service levels for AFS clients.

Some surprises were found regarding the types of occupational interactions between the two organizations (See Tables 7A & 7B). For example, 29.9 percent of the ES respondents identified JTPA intake and eligibility staff as the occupational type with whom they have the most frequent contact, followed by JTPA management at 25.4 percent. The category of job development and marketing staff ranked third with 22.4 percent of ES staff indicating they had their most frequent contact with this type of employee.

Not only did the largest group of ES respondents cite intake and assessment occupations as the most frequent contact group, it was also cited the most often as the occupation with which they had "some contact". ¹²

¹²Respondents were asked two different questions regarding occupational contact. One inquiry asked respondents to identify the occupations from the counter organization with which they had contact with ("some contact with"). The other question asked them to rank the amount of contact they had with the different occupations ("most contact").
Approximately 45 percent of ES staff indicated some contact with intake and assessment staff, a little over 38 percent indicated some contact with job development/marketing staff, and just over 30 percent indicated they had some contact with ES management employees.

"Placement staff" was cited by 50 percent of the JTPA respondents as the occupation they had the most contact with, followed by "management" at 31.3 percent. Slightly more than 64 percent of the JTPA respondents indicated some communication with placement staff and 48.8 percent reported some dealings with ES management.

Frequent interactions between ES and JTPA employees involved in placement activities should be expected; communication was cited with placement staff by 38.4% of ES and 64.4% of JTPA staff respectively (See Table 8A). However, the amount of apparent contact cited by ES staff (44.6%) between themselves and JTPA intake and assessment staff is surprising. If ES organizational members frequently refer clients to JTPA this would explain the ES/JTPA intake connection, however, the survey results indicate that most ES staff seldom if ever refer clients to JTPA.

Both groups noted "Discuss ways to coordinate services" as their most frequent reason for contact, followed by "client problems". Employer related reasons were seldom mentioned as the number one reason for contact by either group.
Only 3.1 percent of ES staff and 10 percent of the JTPA respondents indicated their primary reason for contact was to "exchange job orders." Although 86.9 percent of ES staff and 56.7 percent of JTPA agency members indicated they have contact with employers, it is not known how many of these individuals would actually be in a position to exchange employer job orders with members of other organizations. A separate question determined that slightly less than 87 percent of ES staff and a little less than 57 percent of JTPA staff have contact with employers in need of placement assistance. Twenty-three percent of the ES staff and 55 percent of JTPA staff who work with employers needing placement assistance, exchange job orders.

The majority of respondents from both systems indicated contact initiation was about equally split between the two groups (See Table 9A). Surprisingly, however, none of the JTPA and only 10.1 percent of ES staff indicated that members from the other organization usually initiated contact. Since a large percentage of both groups, 27.5 percent of the ES and 41.2 percent of the JTPA respondents indicated they usually initiated the contact these figures would appear to be less than accurate reflection of what actually happens. The most likely explanation for this is that when individuals are asked to compare their behavior with that of others they frequently view their own in a more positive light.
Client Contacts and Referrals

The following section deals with the level of client contact and the frequency of referral reciprocity between the two kinds of organizations. The amount of staff in the two types of organizations who indicated having direct contact with program participants (applicants as opposed to employers) was equivalent with 73 percent of the ES staff and 72.8 percent of the JTPA respondents indicating client contact (See Table 10A).

The differing missions and eligibility guidelines of the two organizations suggest that the ES offices would have more contact with a greater number of clients than local JTPA organizations. Data support this contention with close to 52 percent of the ES staff versus nine percent of the JTPA respondents reporting that on average they see more than 25 new clients per week.

ES respondents indicated that a little over 33 percent of the new clients seen in a given week are probably appropriate for JTPA services (See Table 11A). Several ES respondents volunteered that they had no way of knowing whether clients were appropriate for JTPA services and elected not to answer the question. In comparison, 49 percent of the new clients seen by JTPA respondents in a given week were said to be appropriate for ES services.

The average rate of referral of appropriate clients to
the other organization was extremely low for both organizations (See Table 11A). ES staff indicated that on average only 21.7 percent of clients who they considered to be appropriate for JTPA service were actually referred to the JTPA organization. The average referral rate of appropriate clients by JTPA staff was 33.5 percentage.

These differences regarding the determination of client appropriateness and referral rates can be attributable to a variety of differences between the organizations, such as eligibility requirements, client assessment levels, target populations, and numbers served. The lower ES appropriateness determination level may be due to the complex and often confusing JTPA eligibility requirements, which many ES staff may not fully understand. Still another explanation for the lower ES level may be that ES staff members must not only determine the client's job training needs but also estimate the clients income status, both of which takes time. Given the large number of applicants ES staff see in a given week, there seems inadequate time for staff to make accurate income estimations, if any at all. Even if there is time, ES staff appear to have limited knowledge regarding the specific services offered by JTPA programs, and consequently insufficient information to judge if the client would benefit from or even qualify for JTPA services. Rather than "guess" at eligibility or appropriateness for services and risk referring clients who are not eligible or appropriate
for JTPA services, ES staff may elect not to refer at all. In contrast, when JTPA staff refer clients to ES for placement services, the staff persons' primary criterion is whether or not the client will be able to compete at a reasonable level for jobs which are listed with the employment office. And since assessment is an integral part of the JTPA process, JTPA personnel will likely have fairly reliable information on the client's job readiness, useful to determine whether or not the client will benefit or not from the referral.

A definitive explanation as to why both organizations refer such relatively low numbers of individuals is unclear. Possibly staff members feel that although the client is appropriate for the other organization their own organization will be able to adequately serve the client's needs. Furthermore, in relatively good economic times, low unemployment levels may create difficulty in filling job orders. Both types of organizations' effectiveness and in some cases even their funding levels are partially measured by the amount and quality of placements. Therefore staff members, not surprisingly, may be hesitant to encourage clients with high prospects of placement to the other agency for service.

This analysis warrants a caveat. There may have been some differences of interpretation between respondents as to what constitutes a referral. For example, some respondents from both ES and JTPA organizations indicated that all
participants receive a handout describing other employment and training resources in their community. To some of the respondents this action equated to a 100 percent referral rate. Although one could technically call this a referral it is substantially different than a staff person verbally explaining and/or encouraging a client to explore the opportunities available at another organization or agency. As a result, the actual referral figures may be even lower than reported here.

**Employer Contacts and Referrals**

86.9 percent of the ES personnel reported having direct contact with employers in comparison to 56.7 percent of the JTPA population (See Table 12A). This reflects the greater amount of occupational stratification typically found in JTPA organizations in comparison to ES offices. Towards the end of CETA and during the early transition to JTPA most staff (JTPA) were generalists, with each staff member providing employability and placement counseling to clients. In an attempt to meet the more stringent placement emphasis of JTPA many agencies' staff became highly specialized, with some providing only job readiness counseling, others dealing only with job ready clients and some who only marketed services to employers and/or solicited job orders.

One of the more surprising factors in the area of employer relations was the tremendous lack of coordination
which appears to exist between the two systems and employers in the local communities studied (See Table 13A). 77.3 percent of the ES staff who have contact with employers indicated for example that they referred employers to the local JTPA organization less than 10 percent of the time when they were unable to fill an employer's job order. Fewer than 10 percent of the ES staff indicated they referred employers 100 percent of the time. JTPA staff reported a higher level of referral when faced with the same circumstance, although it was still relatively low. 48 percent of the JTPA respondents indicated they referred employers more than 50 percent of the time, and 34 percent reported that they always refer employers to the local ES office.

The concept of domain consensus may explain the low employer referral rate to JTPA agencies by ES staff. Domain consensus refers to the relative amount of agreement found amongst agency members in an organizational about which agency or agencies are the legitimate providers of specific services. ES responses to this question reveal that some ES staff perceive little domain consensus regarding JTPA placement activities. ES respondents citing placement as a problem duplication was not the only support for this contention. ES staff members' accusation of JTPA's illegitimate involvement in placement activities was cited a number of times in several sections of the survey.
Over the years ES staff have worked diligently to acquire "sole source" referral agreements with many of the major employers in Oregon's communities and for a long time were successful in maintaining their exclusive claim and access to these employers and job orders. In the last decade, however, JTPA organizations in many communities have aggressively and successfully sought training and placement opportunities for their clients with many of the Employment Service's "sole source" employers. This has been accomplished by offering employers a variety of incentives which the Employment Service did not have the staff nor the resources to provide.

Many employer financial incentives have been utilized by JTPA organizations to entice employers to hire JTPA trainees. These incentives included On-the-Job and classroom training funds, assistance for employee (JTPA participants) equipment purchases as well as personnel services such as customized assessment programs, strength testing, advertising and the development of personnel manuals and job descriptions. Adding insult to local ES offices' injuries many JTPA organizations advertised their "training services" in the local media as a one-stop, full-fledged, placement service which could handle just about any employers needs. In essence, due to a greater amount of resource flexibility, JTPA organizations in many areas of the state were able to gain a large share of the Employment Service's traditional
placement market.

One explanation for the relatively low ES and JTPA employer referral rates may also be the fear of losing a valuable source of placements if the counter organization gains access to the employer. The difference in the referral rates between the two systems may be due in part to the "solve the employer's needs" marketing strategy used by some JTPA programs. This strategy is based on the JTPA employer relationship; as long as employer's needs are taken care of by JTPA (job orders filled), either directly by a JTPA applicant or indirectly by referring the employer to another organization which can fill the job order, the JTPA organization will retain the relationship with the employer. This philosophy came to be a part of the placement strategy of several JTPA organizations in the early eighties when many of them utilized the same marketing consultant to revamp their employer marketing strategies.

The last area of employer contact deals with how frequent ES and JTPA staff jointly visit employers to explain their respective services. Frequent and numerous joint employer visits are an indication of a relatively high level of coordination between the two and represents much more than just a "joint visit". First, the existence of joint visits infers there is a relative amount of task domain agreement between the two agencies (at least regarding employer services). Secondly, the presence of joint visits
is an indication of interdependence; with members of both agencies willing to put aside their own potential for placements in favor of long-term benefits for all of the parties concerned (the two agencies as well as the employer). Only 18 percent of the ES employees who call on employers indicated that they ever make joint employer visits with their JTPA counterparts. In comparison, 36 percent of the JTPA members who call on employers to explain services claimed they had made joint visits with ES staff members. The actual number of times respondents indicated having made joint visits was relatively small, with ES and JTPA staff reporting an average of 1.75 and 2.36 joint visits per year.

Anecdotal comments from respondents revealed that a large new employer opening is a likely scenario for joint visits. In smaller communities when a new industry considers locating in the town, local and state leaders typically marshal as many local resources as possible, including the facilities of both the local ES and JTPA organizations to attract the prospect. Regardless of the amount of domain consensus and/or interdependence found in the relationship they typically work together, rather than risk unwanted scrutiny and/or negative publicity.

Several issues not explored in this research deserve examination in the coordination of employer services. Matters such as the frequency of duplicated contact for job orders, the impact on employers' productivity rates and on
job seekers when one of the respective organizations fails to pass on job orders or training opportunities to the other organization, offer focuses for future research.

**Selected Management Specific Issues**

As mentioned in Chapter One, JTPA legislation amended the Wagner-Peyser Act, requiring private industry councils to approve the local ES office's yearly plan and each state's job training coordinating council to approve the state-wide plan. This presumably would force state employment division offices and JTPA service delivery organizations to coordinate their efforts at the local and state level.

In the survey ES and JTPA management staff disagreed slightly over the effectiveness of the required sign-off (See Table 14A). Using a Likert scale respondents were asked to respond to the following statement:

"The Wagner-Peyser Act requirement of approval of the Employment Service's yearly plan of service by the local Private Industry Council has significantly increased the amount of coordination and cooperation which exists between the two . . . ."

The scaling ranged from one, denoting "strongly disagree" to seven; "strongly agree". JTPA management respondents indicated that they slightly disagreed with an averaged response ($\bar{X}$) of 3.5. ES management staff on the other hand agreed slightly ($\bar{X} = 4.5$). Only two out of the seven JTPA Directors who answered the question agreed with the state-
ment (See Table 14B). Five ES managers agreed with the statement, two disagreed and one was neutral (See Table 14B).

Why is there a difference in how the two sets of managers and directors answered this question? The collective response of the ES managers would lend credence to the effectiveness of mandated coordination. It is their organization which has been affected the most, they are the ones who must submit the plan to the local PIC for approval. Why would leaders of an organization agree that a process has increase coordination, when the process has the potential to severely restrict their organization's autonomy and even prevent it from receiving operating funds?

ES managers and JTPA Directors are of course answering the questions in this survey based on their own experiential frame of reference as well as that of others. As mentioned earlier, in Oregon since the inception of JTPA every local plan has been approved. As a result, the PIC sign-off process although undoubtedly a time consuming experience for ES managers, has not limited adversely their organization's (ES) autonomy at all. The plan sign-off process in and of itself may be conceived legitimately by some ES managers as creating more coordination than existed previously. In other situations it may be used as a token way to document and verbalize coordination without actually having to enter into any interdependent activities. And in still other areas the process may have served as the impetus for ES
managers to work closer with their JTPA counterparts to develop mechanisms and launch projects which resulted in a more coordinated and effective local employment and training system.

Surprisingly, the relationship coordination levels in Communities Five and Eight were rated by JTPA staff as two of the highest in the sample, yet the two ES managers in those communities indicated that they disagreed strongly that the sign-off process resulted in increased coordination between their organization and the local JTPA agency.

Based on my own personal experience and conversations with numerous ES and JTPA staff I would conclude that coordination between the two systems has increased since the inception of the Wagner-Peyser review process. However, to attribute the increases in coordination between the two types of organizations solely to the review process is unsupported by any data found in this research. I would conclude that administrators who are actually creating, developing and participating in coordination activities with their ES and/or JTPA counterparts view coordination as much more than just a letter of agreement or memorandum of understanding between organizations' leaders or policy makers. Instead it is an ongoing, time consuming and resource demanding process which is far more than just written words.

A potential coordination mechanism in place to some degree in every service delivery area in the state, is the
various combinations of staff, employers and board members who serve on the others organizations' respective councils and committees. In some communities there are both interlocking and overlapping directorates. These connections should enhance the understanding and flow of communications between the two organizations given that the interlocking council and committee members should have a strong familiarity and understanding of both organizations. Although, the Employment Service does not have a board of directors per se', it does have Job Search Employer Committees which advise local offices regarding employer services. In Oregon, JTPA organizations have two different kinds of councils; private industry councils (PICs) and in The Oregon Consortium's districts, Local Business Advisory Councils (LBACs).¹³

In all but one of the eight communities surveyed, respondents indicated that each organization had a staff member on their counterpart agency's council or committee. Although none of the of the seven JTPA Directors who completed the survey serve on their local JSEC, seven of the eight JTPA organizations have a staff member who serves on the JSEC in their community. With the exception of

¹³The Oregon Consortium delivers services in Oregon's 27 rural counties through nine subcontractors in nine districts. To increase the amount of local control and participation each district has its own local committee which has local responsibilities similar to a PIC.
Community Six (the same community where the JTPA organization is not represented on the JSEC), ES managers serve on the LBAC and/or the PIC.  

The data indicates that these overlapping directorates may result in an increase in the perceived level of coordination and/or cooperation between the two organizations. In Community Six (the only organizational pair which does not have representatives on each others committee and council), ES respondents gave the relationship a lower overall coordination rating than did any other ES group. The Community Six JTPA coordination level was also rated extremely low by the JTPA respondents.  

Based on the survey data, ES and JTPA staff both appear to be fairly conscientious about their involvement with their counterpart organization's committee and council meetings. The frequency of attendance by counter staff members and their level of participation at council and committee meetings were described as "regularly" and "active" by all ES and JTPA managers and directors who participated in the research.

The existence of jointly operated and/or subcontracted

"Some LBAC members are also members of the Oregon Private Industry Council.

"Two questions were used to determine coordination levels; questions 28 and 39. The ED office in Community Six was ranked the lowest on both of the two questions. The Community Six JTPA agency's rankings for the two questions were 7 and 6 respectively for the two questions."
programs indicates a fairly high level of coordination within an organizational set (Davidson, 1976; Mulford and Rogers, 1982). There were several reported examples of both in the organizational pairs studied in six of the eight communities which have jointly operated programs.

In two communities, Four and Six, there was disagreement between ES and JTPA management staff as to whether or not there was joint operation of programs or not. The apparent dichotomy concerning joint operation of programs may have resulted from the way the question was phrased in the survey instrument. It asked only if respondents knew if their organization "operated any of its programs jointly" with their counterpart agency, without explaining the term. Had the question included a definition and/or specific criteria for determining "joint operation," validity of the question might have been higher, resulting in more consistent data.

No ES offices in the survey subcontracted out programs to the local JTPA organization. The Employment Service has few if any discretionary program funds, so this is not surprising. According to JTPA management respondents there were two JTPA organizations in the sample which subcontract programs to their local ES office. JTPA programs in Community Three and Five subcontract dislocated worker ser-

"One ES manager did not respond to this question."
vices to their local ES office. The Community Five JTPA agency also subcontracts the placement portion of its AFS New JOBS program to the local ES office. 

There appears to a fairly strong relationship between the levels of coordination and cooperation reported by ES respondents and to a lesser degree JTPA personnel, and the presence of JTPA agencies subcontracting with local ES offices for services. The ES office in Community Three had one of the highest rankings of the seven other ES offices (first and third) on the two questions dealing with coordination and cooperation levels. In Community Five there was an even stronger relationship, with the ES office involved having the highest ranking of any ES office on their averaged response rate for each of the two questions dealing specifically with cooperation and coordination. In Community Five the JTPA organization which subcontracted also had the highest coordination and cooperation scores of all JTPA organizations in the sample. In Community Three, however there appeared to be little if any relationship, since the organization was ranked fourth and fifth in comparison with other ES offices on the two coordination/cooperation level questions.

The survey displayed a similar relationship with inter-

"New JOBS is a welfare pilot program which AFS elected to operate differently in different parts of the state. In Community Five, JTPA operates the program and subcontracts with the ES office for placement services."
dependence and the existence of a contractual relationship between the two types of organizations. Of the two ES and two JTPA organizations involved in subcontracting, all appeared in the top three of their respective systems' ranking on reported amounts of interdependence. Two of the four organizations involved were ranked first in their respective sample group, one was second and the lowest organization was ranked third on levels of felt interdependence with their counter organization. This would indicate a positive relationship between the presence of subcontracting and higher levels of perceived interdependence within the organizational dyad.

There is apparent evidence linking levels of interdependence, coordination and cooperation with the existence of subcontracting (See Tables 15A & 16A). An important question remains, however, concerning the causal factor. Does the presence of subcontracting increase coordination, cooperation and interdependence levels or vice versa? One can see the attractiveness and simplicity of the latter view, in particularly to ES administrators. More frequent JTPA subcontracting leading to increases in coordination, cooperation, and interdependence seems a simplistic conclusion at best. Subcontracting may in fact be both a cause and effect of coordination and cooperation. As two organizations become more interdependent, more coordination and cooperation may occur. This may lead to subcontracting of
services, which can result in increased levels of cooperation, coordination and felt interdependence between the two organizations.

Figure 2 - Cyclical Process

Coordination and Cooperation - All Respondents

Respondents were asked about the level of coordination and cooperation which exists between the two types of organizations. This section will discuss some of the more significant findings that have resulted from examination of this section of data. The specific issues addressed pertain to these questions:

1. What is the level of cooperation and coordination between the two types of organizations in general, and specifically the level in each of the six communities in the study?

2. What is the quality of the individuals' relationships with staff members of the other organization?

3. How formalized and structured are the ties in the relationship?

4. How much competition for resources exists between the two local agencies?

5. How much duplication of services exists?
6. What if anything is preventing more cooperation and coordination from occurring?

7. Are there any specific disputes which occurred between the two organizations?

When asked to describe their organizations' relationship with the local ES or JTPA office the average response from both population groups ranged from fair to good. However, the majority of respondents in both systems indicated their own personal relationship with members of the counterpart agency ranged from good to excellent. One explanation for the differences may be the same as was mentioned during the discussion of contact initiation; when individuals are asked to compare their behavior with that of others they frequently view their own as more positive.

JTPA respondents rated both their personal and offices relationship higher than did their ES counterparts. Anecdotal data collected from several different questions indicated that some individual ES staff felt extremely threatened by the local JTPA agency. This is not surprising since from the standpoint of many ES members, JTPA is the interloper in the relationship. Some ES staff may long for the days when their organization was the undisputed focal organization in the employment and training set, with few if any restrictions placed upon their autonomy by other community organizations.

Although some may equate a "good" relationship and a "well coordinated" relationship this is not necessarily the
case. It may not be possible to have a well coordinated in conjunction with a "poor" relationship, however, it is quite possible, as it appears this research reveals to have a "good" relationship but substantially lower or little coordination at all. Coordination and cooperation levels between the two systems in the eight communities were lower than respondents' rating of the overall relationship in general. In comparison to the relatively high estimation of the overall relationship reported by both respondent groups, individual organizations' average cooperation and coordination levels ranged from relatively high to slightly below medium, with the vast majority in the middle range.

One of the specific questions regarding cooperation and coordination levels asked respondents to rate the amount of cooperation and coordination they had with the counterpart agency in comparison to other organizations with whom they had contact with (See Table 17A). Using a seven point scale ranging from "much lower" to "much higher", ES and JTPA respondent groups' rating means were about the same (ES $\bar{x} = 4.81$, JTPA $\bar{x} = 4.6$). These two means exceed "neutral", and as a result the amount of coordination and cooperation between the two systems in comparison to the amount they have with other organizations.

When the two groups of respondents were asked to use a seven point scale to rate how much cooperation and coordination existed overall between their organizations and the
counter agency, the mean scores (ES $\bar{x} = 4.55$, JTPA $\bar{x} = 4.84$) also exceeded the neutral value (See Table 18A).

Although the mean responses for the two sample groups were relatively neutral on the above two inquiries, agency averages ranged from 3.17 to 5.66 for the question comparing the ES/JTPA level to other organizations in the community and from 2.8 to a high of 5.66 for the overall level of cooperation and coordination. This mean range is a possible indicator that coordination and cooperation levels can be strongly affected by specific factors at the local level, such as personalities of local managers and directors, the type of organization operating the JTPA program, local labor market conditions and community norms.

In examining the level of cooperation and coordination of the two systems as well as individual community relationships respondents were asked if activities could be better planned and coordinated between the two types of organizations (See Table 19A). Results corresponded to other coordination questions with the two groups displaying similar response means (ES $\bar{x} = 4.83$, JTPA $\bar{x} = 4.65$, 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). There were no organizational means from either group in any of the eight communities with a value less than four. From this data we can conclude that in general the members of the two systems concur generally that activities could be better planned and coordinated between the two systems.
As indicated in Chapter Three most researchers believe that coordination levels are closely related to the amount of interdependence which exists between the organizations involved. In an attempt to measure the amount of interdependence between ES and JTPA organizations respondents were asked to rate from one to seven (1 = not very important and 7 = very important) how important they felt the counter agency was to the fulfillment of their own organization's goals. The overall amount of interdependence between the two systems ranged from somewhat low to slightly above moderate (See Table 20A). Although the average individual response rates for this question were slightly higher than neutral for both populations, the individual agency averages painted a different picture. Only three out of the eight ES offices averaged greater than 4.0, with the lowest 2.88 and the highest 5.17. For JTPA offices only three of the eight organizations had averages higher than 4.0, with 2.88 the lowest and 5.45 the highest. Generally the organizations which had the highest levels of cooperation and coordination also had the highest averages on the "goal" question (See Tables 20B & 20C). The ES office in Community Six was a notable exception, it had the highest interdependence average, yet it consistently had one of, if not the lowest score of any other ES offices on just about every other
coordination and cooperation related question."

The data also pointed to a difference in how both ES managers and JTPA directors responded in comparison to other system members. Typically, the managers and directors views were more positive than their staff (See Tables 21A, 21B, 22A & 22B). This can be attributed to several factors. One possible explanation may be that managers and directors may have more positive interpersonal contacts and exchanges with their counterparts in the other organization than do line employees. This contact may occur through the development of the Wagner-Peyser plan and/or from attending meetings of the local area Job Search Employer Committee, Private Industry Council and/or Local Business Advisory Council meetings, as well as other community meetings. If the interactions are positive the managers and directors may conclude that their organizations overall are well coordinated. Another explanation may be that as chief administrator of their respective organizations they are more likely to have a broader picture and better understanding of the extent and nature of the overall relationship, than do individuals in positions with a narrower focus. One, however, could make a case for the opposite; executive officers are frequently removed from everyday, routine, interagency

\[^{18}\text{As indicated in the methodology section the ES organization sample from Community Six was skewed by only including individuals who had direct contact with JTPA organizations.}\]
actions and as a result they may have a distorted view of what is actually happening at the staff level.

Given the sensitivity of the issues studied in this project some managers and directors may have intentionally attempted to paint a more positive relationship between the two entities then actually exists. One could argue that this could be true for all respondents, however, other staff members are not usually singularly held responsible for relations between organizations as directors and managers oftentimes are. Still, I saw no evidence of any extremely exaggerated claims from managers or directors and as a results would attribute the individual differences to one or all of the former explanations.

The degree of formalization found in the organizational dyads was another focus of analysis in the project. The presence of formalized interagency agreements outlining the roles and responsibilities of each organization involved is indicative of a highly coordinated system. Respondents were asked if there was a formal agreement between their agency and the counterpart organization. Seven of the eight ES managers and all seven of the responding JTPA directors noted there was a formal agreement between the two organizations in their community. 73 percent of the total ES respondents and only 52 percent of the total JTPA respondents indicated there was an agreement between the two organizations in their community. 13 percent of the ES
respondents and 20 percent of the JTPA sample volunteered that they did not know if an agreement existed between their organization and the local ES or JTPA office."

Undoubtedly, some of the apparent disagreement may be due to confusion over the term "formal agreement". To some, managers and directors in particular, sign off by both parties on the Wagner-Peyser Plan constitutes an agreement. To others a "formal agreement" may not need to be in writing and may simply be a verbal clarification of roles, that is, "you handle placement activities and we will take care of training." Judging by respondent comments, many thought a contract to provide services for a single client group constituted a formal agreement. The intent of the question was to determine if there was a master, interagency agreement outlining the specific roles and responsibilities of each organization. Subjects covered and roles defined under such an agreement might include client referral processes, exchange of job orders, roles in large economic development projects, etc. Written comments suggest that only one community had this kind of an agreement between the two types of organizations.

Another indicator of a well coordinated service delivery system is the existence of mutual client referral processes between organizations. According to the data, four

"The response choices for the question were yes or no, those who indicated "I don't know"wrote it in."
communities in the sample have implemented a mutual client referral process. Not all communities agreed whether or not the two organizations had a process or not. In an attempt to determine whether or not a referral process existed in each of the communities four different groups of respondent answers were examined: (1) ES managers, (2) the remainder of the ES staff respondents, (3) JTPA Directors, and (4) the remainder of the JTPA respondents. Only three out of seven communities expressed agreement in the four categories as to whether or not a process existed. Agreement did emerge between the respective managers or directors and each organization's in all of the ES offices and in five out of seven JTPA organizations. 50 percent of the eight sets of staff members concurred with one another and six out of the seven managers and directors voiced agreement.

The amount of disagreement amongst the various groups regarding the existence of a client referral processes may indicate either a true lack of agreement and/or understanding by and between the different sample groups. Still it may be due to differing perceptions as to what is actually meant by the term "mutual client referral process." To some respondents the term may mean a written uniform policy,

\footnote{One community did not have a respondent who identified themselves as a JTPA Director, however there was an almost unanimous response from both ED and JTPA respondents indicating the existence of a mutual client referral process in the community involved.}
complete with referral forms and follow-up activities. To other sample members a mutual referral process may only be an established referral method regardless of the amount of formality involved. With the lack of clarity in so many of the communities over the existence of a referral process this issue warrants further research.

There also appeared to be a positive relationship between those organizations which had a referral process and how high their respective coordination and cooperation levels were (See Table 23A). Five of the eight organizations who indicated they participated in a mutual referral process had a system ranking of three or higher on their responses to the two questions which dealt with coordination and cooperation. Two agencies with a mutual referral process were ranked fourth on one question and fifth on the other and one organization ranked sixth on both questions. The data therefore supports the contention that there is a positive relationship between increases in cooperation and coordination levels and the presence of a mutual referral process. Similar to the relationship between subcontracting and increased levels of cooperation and coordination, the presence of a mutual referral process may be both a cause and effect of increases in coordination and cooperation.

Other Significant Relationship Issues

A variety of differences ranging from mild disagree-
ments to substantial conflicts came to light during the course of the research. Some of the differences may be unique to the particular individuals involved, others however, appeared to me more substantial in nature and warrant investigation. The following section will deal with some of the more substantial issues affecting the relationship such as client confidentiality, JTPA placement activities, competition for various types of resources, and duplications of services.

The strictness of the Employment Service's confidentiality regulations have been cited for many years by both ES and JTPA staff as a barrier to effective coordination for a number of years. Just over 42 percent of the ES respondents and over 44 percent of the JTPA sample indicated confidentiality regulations kept their organization from working more closely with their counterpart agency (See Table 24A). Only five percent of the ES group and just under four percent of the JTPA respondents indicated that confidentiality was not a problem.

The survey uncovered various methods respondents utilized to deal with confidentiality. The most frequent method mentioned by both groups was the use of client releases, cited by 23.73 percent of the ES respondents and by 34.55 percent of the JTPA respondents. Following organizational policy and/or referring it to their supervisor was noted by just over 22 percent of the ES respondents. Only 5.4 per-
cent of the JTPA respondents mentioned "following organizational policy" as a method.\textsuperscript{21}

Although both groups frequently cited confidentiality as an impediment to working more closely there were several other noteworthy barriers (See Table 24A).\textsuperscript{22} Approximately 56 percent of the ES respondents and 42 percent of the JTPA population indicated a lack of understanding about each other's organization as a reason for not working closer together. For JTPA respondents, the category "historical differences between the two organizations" appeared as the second most mentioned reason, with 43.82 percent citing it. In contrast, 28.57 percent of the ES staff cited historical differences. Despite the many barriers cited which prevent the two types of organizations from working more closely, 27.55 percent of the ES and 30.34 percent of the JTPA respondents indicated the members of the two systems were working as close together as possible.

Competition between the two organizations was also noted by a large percentage of both groups as a obstacle to the two groups developing a closer working relationship.

\textsuperscript{21}This may indicate that some JTPA organizations do not have a confidentiality policy which covers exchanges with other employment and training organizations.

\textsuperscript{22}Respondents were given several reasons and asked to identify and rank the reasons which were germane to their relationship. Respondents were also given "working as close as possible" as an option as well as an open category to write in any reasons not mentioned.
(ES = 39.8%, JTPA = 30.33%). A substantial group of JTPA respondents (37.93) however, indicated that they were not competing for any resources with the ES office. In contrast, only 17.71 percent of ES respondents indicated that the two were not in competition for resources.

The most frequently mentioned object of competition for both organizations was job orders, with 60 percent of the ES and 44.83 percent of the JTPA respondents citing it (See Table 25A). Placements were also identified as a resource being competed for by 51.04 percent of the ES group and 39.08 percent of the JTPA population. Some respondents may view the two as separate issues with job orders being the actual request from an employer and the placement the opportunity to fill the job order with one of their own agency's clients, thereby getting the placement credit. To others, job orders and placements are viewed as two separate issues. The data supports this with many individual respondents identifying one but not the other.

Surprisingly, 52.08 percent of the ES respondents believed that the two systems competed for funds. In contrast, competition for funds was mentioned by only 17.24 percent of the JTPA population. Only two ES managers indicated that they were competing with JTPA for funding.

Explaining why such a large number of ES respondents perceive competition for funds is difficult without further research. However, most funds which are received by both of
the two types of organizations are formula allocated with little if any discretionary funds for which the two might compete. Since the inception of JTPA, ES funds have been continually reduced. Despite the fact that JTPA agencies have also seen reduced funding allocations, in communities where fixed unit price contracting has been utilized JTPA organizations have had greater discretion on how they are able to spend funds. The ability to fund high profile employer targeted advertising programs at a time when local ES budgets and staffs were shrinking may have contributed to the view that there is competition for funds between the two systems.

An important resource to both types of organizations are clients. A number of both groups indicated competition for clients occurred (ES = 29.17%, JTPA = 24.14%). Two factors most likely contribute to this response. First is simply supply and demand. With the overall improvement in Oregon's economy in the last few years, the unemployment rate has been reduced, resulting in a smaller and less

Under current federal law governors may allocate 10% of the Employment Division's funds to operate joint Employment Division/JTPA projects. To date these dollars have been used to fund ES labor market information research which is utilized primarily by JTPA organizations for planning purposes.

Due to pressure from the U.S. Department of Labor many Oregon JTPA organizations have elected to return to cost reimbursement funding which will greatly reduce the amount of spending discretion JTPA administrators have.
skilled overall client pool. Secondly, JTPA organizations have steadily attracted more of the higher skilled clients who traditionally have used the Employment Service in the past. This is due in part to JTPA's increased efforts to acquire higher wage job orders, JTPA's ability to offer both training and supportive services to displaced workers whom qualify for services regardless of income, and increased client recruitment and advertising.

Duplication of services between the two types of organizations is also a serious issue which affects the relationship between the two types of organizations (See Table 26A). A majority of the ES respondents (59 percent) felt that local JTPA organizations were duplicating services or programs provided by the Employment Service. In contrast, a majority of the JTPA respondents (53 percent) indicated that the local ES office was not duplicating services provided by the JTPA organization.

By far the most significant duplication which came to light could best be termed "employer and placement services" (See Tables 26B & 26C).25 ES respondents mentioned it 59 times and JTPA staff 28 times. Of the 59 times "employer and placement services" was mentioned by ES staff, 64.41 percent of the times the duplication was said to have caused

25This category included such things as applicant referral, job orders, employee screening, employer contacts and other miscellaneous services.
problems. In comparison only nine of the 28 or 32.14 percent of the duplications of services mentioned by JTPA respondents were said to have caused problems.

The eight ES managers were somewhat mixed in their opinions regarding employer and placement services. Five out of the eight identified it as a duplication and three out of the eight indicated it had caused a problem. It was the only service mentioned by any of the eight managers as being duplicated. Of the seven JTPA directors three mentioned it as a duplication however, none of them indicated that it had caused a problem.

ES respondents indicated twice as often as their JTPA counterparts that the duplication of employer and placement services had caused problems. Given the frequency with which placement was cited as a problem by ES respondents and also the intensity of ES members' written comments, one concludes that many ES respondents feel there should be stricter limits upon JTPA placement activities.

Few if any individuals would doubt that ES was designed to serve as the primary labor exchange organization in each of the fifty states. The JTPA system, on, the other hand, was designed to serve as the primary job training system for low income citizens and other specific targeted groups such as dislocated workers, disadvantaged youth, welfare recipients, older workers and handicapped individuals. It is therefore not surprising that members of an organization
(ES) which for decades has dominated the placement sector of the employment and training delivery system would respond fairly strongly against another organization which in some cases may be duplicating services which they (ES) view as their own.

Despite the large numbers of ES staff who mentioned placement services as a duplication it was only cited 11 times when respondents were asked if there had been any significant differences of opinions between the two in the last two years. Of the eleven times it was mentioned, six were by ES staff and five by JTPA personnel. No JTPA Directors identified it as having been a significant difference of opinion, however, it was mentioned by two ES managers.

The only other "significant disagreement" which was mentioned with any frequency could be called "philosophical differences." These typically were clashes over fundamental values such as what service levels should be offered to various client and employer groups, how one agency members viewed the other organization's staff and/or how the other agency treated clients. Philosophical differences were mentioned five times by ES staff and only once by the JTPA population. With the exception of one community where an agreement outlining responsibilities had been negotiated during the two year time span covered by the question, few if any of the disputes mentioned had been resolved. Even in
the community where the agreement had been negotiated there still appeared to be problems which still were not resolved.
CONCLUSION

This project has examined a substantial issue - the relationship between two interdependent employment and training systems. Two goals guided this effort: First, that the issues examined and results discussed should be relevant and useful to employment and training practitioners and policy makers; and second, that the effort build upon and contribute to organizational scholarship.

The locus of the project was eight employment and training dyads, each consisting of a local ES office and a JTPA service delivery organization. Consequently this study assessed coordination and competition at the system level. Benson (1982) contends that the focus of interorganizational analysis should be at the policy level in order to ascertain the broader contextual effects of society on specific systems, but system level examination is important in that it offers line workers, administrative leaders and policy makers insight into the status of the relationship between the two organizations specifically and the two systems' relationship overall. In this case, system members will be able to use the project's findings as a starting point from which to improve the coordination and cooperation levels between the two.

At the onset of this undertaking several research questions were posed concerning the status of relations
between the two systems. This chapter will summarize the more pertinent findings which deal specifically with the relationship between the ES and JTPA systems. The commentary will subsequently review some of the findings which have broader interorganizational implications and conclude with a discussion of areas which warrant further research and investigation.

Demographic Findings

There were several demographic differences between the two groups. JTPA respondents in large were younger and more educated than their ES counterparts. The JTPA sample group was composed predominately of women (70%), whereas the female-male ratio for the ES sample was about equal.

Several reasons for the demographic variances between the two groups were offered. The length of service and age differences were attributed to the relatively short time JTPA organizations have been in existence in comparison to the ES system.

The reported disparity in educational levels between the two (ES & JTPA) was explained by the differing occupations found in the two systems. JTPA organizations employ a larger number of employees; administrators, counselors and trainers who are likely to have a college education.

The differences found in gender ratios was attributed to the ES being a unionized, state agency whose affirmative
action levels receive closer scrutiny from external entities. The high level of women in the JTPA sample was attributed to the social service orientation of many JTPA organizations.

ES - JTPA Contacts

The local JTPA agency was cited by ES respondents as the organization with which they have the most contact. In contrast, JTPA respondents identified the local ES office as the third most frequent organization they have contact with; ranked after the state welfare office and local community colleges.

ES staff reported that they had contact with JTPA intake and assessment staff most frequently. JTPA respondents indicated that they had the most contact with ES placement staff. The two dominant reasons cited by both groups for contact with their counter agency were "To discuss coordinating services" and "Client Problems". ES and JTPA respondents concurred that contact initiation between the two groups was about equal.

Coordination and Cooperation Levels

One question concerned the overall level of cooperation and coordination between the two systems. The level of cooperation and coordination between the two systems appeared moderate. Both parties indicated generally that they
had more cooperation and coordination with each other than they had with other community organizations. The coordination and cooperation levels were not equal in all of the eight communities studied, leading to the conclusion that coordination and cooperation levels can be greatly affected by local particulars including the presence or absence of various coordination mechanisms.

Several different coordination mechanisms were observed during the course of the project, many of which had a positive relationship on reported coordination and cooperation levels. Positive coordination mechanisms revealed included subcontracting of services between the two agencies, mutual client referral processes, and overlapping directorates.

Placement Activities

The research sought to determine what, if, any significant controversies existed between the two systems. JTPA organizations' involvement in placement and other employer activities was a major issue of contention for many ES respondents. A majority of ES staff cited employer and/or placement services as a duplication, with twice as many ES respondents as JTPA staff reporting that the duplication had caused problems. The placement of JTPA training graduates is a legal and legitimate one, it appears, however, in some locales that JTPA agencies may have provided labor exchange services for applicants other than tradi-
tional JTPA trainees, thereby leading to perceptions of infringement on the Employment Service's legitimate domain. A broad spectrum of ES staff, expressed concern on this issue, ranging from job service representatives to office managers. Although, some of the ES concerns may be unfounded, in many communities JTPA organizations have advertised their ability to provide labor exchange functions to employers.

A problem related to the employer services issues is that in many communities there is little or no coordination between the two systems in the provision of employer services. Just over half of JTPA and less than a quarter of ES placement staff indicate they exchange job orders with their counterparts. Although, 48 percent of the JTPA members report they refer employers to ES when they are unable to fill the employers job orders, just under 11 percent of ES respondents refer employers to JTPA at least 50 percent of the time. A large number (45.2%) of ES staff indicate they never refer employers to the JTPA organization.

**Client Referral Rates**

The rate of client referral between the two systems was relatively low. JTPA staff indicated they refer just over a third of the potential eligible clients to the local ES for service. ES respondents indicate they referred even fewer appropriate clients to the local JTPA office, referring just
over one-fifth of the clients whom they feel are potentially appropriate for JTPA services. The low rate was somewhat surprising and although a definitive explanation was not discovered, several were offered to explain the low referral rates. Explanations offered included differing eligibility requirements and target populations between the two systems; staff members' lack of information about the counter program's eligibility and services; or staff members may feel they will be able to place the individual without referral. The latter reason is especially relevant since placements play an important role in how both organizations are evaluated.

Reasons For Not Working Closer

A variety of reasons were offered to explain why the two systems did not work together more closely. A major reason cited by both systems' members was the lack of understanding about each other's organizations and programs. Other explanations offered included ES confidentiality regulations, historical differences, and competition between the two systems as impediments to collaboration. Despite the barriers cited, some of which could be termed substantial, over a quarter of the ES staff and just under a third of the JTPA respondents indicated they were working together as closely as possible.
Competition For Resources

A much larger percentage of ES than JTPA respondents noted there was competition for resources between the two systems. Resource competition featured job orders (mentioned most frequently by both groups); placements; competition for funds (primarily by ES respondents); staff (again, primarily by ES staff); and clients. Although many individuals questioned felt there was substantial competition for resources, 38 percent of JTPA and 18 percent of ES respondents indicate that there was no competition between the two systems.

Interorganizational Implications

The research also generated findings with ramifications for organizations beyond the locus of the study. First, mandated coordination appeared to have little impact on actual coordination and cooperation outcomes with one and/or a combination of two outcomes occurring as a result of the mandated coordination. First, the required mandated action is complied with but little if any additional coordination and/or cooperation activities occur.

The second outcome is that administrators used coordination mandates as a starting point from which to develop substantial coordination mechanisms, leading, in turn, to highly interdependent relationships. The project discovered
examples of both kinds of mandated coordination outcomes. In some communities the approval of the Wagner-Peyser plan by the local PIC appeared to be the primary coordination activity. In other locales there was evidence of joint employer visits, mutual client and employer referral processes, and shared program operation.

The project also substantiated the positive relationship between coordination and cooperation levels and the amount of interdependence present in the dyad. The relationship was described as a circular phenomenon with increases in cooperation and coordination levels leading to increases in interdependence, which in turn can lead to further increases in coordination and cooperation, leading to even further interdependence and so on. The cycle can also work in reverse; when cooperation and/or coordination is reduced, the level of interdependence will most likely decrease. As less interdependence is perceived between the two, fewer coordination mechanisms such as subcontracting, joint program operation and client referral reciprocity are likely to occur.

Lastly the research found that chief administrators, in this case, managers and directors, consistently perceived the dyadic relationship to be more positive than did their subordinates. The most likely explanation for the discrepancy are administrators' detachment from everyday interactions which occur between line members of the two
organizations. Adding to the detachment is that administrators may have a good personal relationship with their executive counterpart and falsely assume it is indicative of the two agencies overall relationship.

**Future Research Efforts**

Employment and training systems offer fertile ground for exploring many interorganizational issues. This effort has discovered many coordination features that exist between two employment systems, in one particular state. Further research is warranted, however, in other states and systems to determine the representativeness of the data and interpretations presented in this project.

Many of the survey responses reported here may have warranted follow-up, however, due to time and financial constraints that was not feasible. One of the most pressing needs which arose during the course of this project was the lack of an existing methodology to quantify the actual amount of coordination and cooperation between the two systems. This would have allowed for more accurate comparisons of coordination and cooperation levels in the eight communities.

Some respondents uncertainty appeared regarding several terms used in the survey instrument. As a result, questions concerning the existence and impact of client referral processes, joint program operations, and interagency agree-
ment warrant further research attention.

Due to research and time constraints the study focused only on relationships at the local level. An investigation of the amount and impacts of existing state wide administrative cooperation and coordination deserves attention and investigation.

Additionally this research revealed a need to better differentiate between coordination and cooperation. The bulk of the literature strongly suggests there is a clear difference between the two and as a result they deserve separate attention in future efforts.

Future examinations should focus more on the impact interdependence activities, structures and mechanisms have on interorganizational relationships. This in fact may be the key to increasing coordination and cooperation levels in social service delivery systems.

Limitations of this Research

While this study reports interesting data concerning ES and JTPA cooperation and coordination, two caveats seem justified. Although, I have made every attempt possible to limit my own biases in conducting and reporting the findings of this project, I do a bring a history of work with JTPA and CETA organizations to the study. The research reflects my attempt to view the ES - JTPA relationship with as much detachment as possible.
During this project I was frequently confronted with new information which challenged my stereotypes and preconceived views about employment and training coordination issues in general and the Oregon ES/JTPA relation specifically. As a result, I came a way with a better understanding and greater appreciation for this highly complex and significant relationship.

Undoubtedly, I have raised more questions than I have answered in this project. If I accomplish the same in the readers mind than I consider this project a successful one. I am hopeful, indeed, that this document will stimulate discussion in the Oregon employment and training community. Through such discussions I am confident Oregon’s many talented and dedicated employment and training professionals will find appropriate answers and solutions as they build upon their outstanding record of innovation and progress in the delivery of employment and training services.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
Surveys and Cover Letters
July 17, 1989

Mr./Ms. __________
Manager
Oregon Employment Division
605 Cottage St. NE
Salem, OR 97301

Dear _______

Enclosed are Job Training Partnership/Employment Division coordination surveys for yourself and specific members of your staff. I would appreciate it if you would forward the staff surveys for me.

After discussions with several Employment Division managers, I have decided to survey all Employment Division local staff with the exceptions of clerical staff and adjudicators. As a result there may be surveys for individuals whom you initially did not indicate as having contact with the local JTPA organization. The rationale for expanding the sample is that in many cases despite little if any contact with JTPA staff, Employment Division personnel still may refer clients and/or employers to JTPA for services.

With as large as the sample has grown (about 300 respondents), so has the potential for mistakes. If I have sent surveys for staff who no longer work at your office or there are other extra surveys I would appreciate it if you could return them to me so I will be able to accurately measure the response rate.

In the event you should have any questions regarding the survey feel free to contact me at 753-5414.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Redacted for Privacy

Pete Bober
Masters Candidate
July 1989

Dear Employment and Training Professional:

The attached survey is part of a study examining the relationship between local offices of the Oregon Employment Division and Job Training Partnership organizations. The study is for my Masters thesis at Oregon State University.

The purpose of the survey is to determine the amount of coordination and cooperation which exists between the two systems and identify the key issues affecting coordination and cooperation levels.

The survey is being administered simultaneously to staff in a number of different Employment Division local offices and Job Training Partnership organizations throughout the State of Oregon.

The individual information collected in this survey will only be used in aggregate with other respondent's answers. Under no circumstances will individual surveys or information be released to organizational administrators, directors, managers, supervisors or governing and/or advisory boards.

As one of the experts on what's happening at the local level, your active participation in this project is critical to its success. I hope you will take time out of your busy day and complete the questionnaire in its entirety. Since it is unlikely you will have to answer the entire survey it should take only about twenty minutes of your time to complete. Answer all of the questions contained in the sections pertaining to you, to the best of your ability. After you have completed the questionnaire, please staple it shut and drop it in the mail (its already stamped and addressed) as soon as possible. Please do not discuss your answers with other staff members until after you have completed the survey.

For the purposes of this survey any references to "the local Job Training Partnership organization or office" you should consider the organization to be The Private Industry Council and or any of its subcontracted programs for specific client groups such as dislocated workers, youth, displaced homemakers, etc.

If you have any questions regarding the survey or are interested in receiving a copy of the final results of the project, please call me at (503) 753-5414.

Thank you for your cooperation, your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Pete Bober,
Masters Candidate
Local Coordination:
The Oregon Employment Division
and
JTPA Organizations

Pete Bober
Oregon State University
July, 1989
1. Please rank the following organizations whose local office you have the most contact with starting with number "1" as being the most frequent contact, "2" the next most frequent, etc. If you have no contact with an agency give it a "0".

A. ___ State of Oregon Adult and Family Services
B. ___ State of Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation
C. ___ Private Rehabilitation Organizations
D. ___ Community College
E. ___ Local Job Training Partnership organization
F. ___ Other

2. Which of the following job categories describes the types of local Job Training Partnership staff you have contact with on a monthly or more frequent basis? (mark more than one if you have contact with more than one type of Job Training Partnership staff person)

A. ___ Clerical
B. ___ Intake or eligibility
C. ___ Trainer
D. ___ Case manager
E. ___ Job developer or marketing representative
F. ___ Management
G. ___ Other

H. ___ I do not have contact with local Job Training Partnership staff

If you do not have contact with local Job Training Partnership staff please go to Question #6.

3. Please rank the following types of Job Training Partnership staff you have the most contact with starting with number "1" as being the most contact, "2" the next most contact, etc. If you have no contact at all with a particular job type, give it a "0".

A. ___ Clerical
B. ___ Intake or Eligibility
C. ___ Trainer
D. ___ Case Manager
E. ___ Job Development or Marketing Representative
F. ___ Management
G. ___ Other

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
4. Who usually initiates the contact?
   A. _____ You
   B. _____ Job Training Partnership Staff
   C. _____ About equal

5. Please rank the following reasons for your contacts with Job Training Partnership staff, starting with number "1" as being the most frequent reason, "2" the next most frequent etc. If the reason doesn't apply mark it with a "0".
   A. _____ Discuss ways to coordinate services
   B. _____ Discuss new programs of each organization
   C. _____ Client related problems
   D. _____ Exchange ideas
   E. _____ Exchange job orders
   F. _____ Discuss employers
   G. _____ Plan a joint project
   H. _____ Discuss coordination problems
   I. _____ Other (please specify)

6. Does your work involve direct contact with clients, program participants or applicants?
   A. _____ No
   B. _____ Yes

   If you answered "No" to Question #6 please go to Question #10.

   * * CONTACT WITH CLIENTS * *

7. In an average week how many individual clients, program participants or applicants do you have a first-time contact with?
   A. _____ 0 - 10
   B. _____ 11 - 25
   C. _____ 25 - 50
   D. _____ More than 50

8. Of the individual clients, program participants or applicants you see in an average week for the first-time, what percentage in your opinion would possibly be appropriate for Job Training Partnership services?
   A. _____

   PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
9. What percentage of the first-time applicants you see in an average week do you actually refer to the local Job Training Partnership organization?
   A. ________

10. Do you have direct contact either by phone or in person with employers who are in need of placement assistance and/or are using your organization's placement services?
   A. _____ No
   B. _____ Yes

   If you answered "No" to Question #10 please go to Question #13.

** EMPLOYER CONTACT SECTION **

11. When you are unable to fill an employer's job order how often do you refer the employer to the local Job Training Partnership organization for placement services?
   A. _____ I never refer employers to the local Job Training Partnership organization if I am unable to fill an employer's job order
   B. _____ More than 1% but less than 10% of the time
   C. _____ More than 10% but less than 25% of the time
   D. _____ More than 25% but less than 50% of the time
   E. _____ More than 50% but less than 75% of the time
   F. _____ More than 75% but less than 100% of the time
   G. _____ I always refer employers to the local Job Training Partnership organization if I am unable to fill an employer's job order

12. Do you ever make joint employer visits to explain services, with a Job Training Partnership staff person?
   A. _____ No, I don't make employer visits
   B. _____ No, I have never made an employer contact with a Job Training Partnership staff person
   C. _____ Yes, I have

   If yes, how many times in the last year? _____

13. Do you supervise other employees?
   A. _____ No
   B. _____ Yes

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
14. Is your position considered to be a part of management or administration?
   A. _____ No
   B. _____ Yes

[If you answered "No" to both Question #13 and Question #14 please go to Question #26.]

** MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL SECTION **

15. Does your organization operate any of its programs jointly with the local Job Training Partnership organization?
   A. _____ No
   B. _____ Yes (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Title</th>
<th>Number of Participants Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Does your organization subcontract any of its programs or services to the local Job Training Partnership organization?
   A. _____ No
   B. _____ Yes (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Title</th>
<th>Number of Participants Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Are any of your organization's staff "outstationed" at the local Job Training Partnership office?
   A. _____ No
   B. _____ Yes (please specify number and type of employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
18. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "The Wagner-Peyser Act requirement of approval of the Employment Division's yearly plan of service by the local Private Industry Council has significantly increased the amount of coordination and cooperation which exists between the two organizations." (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Do you serve on the Business Advisory or Private Industry Council of the local Job Training Partnership organization?

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes

20. How frequently do you or members of your staff attend local Business Advisory or Private Industry Council meetings?

A. _____ Regularly
B. _____ Occasionally
C. _____ Only when asked
D. _____ Never attend
E. _____ Don't know

21. If you have attended a local Business Advisory or Private Industry Council meeting, which of the following best describes your role?

A. _____ Active participant
B. _____ Observer
C. _____ Presenter
D. _____ Never attended

22. To the best of your knowledge do any of the following serve on the local Business Advisory or Private Industry Council?

- A. _____ Other staff members of your organization
- B. _____ Members of your Job Service Employer Committee
- C. _____ Employers who utilize your program for hiring employees
- D. _____ None of the above
- E. _____ Don't know

23. Is the local Job Training Partnership Manager, Director or one of his or her staff, a member of your Job Service Employer Committee?

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes
C. _____ Don't know

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
24. How frequently does the local Job Training Partnership Manager, Director or a member of his or her staff attend a Job Service Employer Committee meeting?
   A. _____ Regularly
   B. _____ Occasionally
   C. _____ Only when asked
   D. _____ Never
   E. _____ Don't know

25. When the local Job Training Partnership Manager, Director or a member of his or her staff attends a Job Service Employer Committee meeting, which of the following best describes his or her role?
   A. _____ Active participant
   B. _____ Observer
   C. _____ Presenter
   D. _____ Never attends
   E. _____ Don't know

** ** COORDINATION AND COOPERATION ** **

26. How would you describe your relationship with your Job Training Partnership contact(s) overall?
   A. _____ Poor
   B. _____ Fair
   C. _____ Good
   D. _____ Excellent
   E. _____ I do not have contact with local Job Training Partnership staff

27. How would you describe your overall office's relationship with the local Job Training Partnership organization?
   A. _____ Poor
   B. _____ Fair
   C. _____ Good
   D. _____ Excellent

28. In comparison to the amount of cooperation and coordination you have with other employment and training organizations in your community, how would you rate the overall level of cooperation and coordination between your organization and the local Job Training Partnership organization? (circle one)
   Much lower       Much higher
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
29. How important is the local Job Training Partnership organization to the fulfillment of your organization's goals? (circle one)

Not very important
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very important

30. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "Activities between my organization and the local Job Training Partnership organization could be much better planned and coordinated." (circle one)

Strongly disagree
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly agree

31. When it is necessary to exchange information with a Job Training Partnership staff person regarding specific clients or employers, how do you deal with confidentiality?

A. __________________________________________________________________________

B. ______ I do not have contact with local Job Training Partnership staff

C. ______ I do not deal with either individual clients or employers

32. Does your organization have any sort of formal agreement with the local Job Training Partnership organization, outlining the specific responsibilities of each organization?

A. ______ No

B. ______ Yes (please describe) __________________________________________________________________________

33. Has your organization established a formalized process with the local Job Training Partnership organization for the mutual referral of clients for services?

A. ______ No

B. ______ Yes

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
34. Has your organization established any special rules regarding how you or other staff are to interact with the local Job Training Partnership organization?

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes (please specify)

35. Which if any of the following items do you feel your organization is competing for with the local Job Training Partnership organization? (mark as many as necessary)

A. _____ Clients
B. _____ Funds
C. _____ Staff
D. _____ Job orders
E. _____ Placements
F. _____ Other (please specify)
G. _____ None

36. Which if any of the following reasons do you think keep you or others in your office from working more closely with the local Job Training Partnership organization (if more than one reason exists please rank with "1" being the highest)?

A. _____ The attitude of your organization's management regarding Job Training Partnership organizations and/or programs
B. _____ Historical-differences between the two organizations
C. _____ Confidentiality regulations
D. _____ Lack of understanding about each others' roles and services
E. _____ Competition between the organizations
F. _____ Other (please specify)

G. _____ We are working as closely as possible

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
37. Is the local Job Training Partnership organization providing services or programs which duplicate those provided by your organization? If so, has this duplication caused your organization any problems?

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes (please specify)

Service or Program Duplicated Caused Problems?

(circle)

1) ___________________________
   No Yes

2) ___________________________
   No Yes

3) ___________________________
   No Yes

4) ___________________________
   No Yes

5) ___________________________
   No Yes

38. Within the last two years, have there been any instances of significant differences of opinion between your organization and the local Job Training Partnership organization? These might have involved differences of opinion concerning program objectives and goals, the kinds of or quality of services offered, requirements for admittance to a program, or inter-program planning and coordination.

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes (please describe the disagreement)

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

Which differences of opinion were resolved?

______________________________

39. Overall how much cooperation exists between your organization and the local Job Training Partnership organization? (circle one)

Very little cooperation High degree of cooperation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

** PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS **

40. What is your official job title?

A. __________________________

OED
41. How long have you worked for the Employment Division?
   A. __________________

42. What is your sex?
   A. _____ Female
   B. _____ Male

43. What is your age?
   A. _____ 18 - 20
   B. _____ 21 - 30
   C. _____ 31 - 40
   D. _____ 41 - 50
   E. _____ 51 - 60
   F. _____ 61 - 70

44. Which of the following best describes the amount of education you have?
   A. _____ 08 - 12 years
   B. _____ 13 - 14 years
   C. _____ 15 - 16 years
   D. _____ 17 - 19 years
   E. _____ 20 - 21 years

END OF SURVEY

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE
July 17, 1989

Mr. Director
Mid-Willamette Jobs Council
Oak Hills Mall, Suite 225
1495 Edgewater N.W.
Salem, OR 97304

Dear [Name],

Enclosed are Job Training Partnership/Employment Division coordination surveys for yourself and specific members of your staff. I would appreciate it if you would forward the staff surveys for me.

With as large as the sample has grown (about 300 respondents), so has the potential for mistakes. If I have sent surveys for staff who no longer work at your office or there are other extra surveys I would appreciate it if you could return them to me so I will be able to accurately measure the response rate.

In the event you should have any questions regarding the survey feel free to contact me at 753-5414.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Redacted for Privacy]

Pete Bober
Masters Candidate
Dear Employment and Training Professional:

The attached survey is part of a study examining the relationship between local offices of the Oregon Employment Division and Job Training Partnership organizations. The study is for my Masters thesis at Oregon State University. The purpose of the survey is to determine the amount of coordination and cooperation which exists between the two systems and identify the key issues affecting coordination and cooperation levels.

The survey is being administered simultaneously to staff in a number of different Employment Division local offices and Job Training Partnership organizations throughout the State of Oregon.

The individual information collected in this survey will only be used in aggregate with other respondent's answers. Under no circumstances will individual surveys or information be released to organizational administrators, directors, managers, supervisors or governing and/or advisory boards.

As one of the experts on what's happening at the local level, your active participation in this project is critical to its success. I hope you will take time out of your busy day and complete the questionnaire in its entirety. Since it is unlikely you will have to answer the entire survey it should take only about twenty minutes of your time to complete. Answer all of the questions contained in the sections pertaining to you, to the best of your ability. After you have completed the questionnaire, please staple it shut and drop it in the mail (its already stamped and addressed) as soon as possible. Please do not discuss your answers with other staff members until after you have completed the survey.

For the purposes of this survey any references to "the local Employment Division office" you should consider it to be the East Multnomah office.

If you have any questions regarding the survey or are interested in receiving a copy of the final results of the project, please call me at (503) 753-5414.

Thank you for your cooperation, your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Redacted for Privacy]

Pete Bober,
Masters Candidate
Local Coordination:

The Oregon Employment Division
and
JTPA Organizations

Pete Bober
Oregon State University
July, 1989
1. Please rank the following organizations whose local office you have the most contact with starting with number "1" as being the most frequent contact, "2" the next most frequent, etc. If you have no contact with an agency give it a "0".

A. ______ State of Oregon Adult and Family Services  
B. ______ State of Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation  
C. ______ Private Rehabilitation Organizations  
D. ______ Community College  
E. ______ Local Employment Division office  
F. ______ Other

2. Which of the following job categories describes the types of local Employment Division staff you have contact with on a monthly or more frequent basis? (mark more than one if you have contact with more than one type of staff person)

A. ______ Clerical  
B. ______ Placement  
C. ______ Unemployment Insurance  
D. ______ Veterans  
E. ______ Management  
F. ______ Other

G. ______ I do not have contact with local Employment Division Staff

If you do not have contact with Employment Division staff, please go to Question #6.

3. Please rank the following types of Employment Division staff you have the most contact with starting with number "1" as being the most contact, "2" the next most contact, etc. If you have no contact at all with a particular job type, give it a "0".

A. ______ Clerical  
B. ______ Placement  
C. ______ Unemployment  
D. ______ Veterans  
E. ______ Management  
F. ______ Other

4. Who usually initiates the contact?

A. ______ You  
B. ______ Employment Division Staff  
C. ______ About equal

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
5. Please rank the following reasons for your contacts with Employment Division staff, starting with number "1" as being the most frequent reason, "2" the next most frequent etc. If the reason does not apply mark it with a "0".

A. _____ Discuss ways to coordinate services
B. _____ Discuss new programs of each organization
C. _____ Client related problems
D. _____ Exchange ideas
E. _____ Exchange job orders
F. _____ Discuss employers
G. _____ Plan a joint project
H. _____ Discuss coordination problems
I. _____ Other (please specify)

6. Does your work involve direct contact with clients, program participants or applicants?

A. ____ No
B. ____ Yes

If you answered "No" to Question #6 please go to Question #10.

** CONTACT WITH CLIENTS **

7. In an average week how many individual clients, program participants or applicants do you have a first-time contact with?

A. _____ 0 - 10
B. _____ 11 - 25
C. _____ 25 - 50
D. _____ More than 50

8. Of the individual clients, program participants or applicants you see in an average week for the first-time, what percentage in your opinion would possibly be appropriate for Employment Division services?

A. ___________

9. What percentage of the first-time applicants you see in an average week do you actually refer to the Employment Division?

A. ___________

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
10. Do you have direct contact either by phone or in person with employers who are in need of placement assistance and/or are using your organization's placement or training services?

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes

If you answered "No" to Question #10 please go to Question #13.

** EMPLOYER CONTACT SECTION **

11. When you are unable to fill an employer's job order how often do you refer the employer to the local Employment Division office for placement services?

A. _____ I never refer employers to the local Employment Division office if I am unable to fill an employer's job order
B. _____ More than 1% but less than 10% of the time
C. _____ More than 10% but less than 25% of the time
D. _____ More than 25% but less than 50% of the time
E. _____ More than 50% but less than 75% of the time
F. _____ More than 75% but less than 100% of the time
G. _____ I always refer employers to the local Employment Division office if I am unable to fill an employer's job order

12. Do you ever make joint employer visits to explain services, with an Employment Division staff person?

A. _____ No, I don't make employer visits
B. _____ No, I have never made an employer contact with an Employment Division staff person
C. _____ Yes, I have

If yes, how many times have you done this in the last year?

a. ______________

13. Do you supervise other employees?

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes

14. Is your position considered to be a part of management or administration?

A. _____ No
B. _____ Yes

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
If you answered "No" to both Questions #13 and #14 please go to Question #26

** MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL SECTION **

15. Does your organization operate any of its programs jointly with the local Employment Division office?
   A. ____ No
   B. ____ Yes (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Title</th>
<th>Participants Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Does your organization subcontract any of its programs or services to the local Employment Division office?
   A. ____ No
   B. ____ Yes (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Service</th>
<th>Participants Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Are any of your organization's staff "outstationed" at the local Employment Division office?
   A. ____ No
   B. ____ Yes (please specify number and type of employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
18. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "The Wagner-Peyser Act requirement of approval of the Employment Division's yearly plan of service by the local Private Industry Council has significantly increased the amount of coordination and cooperation which exists between the two organizations." (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Do you serve on the Job Service Employer Committee of the local Employment Division office?

A. _____ No  
B. _____ Yes

20. How frequently do you or members of your staff attend local Job Service Employer Committee meetings?

A. _____ Regularly  
B. _____ Occasionally  
C. _____ Only when asked  
D. _____ Never attend  
E. _____ Don't know

21. If you have attended a local Job Service Employer Committee meeting, which of the following best describes your role?

A. _____ Active participant  
B. _____ Observer  
C. _____ Presenter  
D. _____ Never attended

22. To the best of your knowledge do any of the following serve on the local Job Service Employer Committee?

A. _____ Other staff members of your organization  
B. _____ Members of your local Business Advisory Council or Private Industry Council  
C. _____ Employers who utilize your program for hiring employees  
D. _____ None of the above  
E. _____ Don't know

23. Is the local Employment Division Manager, or one of his or her staff, a member of your Business Advisory Council or Private Industry Council?

A. _____ No  
B. _____ Yes  
C. _____ Don't know

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
24. How frequently does the local Employment Division Manager or member of his or her staff attend a Business Advisory Council or Private Industry Council meeting?
   A. _____ Regularly
   B. _____ Occasionally
   C. _____ Only when asked
   D. _____ Never
   E. _____ Don't know

25. When the Employment Division Manager or a member of his or her staff attends a Business Advisory Council or Private Industry Council meeting, which of the following best describes his or her role?
   A. _____ Active participant
   B. _____ Observer
   C. _____ Presenter
   D. _____ Never attends
   E. _____ Don't know

** COORDINATION AND COOPERATION **

26. How would you describe your relationship with your Employment Division contact(s) overall?
   A. _____ Poor
   B. _____ Fair
   C. _____ Good
   D. _____ Excellent
   E. _____ I do not have contact with Employment Division Staff

27. How would you describe your overall office's relationship with the local office of the Employment Division?
   A. _____ Poor
   B. _____ Fair
   C. _____ Good
   D. _____ Excellent

28. In comparison to the amount of cooperation and coordination you have with other employment and training organizations in your community, how would you rate the overall level of cooperation and coordination between your organization and the local Employment Division office? (circle one)
   Much lower
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Much higher

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
29. How important is the local office of the Employment Division to the fulfillment of your organization's goals? (circle one)

Not very important  Very important

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

30. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement; "Activities between my organization and the local Employment Division office could be much better planned and coordinated." (circle one)

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

1    2    3    4    5    6    7

31. When it is necessary to exchange information with an Employment Division staff person regarding specific clients or employers, how do you deal with confidentiality?

A. ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

B. _____ I do not have contact with Employment Division Staff

C. _____ I do not deal with either individual clients or employers

32. Does your organization have any sort of formal agreement with the local Employment Division office, outlining the specific responsibilities of each office?

A. _____ No

B. _____ Yes (please describe)
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

33. Has your organization established a formalized process with the local Employment Division office for the mutual referral of clients for services?

A. _____ No

B. _____ Yes
34. Has your organization established any special rules regarding how you or other staff are to interact with the local Employment Division office?

A. __ No
B. __ Yes (please specify)

35. Which if any of the following reasons do you think keep you or others in your office from working more closely with the local office of the Employment Division (if more than one reason exists please rank with "1" being the highest)?

A. ___ The attitude of your organization's management regarding the Employment Division
B. ___ Historical differences between the two organizations
C. ___ Lack of understanding about each others' roles and services
D. ___ Confidentiality regulations
E. ___ Competition between the organizations
F. ___ Other (please specify)

G. ___ We are working as closely as possible

36. Which if any of the following items do you feel your organization is competing for with the local Employment Division office? (mark as many as necessary)

A. ___ Clients
B. ___ Funds
C. ___ Staff
D. ___ Job orders
E. ___ Placements
F. ___ Other (please specify)

G. ___ None

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
37. Is the local Employment Division office providing services or programs which duplicate those provided by your organization? If so, has this duplication caused your organization any problems?

A. No
B. Yes (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service or Program Duplicated</th>
<th>Caused Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>(circle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Within the last two years, have there been any instances of significant differences of opinion between your organization and the local Employment Division office? These might have involved differences of opinion concerning program objectives and goals, the kinds of or quality of services offered, requirements for admittance to a program, or inter-program planning and coordination.

A. No
B. Yes (please describe the nature of the differences of opinion)

Which differences of opinion were resolved?

39. Overall how much cooperation/coordination exists between your organization and the local Employment Division office? (circle one)

Very little cooperation
High degree of cooperation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

** PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS **

40. What is your official job title?

A. ____________________________

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE FOR MORE QUESTIONS
41. How long have you worked for JTPA and/or CETA programs?
   A. __________________________

42. What is your sex?
   A. ____ Female
   B. ____ Male

43. What is your age?
   A. ____ 18 - 20
   B. ____ 21 - 30
   C. ____ 31 - 40
   D. ____ 41 - 50
   E. ____ 51 - 60
   F. ____ 61 - 70

44. Which of the following best describes the amount of education you have?
   A. ____ 08 - 12 years
   B. ____ 13 - 14 years
   C. ____ 15 - 16 years
   D. ____ 17 - 19 years
   E. ____ 20 - 21 years

END OF SURVEY

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE

JTPA
APPENDIX B
Tables and Graphs
Table 1A
Gender of Respondents
All ES and JTPA Respondents

- ES: Male 49%, Female 51%
- JTPA: Male 30%, Female 70%

ES N = 98, JTPA N = 92
Table 2A
Distribution of Respondents' Ages
All ES and JTPA Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES N = 98, JTPA N = 91
Table 3A
Educational Level of all Respondents
All ES and JTPA Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Years of Education</th>
<th>ES N = 96, JTPA N = 87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-12 years</td>
<td>14.3% 23.5% 34.7% 24.5% 3.1%</td>
<td>ES JTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14 years</td>
<td>5.5% 20.9% 28.6% 44% 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-16 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4A
Distribution of Staff by Function
All ES and JTPA Respondents

Employment Service

- Job Service Rep. 56%
- Manager 8%
- Misc. Mgt. 13%
- Employment Spec. 8%
- Misc. Line 15%

Job Training Partnership

- Marketing Placement 31%
- Director 8%
- Intake Assessment 3%
- Misc. Mgt. 29%
- Misc. Line 3%
- Training Counseling 25%

ES N = 99
JTPA N = 90
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-34 Years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5A
Years of Service
All ES and JTPA Respondents

ES N Value = 100
JTPA N Value = 92
Table 6A
Agency Most In Contact With All ES and JTPA Respondents

Agencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Employment Service</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult &amp; Family Serv.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Rehabilitation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rehab Agency</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local ES or JTPA</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Selecting Agency as Number 1

ES N = 100, JTPA N = 89
Table 7A
Occupational Contact
All ES Respondents

Occupation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Some Contact With</th>
<th>Most Contact With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake/Eligibility</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Developer/Market</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>30.39%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% With Contact: 71.7%

% Citing Yes*: 75%
% Citing Yes**: 50%

Some Respondents have contact with more than one type.
Table 7B
Occupational Contact
All JTPA Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Some Contact With</th>
<th>Most Contact With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With Contact</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*N = 89, \*\*N = 80
Some Respondents have contact with more than one type.
Table 8A
Most Frequent Reasons for Contact
With Local ES or JTPA Agency

Reasons for Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Contact</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss Coord. Serv.</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss New Programs</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Problems</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Ideas</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Job Orders</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss Employers</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan a Joint Project</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss Coord. Prob.</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES N = 66, JTPA N = 80
Coord. Prob. = Coordination Problem
Coord. Serv. = Coordinating Services

Percentage Selecting Reason as #1
Table 9A
Contact Initiation
ES and JTPA

Self
- ES: 27.5%
- JTPA: 41.2%

Other
- ES: 10.1%
- JTPA: 0%

About Equal
- ES: 62.3%
- JTPA: 58.7%

ES N = 69, JTPA N = 80
Table 10A
Respondents With Client Contact
All ES and JTPA Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Contact</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Client Contact</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES N = 100, JTPA N = 92
Table 11A
Clients Appropriate for Other Agency and Appropriate Clients Actually Referred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Appropriate</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Approp. Referred</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES N = 63, JTPA N = 64

*Note: Equals percentage of appropriate clients referred to other agency*
Table 12A
Respondents With Employer Contact Who Exchange Job Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Contact</th>
<th>Exchange Job Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES</strong></td>
<td><strong>JTPA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES N = 99, JTPA N = 90

*Percentage of staff with employer contact who exchange job orders.*
Table 13A

Employer Referral Rate to Other Agency When Unable to Fill Job Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Referral</th>
<th>Percentage of ES/JTPA Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never refer</td>
<td>ES: 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JTPA: 45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;01% but &lt; 10%</td>
<td>ES: 11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JTPA: 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=10% but &lt; 25%</td>
<td>ES: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JTPA: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=25% but &lt; 50%</td>
<td>ES: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JTPA: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=50% but &lt; 75%</td>
<td>ES: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JTPA: 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=75% but &lt; 100%</td>
<td>ES: 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JTPA: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always refer</td>
<td>ES: 32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JTPA: 34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES N = 84, JTPA N = 50
Table 14A
Wagner-Peyser Sign-Off Has Significantly Increased Coordination and Cooperation
(All Management Staff)

Percentage of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTPA</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree

ES N = 28, JTPA N = 35.
Note: Only management staff from the types of agencies are included.

System Averages:
ES = 3.54, JTPA = 4.5
Table 14B
Wagner-Peyser Sign-Off HasSignificantly Increased Coordination and Cooperation
(ES and JTPA Managers and Directors Only)

7 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

Number of Managers & Directors

ES N = 8, JTPA N = 7
Table 15A
Levels of Cooperation/Coordination and the Presence of Subcontracting

Levels of Cooperation/Coordination

Organizational Averaged Scores

ES Coop/Coord #1   JTPA Coop/Coord #1   ES Coop/Coord #2
JTPA Coop/Coord #2   Subcontracting

Coop/Coord - Cooperation/Coordination
Average of responses to Likert Scale
1 - Much Lower  7 - Much Higher
Table 16A
Goal Attainment (Interdependence) and the Presence of Subcontracting

Importance for Goal Attainment

Organizational Averaged Scores

ES N Value = 98, JTPA N Value = 90
Average of responses to 7 point scale
1=Not Very Important, 7=Very Important
Table 17A
Levels of Cooperation/Coordination In Comparison to Other Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Cooperation/Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Averaged Scores

ES N Value = 94/JTPA N Value = 87
Average of responses to Likert Scale
1 = Much Lower 7 = Much Higher
Table 18A
Overall Level of Cooperation and Coordination
All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Averaged Scores

- ES N Value = 97, JTPA N Value = 91
- Averages of 7 point scale: 1 = Very little cooperation, 7 = High degree of cooperation
Table 19A
Activities Could Be Much Better Planned and Coordinated Between the Two Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Town 3</th>
<th>Town 4</th>
<th>Town 5</th>
<th>Town 6</th>
<th>Town 7</th>
<th>Town 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTPA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Averages

ES N Value = 99/JTPA N Value = 89
Average of responses to 7 point scale
1=Strongly Agree, 7=Strongly Disagree
Table 20A
Levels of Interdependence
(Goal Attainment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interdependence</th>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Town 3</th>
<th>Town 4</th>
<th>Town 5</th>
<th>Town 6</th>
<th>Town 7</th>
<th>Town 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals ES</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals JTPA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Averaged Scores

Average of responses to Likert Scale
1 = Low
2 = High
Table 20B
ES Levels of Cooperation, Coordination and Goal Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation/Coordination/Goals</th>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Town 3</th>
<th>Town 4</th>
<th>Town 5</th>
<th>Town 6</th>
<th>Town 7</th>
<th>Town 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES Coop/Coord #1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES Coop/Coord #2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals ES</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Averaged Scores

Coop/Coord - Cooperation/Coordination
Average of responses to Likert Scale
1 = Low 7 = High
Table 20C
JTPA Levels of Cooperation, Coordination and Goal Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation/Coordination/Goals</th>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Town 3</th>
<th>Town 4</th>
<th>Town 5</th>
<th>Town 6</th>
<th>Town 7</th>
<th>Town 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JTPA Coop/Coord #1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTPA Coop/Coord #2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals JTPA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Averaged Scores

Coop/Coord = Cooperation/Coordination
Average of responses to Likert Scale
1 = Low, 7 = High
Table 21A
Cooperation/Coordination Compared to Other Agencies
(ES Managers versus ES Staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Town 3</th>
<th>Town 4</th>
<th>Town 5</th>
<th>Town 6</th>
<th>Town 7</th>
<th>Town 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Coop/Coord #1</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Coop/Coord #1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Averaged Scores

Coop/Coord = Cooperation/Coordination
Average of responses to Likert Scale
1 = Much Lower 7 = Much Higher
Table 21B
Overall Cooperation/Coordination Level
(ES Managers versus ES Staff)

Level of Cooperation and Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Town 3</th>
<th>Town 4</th>
<th>Town 5</th>
<th>Town 6</th>
<th>Town 7</th>
<th>Town 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Coop/Coord #2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgrs. Coop/Coord #2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES Managers vs Staff

Average of responses to Likert Scale
1 = Very Little, 7 = High
Table 22A  
Cooperation/Coordination Compared to Other Agencies  
JTPA Directors versus JTPA Staff

**Level of Cooperation and Coordination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>JTPA Staff</th>
<th>JTPA Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JTPA Directors vs JTPA Staff

*Average of individual responses, does not include data from Town Five.
**Director from Town Five did not respond.

Scale: 1 = Very Little, 7 = High
Table 22B
Overall Cooperation/Coordination Level
JTPA Directors versus JTPA Staff

Level of Cooperation and Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>JTPA Staff</th>
<th>JTPA Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town 1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 2</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 3</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 4</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JTPA Directors vs JTPA Staff

- Average of individual responses, does not include data from Town Five.
- Director from Town Five did not respond.

Scale: 1 = Very Little, 7 = High
Table 23A
Cooperation/Coordination Levels and the Presence of a Mutual Referral Process

Cooperation/Coordination and Referral Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town 1</th>
<th>Town 2</th>
<th>Town 3</th>
<th>Town 4</th>
<th>Town 5</th>
<th>Town 6</th>
<th>Town 7</th>
<th>Town 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Averaged Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ES Coop/Coord #1
- JTPA Coop/Coord #1
- ES Coop/Coord #2
- JTPA Coop/Coord #2
- Referral Process

Coop/Coord = Cooperation/Coordination
Average of responses to Likert Scales
Table 24A
Reasons For Not Working Closer Together
All ES and JTPA Respondents

Reasons*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>JTPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management's Attitude</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Understanding</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality Regs</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close as possible</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subjects were given multiple choices.
ES N = 98, JTPA N = 89
Table 25A
Competition For Resources
All ES and JTPA Respondents

% Of N Citing Resource Is Competed For

Resources Competing For

ES N = 96, JTPA N = 87
Table 26A
Duplications of Services and/or Programs
All ES and JTPA Respondents

Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ES Percentage Citing Yes</th>
<th>JTPA Percentage Citing Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town 1</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 2</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 3</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 4</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 5</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 6</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 7</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town 8</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES N = 91, JTPA N = 91
Table 26B
Duplications of Services Mentioned
All ES Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Service Duplicated:</th>
<th>Yes - Caused A Problem:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer/Place. Ser.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Client Prg.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elig., Assess., Test</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search Training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Job Training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Job Tax</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Times Mentioned

- **Duplication**
- **Caused a Problem**

**Legend:**
- Assess - Assessment
- Elig - Eligibility
- Place - Placement
- Prg - Program
- Serv - Service
- Test - Testing
Table 26C
Duplications of Services Mentioned
All JTPA Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Service Duplicated</th>
<th>Yes - Caused a Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer/Place. Ser.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Client Prg.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elig., Assess., Test</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search Training</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Job Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Job Tax</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TOTALS**                    | **53**                 

Number of Times Mentioned

- **Duplication**
- **Caused a Problem**

Assess - Assessment
Elig - Eligibility
Place - Placement
Prg - Program
Ser - Service
Test - Testing