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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Public schools represent a central social institution in our society, and a vital component in the social welfare network serving a community. Through the years the schools have developed the services of a variety of non-instructional personnel—psychologists, social workers, guidance counselors, psychiatrists, etc.—whose efforts have included identifying and helping students with social, economic, material, and situational obstacles to achieving traditional educational objectives in academic and socialization areas. In more recent years the public schools have assumed or have had thrust upon them educationally oriented social roles and programs, particularly those geared to low income and minority group populations. Despite this, the schools cannot and are not expected to meet all the needs of all students. School social workers, as the primary school link to home and community, have traditionally engaged and mobilized the social welfare resources of the community on behalf of children and their families who need help that cannot be
or traditionally has not been provided directly by the public schools. Alderson, in reviewing the relationship of school social work services to child welfare services, notes, "It is evident that as efforts increase to meet more fully the pressing problems of today's youth, the collaborative efforts between schools and community social agencies must be increased in both magnitude and efficiency."¹

From an educational perspective, the public schools seek the services of various social agencies to assist students and family members in coping with a variety of social, emotional, and material problems that generally also affect how youngsters function in school. It might be assumed that if all social welfare resources required by the schools were available in the community, no significant problem in coordinating services between the public schools and the social agencies would exist. However, not only are resources limited, but the literature, consistent with the writer's personal experience, indicates that most social welfare programs have been handicapped by the frequent failure of participating organizations to coordinate activities effectively.

One study of the procedures and problems in referring

school children to mental health clinics examined the serious difficulties of coordinating services.\textsuperscript{2} There is no reason to assume that the community under study is exceptional in this regard. Experience in the community indicates significant problems of interorganizational coordination exist.

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the transactions between a public school system and key social agencies providing services to children in one community and to determine what conditions influence existing patterns of interorganizational coordination between schools and agencies.

**Interorganizational Analysis: Review of the Literature**

That there is a "major lacuna" in sociological study in the research of interorganizational analysis has been noted by several writers.\textsuperscript{3} Alderson also notes this paucity:

In scanning the literature of school social work with regard to collaboration, one fact becomes evident.


School social work has devoted substantially more energy and attention, at least from evidence in the literature, to examining aspects of intraschool collaboration as contrasted to an appraisal of school-social agency collaboration.4

The limited social science research in interorganizational analysis more specifically is noted by Warren5 as excluding the "field" within which organizations interact, and by Evan6 as ignoring the "environment" of organizations as a unit for observation and analysis. Both concepts are related to consideration of the norms, values, and collectivities to which the organizations are related.

A theoretical approach that centrally contributes to this study is that of exchange theory, developed by Levine and White. In their seminal work7 they define organizational exchanges as "any voluntary activity between two organizations that has consequences, actual or anticipated, for the realizations of their respective goals or objectives." Exchanges refer to a variety of resources of

5Roland Warren, "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus of Investigation," in Brinkerhof and Kunz, Complex Organizations and Their Environments.
6William Evan, "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory of Interorganizational Relations," in Brinkerhof and Kunz, Complex Organizations and Their Environments.
an organization—personnel, services, funds, facilities, clients, information, etc.—that are usually limited in quantity.

Before reviewing exchange theory as a framework for interorganizational analysis, a major source of this theory is worth noting. Levine and White state that "interaction among organizations may be viewed with an exchange model like that suggested by Homans," initially in "Social Behavior as Exchange" and developed in Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. Homans focuses on "ordinary, everyday behavior," based on observation and analysis of individuals interacting in small groups. He conceptualizes social associations as exchanges of activity, tangible or intangible, and more or less rewarding or costly, between at least two persons. Social behavior and group structure is viewed as being shaped by each individual member's assessments of cost and value and resulting profit of particular exchanges. Levine and White

---

8Levine and White, "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework. . . ."


11Ibid.

12Levine and White, "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework. . . ."
note the limitations of Homans' theoretical framework because it is bound by exchanges primarily economic and deals primarily with individual or psychological phenomena. These referents are not sufficiently comprehensive to be applicable to an analysis of the transactions between complex organizations. In his Exchange and Power in Social Life, published several years after Levine and White's seminal article, Blau also singles out Homans for special recognition, despite some fundamental differences in his own approach. Blau analyzes the processes governing associations among men, employing a framework of exchange theory, as an approach to a more complex theory of social structure. It is interesting that social scientists exploring both interorganizational analysis and the larger social structure of our society both acknowledge their conceptual sources in Homans' work with small group interaction in everyday life.

Reid also interprets coordination within the conceptual framework of exchange theory, and defines coordination as a "system of exchanges between organizations" in which each agency, lacking particular resources.


available for achieving its goals, turns to other agencies to achieve them. With the concept of coordination noted, in which agency goals are a central organizational dynamic, coordination will be considerably affected by how each organization perceives exchange of resources as influencing its goal attainment.

Exchange theory as a framework for interorganizational analysis will be examined essentially to the extent that it can become in some form operationally relevant for this study. Analysis of the interaction between individual agency representatives does not lend itself to a direct translation within the framework of exchange theory in which organizational behavior is determined by organizational goal attainment. Etzioni and Reid emphasize that organizational goals and activities toward such ends must be examined not in formal or paper terms but in what occurs operationally. Following this principle, the primary source of data will be the activities of line practitioners, almost exclusively social workers, in the performance of their day-by-day efforts to directly provide services.

---


16 Reid, "Interorganizational Coordination in Delinquency Prevention and Control."
A potentially useful variable in analyzing coordination is the organizational level on which such exchanges occur. Kahn makes several distinctions. The lowest and most common level is "ad-hoc case coordination" by individual practitioners meeting the needs of particular clients. The next level is "service integration," which also affects individual cases but with policies and procedures regarding patterns of coordination having been arrived at systematically on an interagency level. Here exchanges are planned, case conferences systematically used, etc. The third level is described as "program coordination," dealing not with individual cases but the development of joint agency programs. What interactions between the schools and social agencies actually take place on these levels of coordination?

Reid suggests several determinants of coordination that directly flow from coordination formulated as a system of interagency exchanges:

1. Shared goals.—When agencies seek similar goals a strong force to exchange resources to further mutual


objectives is brought into play. Elsewhere, Reid dis-
cusses modes of organizational coexistence and notes that
agencies with similar goals may be in conflict as well as
interdependent. Such competition between agencies is a
familiar phenomenon.

2. Complementary resources.—Shared goals are
necessary but not sufficient for coordination. Complе-
mentary resources are also a necessary condition for coor-
dination. Each agency must be able to provide the other
with some resources to achieve its own goals. Exchanges
need not be of similar magnitude or value. Large multi-
function agencies tend to engage in fewer exchanges than
small agencies with more limited resources.

3. Mechanisms for controlling exchanges involved.—
This refers to more systematic efforts at case coordina-
tion which may take the form of interagency agreements,
regular case conferences, interagency committees and other
forms of program coordination, and control of resources
other than the elemental level of individual cases.

4. A basic determinant of interorganizational
exchanges generally, including coordination specifically,
is domain consensus. This refers to the degree of mutual
understanding and acceptance of one organization of the
specific goals, and functions to implement these goals, of
another organization with which it has transactions.
The establishment of domain consensus cannot be an arbitrary or unilateral action. Domain consensus defines a set of expectations both for members of an organization and for others with whom they interact about what the organization will or will not do. Hollister notes that domain consensus need not be viewed primarily as an independent variable affecting interorganizational exchange as do Levine and White but as a key dependent variable affected by differences of resources, technology, and ideology in the interorganizational system having transactions. He also proposes that a low degree of domain consensus among organizations may be referred to as "domain dissensus." Reid notes that the process of achieving domain consensus (avoiding overlapping, identifying agency responsibilities, etc.) constitutes much of the interaction between organizations. If, then, as suggested about public schools, the domain of non-instructional service to children is fluid and often blurred (both internal and external to the schools), given this condition, the nature of coordination between the schools and other social agencies will be affected by this

---


lack of clarity as to the school's domain.

Seider\textsuperscript{21} sees interorganizational exchange being regularized through the formalization of referral procedures, negotiations of agreements and service conditions, and reciprocal arrangements involving any use of facilities and staff. Agencies find it advantageous to work together on treatment plans for clients, to clarify or make exceptions to policies or jointly act in areas of mutual concern. What are the requirements for this mutually helpful process? She feels that organizational exchange of resources requires specificity and mutual acceptance and staff time to implement agreed-upon policies. Staff members require knowledge of resources, agency function, skill in organizational interaction such as consultation, and conference and committee methods, and sensitivity to interagency blockages. Administrators must recognize the need to establish appropriate working relationships with key personnel in other agencies in order to enhance the interorganizational exchange through these linkages of necessary authority and contributing to positive staff attitudes. Seider's\textsuperscript{22} material is particularly


\textsuperscript{22}Seider, "Community Organization in the Direct Service Agency."
useful in operationalizing more theoretical considerations.

To varying degrees the determinants of coordination suggested by Reid in the preceding pages can be operationalized, or at least explored operationally as they relate to interactions with the public schools. The institutional and organizational characteristics of the public schools, which reach out for community resources, will be considered as they may influence interorganizational exchanges.

In a broad sense family agencies, psychiatric clinics, public schools, public assistance agencies, protective services, and the probation department are all concerned about the welfare of children. However, some are public and some are voluntary agencies, some are small, some large and administratively complex, some involve voluntary participation, some compulsory. The characteristics of the organizations can reasonably be expected to affect their interaction with other organizations.

Guiding Assumptions and Questions for Operational Analysis

1. It is necessary to identify transactions that actually take place between representatives of the

23Reid, "Interorganizational Coordination in Social Welfare."
schools and social agencies, the kinds of services to the students and clients of the schools and social agencies that are involved, sources of initiation, and their relative frequency. Throughout the inquiry specificity will be sought by requesting recent practice illustrations. This is basic information about interagency exchanges necessary for interorganizational analysis on the operational level. A cluster of questions will provide such data.

2. Characteristics and issues related to coordination between the public schools and social agencies need to be specifically identified and assessed on an operational level. Such existing patterns will be identified by eliciting information about problematic areas and instances of interagency exchanges.

3. Patterns of efforts to resolve difficulties around coordination of services need to be identified. There needs to be exploration as to how practitioners assess the reasons for difficulties in achieving more effective coordination. The study will consider how characteristics and conditions of public schools in particular may influence the development and resolution of school-agency problems of coordination of services.

4. It is inferred that the coordination of services may be affected by the degree of familiarity staff
members have of the resources, services, and programs of
the other organization involved in interactions.

5. An effort will be made to identify if and how
individual perceptions and responses by staff members
affect interagency exchanges on this idiosyncratic level
of organizational behavior. Are organization exchanges
operationally shaped to any significant degree by such
considerations?

6. Executives will be the respondents who are
assumed to have greater organizational authority and are
related to broader considerations of organizational pat-
terns of functioning as they affect goal attainment. Pro-
grammatic considerations and planning will be contrasted
to the thinking and behavior of line representatives deal-
ing primarily with services to individual clients.

Characteristics of the Schools as a
Variable in Interaction and Coordination

This study is focused on the public school system
and the interaction and coordination of its services with
those of several key social agencies in the community.
Particular emphasis will be placed on characteristics of
the public schools as they may affect patterns of coordi-
nation including some of the suggested determinants of
coordination. It is important to know how these charac-
teristics are perceived by the representatives of the
schools themselves (confined in this study to the school social workers) as well as perceived by representatives of the social agencies.

A central characteristic of public education is that it is universal and compulsory, which is reflected in both legal and professional authority that traditionally is conspicuously exercised in patterns of control and discipline of students. Also, the educational programs are conducted in classroom groups, so that individual needs and behavior patterns have to be weighed against the effect on the group process. These points relate to such matters as the question of shared and complementary goals as determinants of coordination. A family agency or mental health clinic, at least in a particular instance, may have some different objectives or emphasis in the area of individual development than that of the schools.

Another characteristic of public education is that there are large numbers of students with many problems, and frequent emergencies, so there is pressure on the system to affect changes in the youngsters who are perceived as disruptive. This may contribute to different expectations and goals between the schools and some social agencies.

From the point of view of channels of communication the public schools are relatively complex, involving
a variety of instructional and non-instructional disci-
plines and a chain of educational authority and decision
making. Special service personnel, operating from central
administration in the schools, come to service individual
schools where the principal has considerable authority and
autonomy. Who makes decisions, who becomes involved in a
case situation (the youngster comes from classrooms of
teachers), who represents the schools as perceived from
outside as well as inside the system? Of course there is
coordination internal to the system, but this area of
authority needs to be explored as it possibly affects
interagency communication. Those outside the schools may
have to relate to a diffusion of authority within the
schools that varies with different situations and affects
the time required and kinds of efforts toward coordination.

The question of domain consensus may be a signifi-
cant one as a determinant of coordination between schools
and social agencies. As noted, the public schools have
increasingly become involved in non-instructional services
to students—dealing with emotional, social, and to some
extent material needs (free meals) of children in need.
There are various kinds and degrees of counseling services
made available to children and family members by schools,
with the lines between educational and broad child welfare
service becoming blurred. Since these boundaries of staff
and programs are fluid, and societal demands on the social role of public schools are increasing, it would appear that both school staff and representatives of the social agencies may be unclear or uncertain as to what services or programs properly are or should be provided by the public schools themselves. This would affect what services are sought by the schools of other agencies and what other agencies seek of the schools, and affect the coordination of services.

A last variable noted as a determinant of coordination is that mechanisms for controlling exchange of resources be available. The availability and use of such mechanisms can be explored in the context of existing patterns for resolution of questions of coordination. What are these mechanisms, on what organizational level do they function, and how systematically are they applied?

It needs to be noted that all variables and characteristics affecting interactions and interagency coordination between the schools and social agencies are not peculiar to characteristics of the public schools. There can be the same or different, better or poorer coordination between the social agencies themselves. Such questions as the appropriateness of referrals and whether adequate information or preparation are provided are general considerations of coordination. However, the focus of
this study is on the interaction between public schools with its characteristics and the social agencies in the community.

Selection of Case Study

In order to examine in sufficient detail the school-social agency exchanges on the operational level and to secure and study the views of respondents, it was most feasible that a case study be done of one public school system and the community it served. The school district and community selected is a relatively large urban center with many of the characteristic educational and social problems of our current urban society. This old city is characterized by the persistence of various viable ethnic enclaves. This is also a city with which this writer has had considerable professional involvement in the school system in particular and with key social agencies. These personal experiences were expected to contribute useful knowledge and help in securing cooperation for the study. The primary approach to the case study will be the focus on the operational level of interorganizational transactions, about which little was written.

The dominant group of organizational representatives at the interface of school system and social agencies were the social workers from Special Services of the
public schools—the link to home and community of the students—and the line social workers of the social agencies. On a less day-to-day, case-by-case operational level, key administrators with their greater responsibilities and authority for shaping their organization's policies will also provide data.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Approach to Study

The locus of this study is an old industrial urban center of approximately 110,000 population in the larger New York City metropolitan area. Over 15,000 youngsters attend the public schools and in the vicinity of 9,000 attend parochial and other private schools. There is a large black and Spanish-speaking population concentrated in particular areas whose inhabitants generally suffer the most intense educational, economic, and social problems in the city. Various viable ethnic enclaves have persisted over an extended period. Though one of the largest cities in the state of New Jersey, and by far the largest in the county, its social welfare network is comparatively underdeveloped. Significant racial tensions and conflicts exist but very little violence has erupted. There have been demonstrations by black students. In many respects its socioeconomic problems and characteristics are similar to other cities and reflect the current social stresses and turmoil of our larger society. Special Services of the public schools, which include the Child Study Teams, have
been expanding significantly in recent years. Much of the energies of the non-instructional staff has been devoted to special educational needs of the socially, emotionally, economically, and medically disadvantaged students.

To make the study manageable, it has focused on transactions confined to those between the public schools and a limited number of key social agencies selected from the large number of social agencies in the community. The four social agencies included in the study were selected based on an inquiry of school social workers, supported by direct observations of this writer who has been professionally involved in this community and its school system. All four agencies appeared on a list of the five most significant social agencies that several of the school social workers were asked to identify. It will be noted again that this study focuses on transactions between the schools and each of the social agencies and does not include transactions between the social agencies themselves.

A central task of the study was to develop questionnaires that could generate information about the content, volume, and direction of exchanges between the schools and social agencies, the patterns, problems and effectiveness of these organizational exchanges, and the factors that tended to influence the patterns of coordination of services. Much of this task was an effort to
operationalize aspects of interorganizational exchange theory as previously discussed. Three instruments were developed. One was to be administered to the agency social workers interacting with the public schools, one for the school social workers interacting with four different agencies, and one was for the administrators, who came from several professional disciplines. While the questionnaires for the school and agency social workers were different, there were many questions and areas identical or similar to both groups so that the expressed responses to shared experiences could be directly compared. This comparability is practically limited by the fact that even in the final lengthy form of the questionnaire the school social workers could not provide equally detailed responses about their relations to each of the four social agencies as the agency social workers could provide about their relations just to the school system.

The time to administer the questionnaire to the line staff ranged between one and one-half hours and nearly three hours, averaging two hours for each interview. The time to interview the administrators ranged between one hour and 20 minutes and one hour and 40 minutes, averaging one and one-half hours. Cards were used for all questions that included a list of items or responses. The narrative responses were recorded nearly
verbatim directly on the questionnaire.

The data intended to be secured about interorganizational exchanges is basically not available in a "hard" form. Examination of social agency records would probably give some minimal concrete information about contacts with the schools. School records are known to be highly incomplete. To attempt to secure data about exchanges from a specified set of records to be kept for purposes of this study would not have been at all feasible. Lastly, and perhaps most crucially, the kind of information necessary to clarify the thinking, assessments, and behavior of the staff members involved in interorganizational transactions could not be totally expressed by statistics. The detailed structured interviews did include many estimates of statistical responses based on recall, as well as various narrative responses. Most recent case examples were requested to concretize various more general responses. The information secured from the interviews might be viewed as not adequately representing reality but rather some distorted version of it as recalled and revealed for purposes of this study. Such distortion probably exists, but the exact extent of such distortion cannot be determined. In any event, representatives of organizations will behave on the basis of their perceptions of how their own and other organizations can provide necessary services for clients
with whom they become involved. Perceptions of organizational domain will affect interactions and coordination of services between the schools and social agencies. Therefore, this provides a satisfactory source of data for the situation being studied.

**Data Being Sought**

1. Information about the interactions between the public schools and the selected social agencies in the community—the kinds, range, and some idea of frequency of exchanges between representatives of the two will be secured. Specificity and illustrations will be systematically sought.

2. Nature, characteristics, and patterns of coordination of services between the schools and social agencies as perceived by representatives (primarily social workers) of each at the interface between schools and agencies will be identified.

3. Several organizational determinants of coordination suggested in the literature will be explored.

   a. Shared goals.—Agencies seeking similar goals constitute a necessary but not sufficient condition, and may lead to conflict as well as interdependence between agencies.

   b. Complementary goals.—One organization helps the other with resources that help achieve its own functions
c. Mechanisms for controlling exchange of resources exist.—Interagency agreements, interagency committees, case conferences around policy in particular situations, etc. At times interagency efforts beyond the level of individual cases are required to define services that can be provided.

d. Domain consensus.—Degree of clarity and shared perceptions among representatives of the schools and social agencies of the functions and goals of each.

These factors include the actual problems of coordinating services that may arise on an operational level between the public schools and social agencies in the community. Are these shared goals (child services) and complementary resources for achieving them manifest by the exchanges between the organizations? What are the actual processes of resolving difficulties around coordinating services and do these mechanisms permit adequate organization controls around exchanges of services? What non-instructional services do the school social workers themselves believe the schools do and should provide, and what are the expectations of social workers of the social agencies as to what services do and should schools provide? How are these last noted views reflected in response to requests from schools for services, and in requesting
services of the schools?

4. Information about the degree of familiarity representatives have of the resources, services, and functions of the organizations interacting, particularly of school services and programs which tend to change. Formal and informal contact between line practitioners affects this clarity as to functions and goals of organizations. This permits coordination to be influenced by idiosyncratic responses by organizational representatives to members of other agencies. Therefore, information regarding the nature and degree of contact between representatives of different organizations is relevant.

5. Are there instances in which previous experiences have contributed to one agency representative seeking out or avoiding another staff member, thus affecting interagency exchanges?

6. From a total organizational position, most likely to be expressed by administrative personnel, the question of priorities in the use of finite resources may result in different perceptions by representatives of different organizations as to how resources should be expended, and this may affect coordination of services. Schools have at times requested development or expansion of programs of a particular agency, but in the context of overall organizational goal attainment such use of
resources might not be considered feasible or timely by the agency. This type of data is difficult to secure but such information will be sought.

Operationalizing for Analysis:
Agency Social Worker Questionnaire

The general conceptional framework for interorganizational analysis has been translated into guiding assumptions for data being sought and the kinds of data being sought has just been noted. The instruments developed for the group of agency social workers, school social workers, and agency and school (Special Services) administrators translate the inquiry for data into essentially operational terms. What follows is a breakdown of the data being sought from the agency social workers, which required the lengthiest of the three questionnaires developed. The area of inquiry noted is followed by a cluster of numbers of the questions relating to that area of information being sought. The actual questionnaire\(^1\) for the agency social workers, as well as those for the school social workers and agency of Special Services administrators are in the addendum. Not all questions in these lengthy instruments proved fruitful for analysis.

\(^1\)See Appendix A, Questionnaire for Agency Social Workers; Appendix B, Questionnaire for School Social Workers; and Appendix C, Questionnaire for Agency and School Administrators.
Agency goals and services, and functions of respondents (#1, 2).—Provides basic information regarding organization's goals and respondents' functions. Replies may provide some framework for analyzing behavior in other responses to questions related to organizational goal attainment and coordination—such as perceptions of domain consensus with schools.

Interaction operationally with school social workers (#6, 8, 9, 11, 19, 20, 22, 23, 46).—These items provide basic data about the nature, frequency, and direction of flow (who initiates contacts) of interaction between social workers of the social agencies and of the school system. With the primary exchanges will be information about the basic unit of "the case," with secondary focus related to questions of coordination of services and clarification of services each may provide. This will contribute to matters of domain consensus. Probably in most cases not too much overlapping of services, etc., will be identified as problematical in principle, but analysis of actual case situations may reveal more questions exist operationally. This will affect patterns of coordination.

Non-social work school personnel (#18, 19, 20, 21).—These questions cover essentially the same basic information as noted for interaction with school social
workers. In addition, they furnish data about how the organizational structure and roles within the school system may affect communication patterns with agency social workers. If even a limited percentage of agency social workers seek out non-social work personnel in the school as a more effective channel, then a question about the role and status of the school social workers arises and some lack of clarity regarding coordination of services.

Determinants of coordination

a. Common goals (#1, 2, 22, 23).—These items establish the degree of commonality in terms of mutual involvement between agencies and schools with children. How the agency social worker views the schools might help them better carry out their own functions. This will give some indication of the degree of differentiation of goals and levels of coordination that exist operationally. It is anticipated that common goals are viewed as existing on the broad level of services to children, with the differentiation between how each organization provides help partly clarified.

b. Resources available (#24, 25, 35).—These questions tap the degree of familiarity of agency social workers with related resources and services of the public schools, and how these services may have some lack of differentiation from agency services. Information
regarding school Special Services is probably fairly good generally but not necessarily specifically, and some significant difficulty in making proper differentiations from and coordinating with school services (question of domain consensus) may exist.

c. Control of use of resources (#29, 30, 31, 32, 38).—These questions deal with patterns of resolving identified problems in coordination of services with the public schools. It is anticipated that clearly structured patterns generally do not exist, that situations are handled essentially on an ad hoc basis, and little staff effort is devoted to periodic discussion of pattern and problems of coordination on a programmatic level.

d. Domain consensus (#25, 35, 26).—These items more specifically will focus on questions of the convergence and divergence of perceptions of domain of organizational functions by representatives of different organizations. There could be some modest lack of clarity regarding some shared functions with the schools that would be more specific in illustrations and attempts at coordination of services.

Coordination elements and patterns (#27, 28, 33, 34, 39, 48, 49, 50, 51).—The items tell much about problems of coordination, patterns of resolving issues, how effective coordination appears to be, views as to the
need to improve, time and effort devoted to coordination of services, conditions that constitute obstacles or enhance coordination of services—with specific illustrations of situation. Though there will probably be identified significant time devoted to contact with school personnel around case situation, there will probably be revealed relatively low priority devoted to systematic (as contrasted to ad hoc case situation) efforts at identifying conditions and determinants of positive coordination and what interferes with making exchanges more effective. Probably there is limited staff interaction on a planning level to develop principles and practices to make coordination more effective—with limitation of staff time being noted as a major factor. Good individual working relationships may well prove most significant organizationally in affecting coordination on an operational level. It is anticipated that there will be indications for efforts to improve agency-school coordination of services by greater interorganization exchanges on a broader base than the individual case—dealing with available resources, overall procedures, and developing programs.

School characteristics (#52, 53, 54, 55).—These items focus on characteristics and conditions of public schools that influence patterns on practices of
coordination. Interesting and significant is whether agency social workers respond to an appreciable degree to the complexity of the school organizationally as it blurs lines of authority, time lags (daily operational), and changing functions of the schools (program considerations). Hopefully, though differences of objectives (such as school emphasis on controlling classroom behavior, agency focus on need for expressive qualities) may emerge as an influence on coordinating services, these objectives could be under one umbrella of helping youngsters cope more effectively with their realities. Questions are structured in terms of possibly eliciting these characteristics and conditions of schools that may influence coordination positively or negatively. Of particular interest in this category is a comparison of the perceptions of representatives of social agencies and schools around their particular orientation to children of mutual interest, whether in fact differing priorities interfere with interorganization accommodation to coordinated efforts.

Idiosyncratic characteristics and informal interaction (#4, 5, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45).—These items will provide data regarding the familiarity professionally with the school social workers from an agency and
broader professional context. Implied is that professional familiarity, with consequences on an informal level, may have an effect on the coordination of services by representatives of interacting organizations. Operationally, these idiosyncratic considerations—characteristics of the social workers—may be a significant determinant in affecting coordination of services between agency and school. How much of this variable exists or will be acknowledged is unknown, but these informal personalized determinants may be substantial. It would emphasize a need to expand from this ad hoc kind of situation to a more broadly based program oriented effort at coordination—to reduce at least some of the negative idiosyncratic influences of coordination.

The question for social workers requests specific illustrations. These replies will be examined by content analysis and hopefully several dominant kinds of case situations will emerge that can be related to the broader categories already noted.

First, then, this instrument will describe what in fact goes on between the social agencies and the public schools, and secondarily, what are those characteristics of the exchanges between the organizations that shape their patterns of coordination.

The original questionnaires were pretested in a
smaller urban community with characteristics broadly comparable to the research site, including school services, though with somewhat more highly developed social services. Four line social workers were interviewed who provided family agency and psychiatric services, as was the executive director of this merged agency. Two school social workers from the district were also interviewed, one of whom had administrative responsibilities. As a result of this pretesting the two questionnaires were modified and shortened, and their form of administration improved. The final instruments (see Appendix) included estimates of frequency counts, rank ordering of explanations, case illustrations of such explanations, and open-ended narrative responses.

The necessary respondents for this study were secured with the help of the administrators of the various organizations involved who had been alerted and had expressed their interest and willingness to cooperate. Without exception they were very helpful in identifying and providing necessary staff to be interviewed, and in making themselves available for interviewing. A primary characteristic of the population for this case study is that it includes almost the total universe of social workers of the schools and social agencies interacting at the interface of their organizations in this community. Also
included were one psychiatrist at the clinic and one volunteer with the family agency who functioned in a liaison role to the public schools. Though three of the four social agencies had their main office in the city, all four served communities in addition to the one under study. The fourth agency was by far the largest single recipient of services of all four agencies. The line agency social workers were identified on the basis of their entire or predominant caseload being confined to the community under study (the public agencies identified caseloads geographically) and having at least one year of experience in this community. All of the school social workers were included. Another characteristic of the social agencies in the study needs to be noted. Coordination of services can be affected by having choices of agencies available to provide particular services. In this study choices are relatively limited. Public assistance, protective services, and certain out-of-home placements are primarily confined to the public agencies in the study. The clinic branch is the only one actually located in the community, though some other outpatient psychiatric services are available on a limited basis to residents in the community. The family agency has the only professional staff providing non-sectarian service to the community, with a Catholic and Jewish family agency also available. The interorganizational transactions of the case study are comprehensively
covered. The different levels of analysis include what is happening operationally, and administrative responses, both within the context of organizational goals, and what idiosyncratic factors may be operative.

Description of Organizations

Bureau of Children's Services (BCS).—This social agency is one of 18 district offices in the state, and services the entire county in which the community under study is located. The nine caseworkers (official designation) had caseloads totally or predominantly confined to the community under study. The district supervisor, chief administrator, was also interviewed. This district office had a total of 45 caseworkers and nine supervisors at the time of the study.

Under administration of the State Department of Institutions and Agencies, BCS is a public, tax-supported social welfare agency delegated with responsibility and legal authority for providing a wide range of services to children. These include social services to children in their own homes (voluntary with parents), foster family placement, and supervision, group family care, protective services, services to unmarried mothers and their babies, adoptive services, purchased day care services, purchased homemaker services, institutional placement, and parole supervision for children under 14. Efforts are made to
strengthen family life and permit children to remain in their own homes. If this does not prove possible, alternate arrangements are sought.

In early 1972 (following data gathering), a state-level reorganization resulted in the Bureau of Children's Services becoming the Division of Youth and Family Services, with some modification of its functions and services.

**County Welfare Board (CWB).**—This is one of the 21 county welfare boards in the state, providing financial assistance funded by the Federal and state governments and administered under supervision of the state. Of the categories of public assistance, which include aid to the blind, aged, and disabled, the largest expenditure by far is the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The overwhelming number of school children in this study whose families receive public assistance falls within AFDC, which usually means that there is no adult male living in the household. Some families of the working poor receive supplemental financial assistance. The community under study had almost half of the public assistance cases and funds for the entire county.

Effective June 1971 the County Welfare Board was divided between an income maintenance unit (about 50 staff members) which investigated and determined eligibility for
financial assistance, and a social service unit (about 24 caseworkers) which provided services to recipients in addition to money. The eight caseworkers in the study were in the service unit. By Federal statute the county welfare boards were required to make available a wide array of "defined" social services to recipients, based on a comprehensive social study. In the case of AFDC, where basic program objectives include strengthening family life and enhancing the development and self-sufficiency of parents and children, "defined" services theoretically made available include family counseling, services to children, housing, training, referrals to community resources, etc., for a total of 51 services. County welfare boards traditionally have tremendous difficulty attempting to deliver these social services. An April 1971 report of the Governor's Commission notes that these social services are primarily "paper" operations, with little effectiveness. The CWB usually sends an annual form letter of inquiry about the presence and school adjustment of children from AFDC families. These inquiries are usually responded to in some routine manner administratively without involving the child study team servicing the particular school.

*Family and Children's Society* (FCS).—This is a private, long-established, and the only non-sectarian
family agency in the community that has a professional staff. It provides services to several communities in the county, of which the one in the study is by far the largest in size and use of agency resources. It also has an outreach office in the largest non-white population center in the community. It is funded through private monies and its fees. The counseling services provided are for problems in parent-child relations, child behavior, marital problems, problems of the aged, and various other personal and family problems. There are also foster care, adoption, and other services. The five line staff members with a year or more on the staff were all interviewed for this study, as was the volunteer who has been functioning in the new role of agency liaison to the public schools from which she had retired as a principal. Only the part-time case aide in the outreach office was not professionally educated. The Executive Director was also interviewed.

**County Psychiatric Clinic (CPC).**—This is the branch office of a voluntary (private) county psychiatric clinic, the only one located in the community. The clinic is funded through non-governmental monies and its fees. It has a children's and adult service and provides "psychiatric therapy" working with groups and individuals. The clinic also provided consultative, training, and general educational services to the community. There is one
full-time social worker (with supervisory responsibilities) in the children's unit who services the community under study and a full-time psychiatrist, and both were interviewed. The social work executive director and medical administrators on the county level, who have direct involvement with the branch office through regular staff meetings, were also interviewed.

Public Schools—The Child Study Team of the Division of Special Services.—The following material describing the Child Study Team is taken directly from the September 1971 manual of the Division of Special Services of the public school system in this study. The school social workers in this study are organizationally part of the Division of Special Services and members of the Child Study Teams that service each of the schools.

Definition

A. A basic Child Study Team consists of a school psychologist, a learning disabilities teacher-consultant, and a school social worker. A Child Study Team may also include a variety of other consultants such as psychiatrist, school physician, nurse, guidance counselor, etc.

Purpose

A. The overall aim of the Child Study Team is to provide mental health consultation to the Public Schools. This is provided in the following ways:

1. Offer consultation services to the schools concerning the learning and adjustment problems of children.

2. Initiate and maintain contact with appropriate
community resources which offer help in meeting the client's emotional, academic, and/or recreational needs.

3. Evaluate children with mental, emotional, and/or learning disabilities for the purpose of proper class placement and further school planning.

4. Consult with and counsel parents of children who are presently problems in school.

5. Provide direct service for a limited period of time through individual or group counseling.

6. Interpret group test results to school personnel.

7. Conduct research projects and provide a resource for teachers and other school personnel who seek to understand the educational and emotional needs of children and youth.

8. Comply with the Rules and Regulations pursuant to Title 18 A, Chapter 46, to identify and classify handicapped children between the ages of 5 and 20.

School Social Worker

1. Functions

a. Services to the individual child

(1) Observes individual in the classroom

(2) Studies school records

(3) Conducts casework interviews with children referred by the principal, guidance counselor, or other Child Study Team member because of learning, personality, or behavior disorders

(4) Provides individual or group counseling for a limited number of students. Consults with other Child Study Team members around suitable educational and counseling plans

b. Services to parents

(1) Counsels parents and interprets the child's behavior to them
(2) Refers children and parents to appropriate community resources

(3) Works with parents in groups on mental health and child training problems

c. Services to school personnel

(1) Offers consultative services to principals, teachers, nurses, guidance counselors, and other school personnel in order to give them a better awareness of mental health concepts

(2) Advises teachers on specific problems

(3) In-service training with faculty groups when requested by administrators

d. Service to the community

(1) Serves on a variety of committees involved with health, education, and welfare

(2) Points up community needs and works with existing agencies to develop necessary resources

(3) Is available as a speaker for community meetings

e. Staff meetings with Child Study Team to discuss on-going problems and to formulate operational plans

f. Research

(1) Conducts research projects

(2) Assists other school personnel in research programs

2. Referrals

a. Request for social work services may be made by school principal, a vice-principal, psychologist, guidance counselor, or teacher using the "Request for Child Study Team Services" form. These requests will usually be related to situations where the problem appears to be related to home conditions or disturbance in the parent-child relationship.
b. The social worker may schedule a home visit or arrange for the parent to come to the school. If the family has been known to other agencies, contact will be made with these agencies for background information.

c. A psychological evaluation will be requested if this is indicated.

d. Upon completion of the social work study, a written report is prepared in duplicate and filed in the master file in the Division of Special Services. A notation will be made on the cumulative record card at the time of the social work study.

e. The social worker will discuss the results of the social work study with the principal, teacher, nurse, or the interested personnel.

f. Referrals for continued treatment may be made to community agencies or private resources.

United Community Services (UCS).—This agency conducts annual financial campaigns and allocates funds to private health and welfare agencies that are financially participating agencies. The social planning committee's main function is to insure the community has a planned, coordinated, and effective program of health and welfare services dealing with problems of its people. It collects, organizes, and disseminates information to work toward this goal. It coordinates activities to avoid duplication of effort.

The executive director of the UCS at the time of the study, who had been in this position for several years, was interviewed to determine possible relevance to this study. This agency enabled its members
organizations to better understand community needs, and determined priorities for allocation of campaign funds to member agencies based on community needs for services, including new programs. However, while having this type coordinating role, UCS did not become significantly involved in the coordination of services between its voluntary member agencies. Its involvement with the public agencies was only on the general level of encouraging and promoting the development of all public and private agencies to meet community health and welfare needs. Overall, then, USC was not any significant factor affecting the findings of this study except by the absence of its role.

Note.—Social workers in the study are variously identified formally in their organizations as psychiatric social workers, caseworkers, and social workers. For purposes of this study, they will all be called social workers.

Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Staff--31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Children's Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Welfare Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Children's Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Psychiatric Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Social Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychiatric Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 psychiatrist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrators—9

Bureau of Children's Services  District Supervisor
County Welfare Board  Director
           Administrative Supervisor
Family and Children's Society  Executive Director
County Psychiatric Clinic  Medical Director
           Executive Director
Public School System  Director, Special Services
           Coordinator, Psychological
           Services
           (Child Study Teams)
United Community Services  Director

Limitations of the Study

Basically this study attempts to operationalize aspects of exchange theory as an approach to interorganizational analysis, and to empirically study one case situation. The findings of this case study of the transactions between the public school system and key social agencies in one community cannot be generalized beyond the particular characteristics of these organizations and this community. To the extent that these characteristics are more comparable than remarkable contrasted to other communities and organizations, and to the extent that exchange theory as a framework for analysis has validity, to that extent these findings may have a degree of generalization. It can also be expected that there may be some idiosyncratic elements involving staff members or organizational
arrangements, so that organizational idiosyncracy can become a variable to consider in interorganizational analysis.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Findings and Analysis of Data from Social Workers

Transactions between schools and social agencies:
Shared goals and complementary resources as determinants of coordination.—As noted in the chapter on methodology, data to be sought for an analysis of interorganizational exchanges included basic information on what happened on the operational level between the school and agency social workers—the frequency, purpose, direction, etc., of their contacts. Throughout this study certain abbreviations and symbols will be used as noted in key below. An inquiry (A#23) of the agency social workers indicated that except for the CWB the other three social agencies estimated that 44% (FCS) to 67% (CPC) of their caseloads were referrals from the school system (Table 1).

Proportion of children in individual caseloads

Key: BCS—Bureau of Children's Services
FCS—Family and Children's Society
CWB—County Welfare Board
CPC—County Psychiatric Clinic
A#—Agency social worker questionnaire
S#—School social worker questionnaire
SSW—School Social Worker
TABLE 1
ESTIMATES OF PROPORTION OF CHILDREN IN INDIVIDUAL CASELOADS REFERRED BY THE SCHOOL SYSTEM (A#23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCS(9)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB(8)</td>
<td>Cannot be determined.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS(5)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5%-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC(2)</td>
<td>Average: 50%-67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From personal observation, relatively low proportion.

TABLE 2
PROPORTION OF CHILDREN FROM SOCIAL AGENCIES ATTENDING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCS(9)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%-100%</td>
<td>400 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB(8)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%-100%</td>
<td>4300 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS(5)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%-73%</td>
<td>200 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC(2)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%-75%</td>
<td>75 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attending school and their approximate number were estimated (AI22). The proportions rose to between 50% (FCS) and 75% (CPC) as noted in Table 2.

With about half of the children of three of the social agencies estimated to be referred by the public schools and even a higher proportion attending school, there is considerable shared agency-school involvement with youngsters and family members known to both organizations. According to estimates, about 25% of the entire school population comes from families receiving public assistance (CWB), and these tend to be youngsters in greater need than other school children. Shared goals have been noted to be a necessary but not sufficient determinant of coordination of services between organizations. In this situation there is considerable shared school-agency interest in the welfare of children known to both.

Estimates of the frequency of contacts between social workers from the school system and social agencies were examined (AI6, S77) to indicate something of the dimension of interorganizational exchange without regard to direction, form, or purpose of these contacts. The findings (Table 3) showed differences in frequency count estimates by school and agency social workers in three of four cases. Overall, the average frequency of school-
TABLE 3
FREQUENCY OF CONTACT BETWEEN SCHOOL AND AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS (A#6, S#7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSW with BCS</td>
<td>1/week or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS with SSW</td>
<td>1/2-3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW with CWB</td>
<td>Slightly &gt; 1/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB with SSW</td>
<td>Slightly &gt; 1/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW with FCS</td>
<td>1/week or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS with SSW</td>
<td>1/2-3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW with CPC</td>
<td>1/2-3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC with SSW</td>
<td>1/week or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4
PROPORTION OF CONTACTS INITIATED BY INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL AND AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS (A#9, S#8)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSW -&gt; BCS</td>
<td>1:1, 9:1, 1:1, 9:1, 1:1, 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS -&gt; SSW</td>
<td>3:2, 1:1, 4:10, 1:3, 9:1, 9:1, 1:1, 1:2, 2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW -&gt; CWB</td>
<td>3:1, 1:9, 9:1, 2:3, 9:1, 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB -&gt; SSW</td>
<td>4:1, 1:1, 1:2, 9:1, 1:10, 1:1, 3:1, 1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW -&gt; FCS</td>
<td>3:2, 1:1, 9:1, 1:1, 9:1, 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS -&gt; SSW</td>
<td>3:1, 1:10 (intake): 1:1, 4:10, 1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW -&gt; CPC</td>
<td>10:0, 9:1, 9:1, 3:1, 9:1, 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC -&gt; SSW</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Each ratio refers to response of individual social worker in school or agency to contacts with school or agency.
agency contacts was between once a week or more and once every two to three weeks, except for the average of only monthly contacts between school and CWB social workers. Including the large numbers of children referred by the schools and attending school, this frequency count of school-agency contacts appears fairly low.

The direction of flow of school system and social agencies gives an indication of which organization is more dependent on the resources and services of the other. Questions S#8 and A#9 provide data on patterns of initiative between the schools and agencies and are noted in Table 4. As anticipated earlier, the school social workers overall initiated a greater volume of contacts than did the agency social workers. This was clearly true in relation to FCS and overwhelmingly in relation to CPS—two private treatment agencies. In the case of BCS, several of their social workers indicated contacting the school social workers more frequently than being contacted, while each of the school social workers estimated contacting as much as or more than they were contacted by BCS. There was no distinct trend by either staff in initiation of school-CWB contacts so that the direction of flow of interorganizational contacts was indeterminate.

What, then, were the purposes of these contacts? The findings (Tables 5 through 12) indicated that school
### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. I</th>
<th>Table 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>BCS → SSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW → BCS</td>
<td>Vol. I I II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSW → CWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. I I II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Request for service</td>
<td>6 0 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exchange of information regarding cases</td>
<td>6 1 8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Information regarding possible services</td>
<td>0 6 1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. To clarify/coordinate services</td>
<td>0 7 2 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. I</th>
<th>Table 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>SSW → CWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW → CWB</td>
<td>Vol. I I II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vol. I I II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Request for service</td>
<td>4 3 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exchange of information regarding cases</td>
<td>7 1 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Information regarding possible services</td>
<td>4 4 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. To clarify/coordinate services</td>
<td>0 4 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vol. I — Very often/often</th>
<th>Vol. II — Occ./rarely/never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSW → FCS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FCS → SSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Request for service
- b. Exchange of information regarding cases
- c. Information regarding possible services
- d. To clarify/coordinate services
- e. Other

### Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vol. I — Very often/often</th>
<th>Vol. II — Occ./rarely/never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSW → CPC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPC → SSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Request for service
- b. Exchange of information regarding cases
- c. Information regarding possible services
- d. To clarify/coordinate services
- e. Other

**Note.** — CPC = 1 SW + 1 MD.
social workers contact the agencies about equally to request direct service and exchange information, except with the CWB where exchanges of information are clearly the dominant reason for contact. The agency social workers clearly contacted the school social workers more for exchange of information than to request direct services from the schools, and clearly initiated more contacts around clarifying and coordinating services with the schools than did the school social workers.

As noted, because of the problem of recall of data, rank ordering of categories was immediately accompanied by a question about the last contact that would illustrate the item under study—in this case, the reason for the school and agency social workers initiating their last contact. "Exchange of information" was divided between providing, securing, or mutually exchanging information. As was illustrated in the content analysis noted below, these "last recalled" findings tended to confirm the responses to the previous question.

SSW → BCS 7 exchanges of information (5 provide, 2 secure)
2 requests for service (placement, protective)

BCS → SSW 11 exchanges of information (6 secure, 1 provide, 4 mutual)
8 requests for services (5 educational programs, 3 evaluations)

SSW → CWB 6 exchange of information (4 provide, 1 secure, 1 mutual)
3 requests for service
1 coordination (different recommendations)

CWB → SSW  6 exchanges of information (3 provide, 3 secure)
2 inquiries regarding possible services
2 requests for service (educational placement)
1 coordination (educational handling)

SSW → FCS  6 requests for service (referrals for counseling)
6 exchanges of information (3 secure, 3 provide, 1 mutual)

FCS → SSW  8 exchanges of information (around school actions)
1 request for service (testing)
1 clarification regarding school request for return to counseling

SSW → CPC  6 requests for service (treatment)
3 exchanges of information

CPC → SSW  1 clarification (patient-school status)
1 coordination (recommend student be returned to school)

The overall impression is that the schools clearly seek more direct services from the private treatment agencies than they provided direct services to the clients of these agencies within the school program. The public school system is organizationally more dependent on the social agencies than the reverse. There is much more equivalency of exchanges between the school system and the two large public agencies.
In view of the organizational complexity previously identified as characteristic of the public schools, an inquiry was made (A#20) of the agency social workers as to who was contacted within the school system, in rank order and relative volume. The findings noted in Table 13 indicate that while agency social workers predominantly contact the school social workers (the schools' link to family and community) they also contact a wide range of other school personnel to a significant degree. This was largely true of the two public agencies, BCS and CWB, though in the case of the welfare board probably attributable to the routine form letters sent to school administrators regarding children of AFDC recipients. The staff of the private counseling and treatment agencies confine this school contact overwhelmingly to the school social workers.

A succeeding question (A#21) explored the reasons for agency social workers contacting other than the school social worker, traditionally the public school system's link to the community and its agencies as well as families. This question and the preceding one are pertinent to questions of what are the patterns of interorganizational exchanges, why do they occur in this form, and how might coordination be effected by these channels. There was revealed (Table 14) a relatively strong tendency for the two public agency social workers (BCS, CWB) to consider
TABLE 13
SCHOOL PERSONNEL CONTACTED BY SOCIAL AGENCIES ACCORDING TO RELATIVE FREQUENCY (A#20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. I—Very often/often</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Social worker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Psychologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Guidance counselor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Nurse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Attendance officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14
WHY AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS CONTACT NON-SOCIAL WORK SCHOOL PERSONNEL (A#21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. I—Very often/often</th>
<th>Vol. II—Occ./ rarely/never</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. No social worker involved, difficult to initiate contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. More direct or effective to contact school personnel directly</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Another child study team member more directly involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administrative clearance or approval being sought</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Rather not work with a particular social worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Not necessary to involve social worker by nature of situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Vol I = Very often/often
Vol II = Occ./rarely/never
BCS = No social worker involved, difficult to initiate contact
CWB = More direct or effective to contact school personnel directly
PCS = Another child study team member more directly involved
CPC = Administrative clearance or approval being sought


it at times more direct or effective to contact school personnel other than the social worker as the main reason for doing so. The next most frequent explanation is that the nature of the situation did not require that a school social worker be involved. The third reason was that no social worker was directly involved and it was difficult to initiate such involvement. It can be speculated that the more dispersed agency transactions are with staff members of the complex school system, the more difficult coordination of services generally becomes. It can also be implied that the more readily accessible the school social workers are to the agency social workers the greater the tendency for the school social workers rather than other school personnel to be contacted. This would generally appear desirable because of the social workers having greater knowledge of as well as primary coordinating responsibilities with the social agencies. Therefore, the school social workers need establish communication patterns with the agency social workers that make themselves more readily available in the schools.

Continuing the examination of the nature of the transactions between schools and agencies, with the "case" as the basic unit of attention, the actual problems in coordination of services were examined (A#27 and S#16). The line social workers of schools and agencies indicated
a relative difference in emphasis on the problems of coordination identified (see Tables 15 and 16). All placed significant emphasis on insufficient time to maintain necessary school-agency contact as a problem of coordination. However, the school social workers, except in relation to FCS, identify this as the most important problem in coordination with the other three social agencies. The social agencies, with the exception of the CWB, place even greater emphasis on other areas--determining areas of responsibility and agreeing on objectives (BCS), agreeing on objectives (CPC), and referral process (FCS). This indicates that the agency staff members placed relatively greater emphasis on non-structural problems of coordination, differences in organizational responsibilities and objectives and the referral process, than do the school social workers. These differences by school and agency staff in their perceptions of the nature of the problems of coordination in themselves contribute to the problem, since problems usually need be mutually identified to more effectively work toward their resolution.

It has already been noted that data support the proposition that the school system by and large has greater dependence on the services of the social agencies than the reverse, and make greater use of agency service than the agencies do of the schools. Yet the agencies
TABLE 15
PROBLEMS OF COORDINATION WITH THE SCHOOLS
RANKED BY AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS (A#27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Referral process</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I--Very often/often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II--Occ./rarely/never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Duplication or overlap of services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Determining areas of responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Agreeing on objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Having time to discuss cases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Lack of familiarity regarding functions of organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank order</td>
<td>BCS</td>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>CPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Referral process</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Determining areas of responsibility</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agreeing on objectives</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Maintaining contact</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Capacity to carry out function</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Grasp of organizational function</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
differ in function, auspices, size, and professionalism as well as patterns of coordination. An effort was made (S#29) to differentially characterize school-agency trans-
actions by selecting phrases that the social worker felt best described these transactions from the following list:

1. We keep trying to get them to do their job.
2. We generally understand each other and try to work things out.
3. They're so swamped I don't expect much.
4. We tend to have disagreements about what has to be done.
5. Have little contact with the agency except for occasional pressing situations.
6. We both keep trying to improve our cooperative efforts.
7. We generally have a good mutual understanding.
8. They're not that interested in working together.
9. We really don't know enough of what they're doing.
10. Other (BCS—How to supervise: frustrating).

The findings from Table 17 reveal relatively clear-cut trends that can be compared to assessment of school-agency effectiveness of coordination of services.

BCS.--Dominant trend is that there is ongoing
TABLE 17
CHARACTERIZATION OF INTERACTION WITH
SOCIAL AGENCIES BY SCHOOL SOCIAL
WORKERS (S#29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency characteristics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effort between schools and agency to understand each other, resolve disagreements, and improve coordination of services, but BCS not too adequate.

CWB.--Very little contact or coordination, and SSW feel that CWB has neither capacity or interest in changing, is locked in.

FCS.--Very favorable view of school-agency relations. Do well and work out difficulties together.

CPC.--Poor and limited working relationships, with little expectations of improvement.

When school and agency social workers were asked to assess the effectiveness of school-agency coordination (A#33, S#35), the ratings ("good," "fair," "poor") of the two groups coincided and also reflected the school social worker characterizations just noted. This is shown in Tables 18 and 19. The most effective coordination was between schools and FCS, poorest between schools and CWB, and more nearly the fair range between the schools and BCS and CPC.

Following up how the school social workers characterized the social agencies in terms of their working relationships, an inquiry was made (S#26) about the agency characteristics which they felt were contributing to differences in their interaction with the several social agencies. These were listed in rank order of importance in Table 20.
### TABLE 18
EFFECTIVENESS OF COORDINATION WITH SCHOOLS (A#33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (aide)</td>
<td>1 (SW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19
EFFECTIVENESS OF COORDINATION WITH SOCIAL AGENCIES (S#35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank order</td>
<td>School social workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Stability of staff</td>
<td>1 3 1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Size of caseload</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Educational level</td>
<td>5 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Social goals and orientation</td>
<td>0 1 3 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—One social worker did not respond; the one "other" listed was supervision.
Strikingly, five of the six school social workers selected educational level (professionalism) of staff members as the most important agency characteristic. Stability of staff was the second most important characteristic. These two variables clearly separated the two small private agencies from the two large public agencies. Relatively little emphasis was placed on size of caseload, which was greatest with the public agencies. Except for the particular orientation of the clinic's social worker, all the positive organizational attributes as viewed by the school social workers were with the private agencies. All but one of the private agency staffs had professional degrees, while none of the public agency line social workers had professional degrees. Also, though precise data were not available, on the basis of observation by this writer, the turnover rate of the staffs of the two public agencies appeared higher than that of the two private agencies. An inference may be raised by these data. Since the school social workers so strongly emphasized the importance of the professional education of staff as a positive influence on how they interact with any particular agency, when agency does not have professionally educated line staff (BCS, CWB), a negative mental set may exist that impedes efforts at school-agency coordination.

Domain consensus as determinant of coordination.-- Domain consensus is the level of agreement between
organizations as to the functions and responsibilities of each organization for doing their exchanges. It has already been noted in the ranking of problems of coordination that agency social workers considered determining areas of responsibility as a significant source of problems in agency-school coordination. Specific questions were addressed to agency and school social workers bearing on domain as possibly affecting coordination.

Agency questions (A#25, A#35) inquired about any lack of differentiation between non-instructional school services and agency services, and whether agency staff at times had services requested which were felt that the school should provide. These two questions, with examples requested, were combined for purposes of analysis of data into one question because of their overlapping.

Content analysis by agency follows:

BCS.—All nine responded positively to combination of questions.

Who does counseling (2)
Who pays for special educational program (1)
Who has responsibility for testing and workup (2)
Who is mainly responsible when school and agency counsel (1)

School pressures BCS to motivate parents or youngsters to greater educational effort when this is primarily an educational problem (5)
Schools refer for counseling or out-of-home placement when problems are primarily educational ones (2)

Makes referral and school pulls out of situation (3)

CWB.—Seven of eight responded positively. One negative response was based on not knowing what schools were supposed to do.

Who provides testing and workup (2)

Who provides counseling (2)

Who conducts investigations of situations (2)

Who arranges for appointments and transportation (2)

School system wanting CWB to use pressure of welfare check to get recipients to deal with educational problems (3). Quotes: "What would school do if not a welfare case?" and "They think we own and control recipients."

FCS.—All five gave some positive response. The one paraprofessional in outreach office in poor non-white neighborhood was clearly most critical of the schools.

Attributing learning or behavior problems to family or emotional problem when essentially an educational one (2)

Responsibility for testing or workup (3)
Lack of clarity regarding FSC or school functions (2)
Provision of transportation (1)
Clarification of lines when agency and school providing services (1)
Schools do as little as possible, try to get FCS to do as much as possible (1)

CPC.—Send youngsters for treatment for emotional problems when essentially an educational problem.

The inquiry of the school social workers focused on two related areas of domain consensus. One (S#13) was whether the social worker perceived any lack of clarity about the differences between agency and school services, and the other (S#14) whether agency staff at times thought the schools should be providing services being requested of the agency, with illustrations requested of both. For purposes of content analysis, these two overlapping areas were combined. S#14 requested specific agency references and all seven were confined to the clinic and BCS, particularly the former. The following categories of questions of school-agencies domain were noted:

Who should provide counseling (5)
Who should provide diagnostic workup (5)
Who should pursue court charges (1)
Appropriateness of referral (1)
Educational or emotional problem (1)
Agencies not doing what should be doing (1)

It was noted also that a new staff member, unclear about school and agency functions, may have difficulty making distinctions in service at times. Most of the school social workers tended not to consider themselves unclear as to school-agency domain. One did state that within Special Services itself staff members felt that they should be providing more counseling.

Several themes emerge from an analysis of the findings from the agency and school social workers around questions of organizational domain. A frequent reference in both groups is the question as to who should provide the diagnostic workup on youngsters in some situations. This usually includes a social history, psychological testing, perhaps a psychiatric consultation, and in the schools, perhaps an evaluation by a learning disability specialist. Another major and probably more complex and pervasive question identified by both groups is who should provide direct counseling services? The schools through Special Services do in fact provide direct counseling services, though the extensiveness and intensiveness of such counseling services are not clearly defined. A third major area identified by all the social agencies, but particularly the clinic and family agency,
involves appropriateness of some referrals. These agencies believe that the schools refer malperforming students and their families for treatment of emotional or family problems when the youngsters' problems are essentially educational ones that should be handled within the educational program. The school social workers made no reference to this area in noting agency perceptions around problems of domain. The two public agencies, CWB in particular, noted a number of times that the schools tried to get them to put pressure (such as through the welfare check) on families and youngsters to get greater educational cooperation, motivation, and performance. They felt that these were educational matters for which the schools had primary responsibility, as well as for investigating certain matters requested of CWB and BCS. Other questions of domain, such as who arranged transportation to keep appointments, court charges, payments for certain educational needs, etc., were noted less frequently.

This study cannot evaluate the frequency of these problems of domain consensus, assess the validity of the various positions, or estimate the overall effect on school-agency coordination. It does appear that it is a central area of difficulty and touches on basic aspects of interorganizational transactions—such as who does workups, who provides counseling, and appropriateness of
referral based on whether emotional or primarily educational solutions are involved. Comments and tone tend to reflect at times more accusatory than conciliatory attitudes. Continued efforts at better mutual understanding of roles and functions of the schools and agencies are necessary. The question of degree of direct counseling services that Special Services provides is unclear within the school system, and perceived differently by social work and educational elements within Special Services, as noted in previous data on how characteristics of the school system may negatively affect school-agency coordination. It would also appear that guidelines for such matters as to under what conditions which organization provides a diagnostic workup would be more clearly arrived at through joint efforts. Data revealed a tendency to polarize educational and emotional and family problems to agency social workers questioning the validity of some referrals from the school system. The boundaries between educational and emotional problems can be blurred and remediation difficult to identify. It would appear that greater cooperation around staffing of such referrals at the agencies, involving joint school-agency participation in these meetings or subsequent conferences, would help the processes of clarification, reconciliation, and more effective joint endeavors.
Mechanisms for controlling exchange of resources as a determinant of coordination.—One of the determinants of coordination suggested in the literature was the existence of mechanisms for controlling exchanges of resources. It was noted that at times interagency efforts beyond the level of individual cases are required to define services that can be provided, which originally were determined by interagency agreements. Some effort was made on an operational level to explore mechanisms for controlling exchange of resources by identifying how attempts are made by line social workers to resolve problems of agency-school coordination of services.

The primary means of BCS and FCS staffs to clarify or coordinate services was, as expected, to call the school social worker. The BCS social worker would next discuss the situation with the supervisor, or in the case of FCS, have a face-to-face conference with the school worker. There was very limited identification of the use or organizational-wide efforts, such as conferences with administrators or discussion in staff meetings, to resolve interorganizational questions. For two CWB staff members the question appeared unreal because of such little significant interagency involvement, though such infrequent situations were most frequently discussed with a supervisor. The clinic social worker exhausted all internal
means of resolving issues of coordination of services with the schools before contacting the school social worker. Table 21 indicates patterns of clarifying and resolving problems of coordination with the schools.

Unlike agency social workers, school social workers have no social work supervisors and are responsible to Special Services administrators—the coordinator on the line level, and the director for the larger structure. As with the large majority of agency social workers, the first choice of the school social workers as a method of resolving problems of coordination was to telephone the agency social worker. Face-to-face conferences with the agency social worker and discussion with own administrator were the next most frequent methods. As with the agencies, little use of staff meetings occurred (see Table 22).

It is difficult to determine to what extent efforts are made by individual school-agency social workers to resolve questions of coordination of services that involve issues that should be considered on a higher administrative level. A content analysis of examples of such situations (A#31, S#24), that occur infrequently, reveals the following categories reaching the attention of supervisor and administrators.

Educational planning (5)

Question of schools or agencies making payments (3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telephone social worker</td>
<td>6 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 5 1 0 0 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Face-to-face conference with social worker</td>
<td>0 3 2 0 1 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 3 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Discuss with supervisor</td>
<td>3 4 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conference with your administrator</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 5 6 0 0 0 1 1 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discuss with peers</td>
<td>0 0 3 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Discuss with staff meetings</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—For CPC "other," #1 is MD, #4 are patients.
TABLE 22
ACTIONS TAKEN BY SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS TO CLARIFY AND RESOLVE QUESTIONS OF COORDINATION IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY (S#19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>School social workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Telephone social worker</td>
<td>6 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Face-to-face conference with social worker</td>
<td>0 3 3 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Discuss with own administrator</td>
<td>0 2 2 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Discuss with peers</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discuss at staff meeting</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Discuss with agency administration</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 23
AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS' FAMILIARITY WITH THE CHILD STUDY TEAM (A#23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly familiar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little familiar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (SW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question of whether school request for services valid (3)

Identification of need for greater school-agency cooperation (3)

Securing services of Special Education (2)

Complaints by family/students regarding school decisions (2)

Differing school-agency recommendations (1)

What can be said from these data is that the primary effects of resolution of questions involving coordination of services and, therefore, expenditure of resources, occur on a case-by-case basis. Discussion of such situations with administrative personnel (includes supervisors) within or between schools and agencies occurs much less frequently, which may be in accordance with the realistic needs in these situations. The impression from the social workers, which will also be examined to a limited degree with administrators in the study, is that neither the school system nor agencies feel their use of their own resources is usually or even often out of their reasonable control. This should tend to enhance coordination, but the data in this area are essentially incomplete and the inferences that may be drawn are very limited.

Familiarity with program functions and staff members as factors influencing coordination.—The extent of
familiarity of staffs with the programs of other organizations has been noted by Seider\(^2\) as one factor influencing the coordination of services. The extent of familiarity of staff members interacting at the interface of their organizations is inferred to also be a factor influencing coordination.

The agency social workers were asked (A#23) about their familiarity with the disciplines and functions of the child study teams in the public schools. Narrative responses were translated into the categories noted in Table 23. The responses of the staffs of the two public agencies, particularly the CWB, indicated their inadequate familiarity with the child study teams for the purpose of maximum use of and coordination with the resources of these teams within the schools. This was also true of the clinic social worker who has been reported to prefer to function in isolation from the schools. The psychiatrist appeared more familiar with the child study team. Not a single staff member, even of the family agency which was most familiar with the child study teams, reported being very familiar. All reported being more familiar with the functions of the social workers than other disciplines.

\(^2\)Seider, "Community Organization in the Direct Service Agency."
There was no comparable question relating to the school social worker’s familiarity with functions of the four agencies.

The implication from these findings is that for the public agencies in particular coordination with the schools might be facilitated by their greater familiarity with the functions of the child study teams of the school system. This could be particularly significant around problems of domain consensus that have been identified. The greater the clarity of boundaries of organizational responsibility the less likely there will be interorganizational misunderstanding of domain.

From A#4 and A#5 questions of professional contact and familiarity with the school social workers were explored. Only one of the BCS social workers and only one of the eight from the CWB had any professional contact with any school social worker outside their caseload during the past year. This outside contact included such things as joint committee work in some social welfare area, exploring community needs, etc. Two of the five family agency staff members and the clinic’s psychiatrist had such contacts.

School and agency social workers interacting on their jobs were asked (S#21, A#40) how well they felt they knew each other professionally. Most striking (see Table
24) was that all the school social workers reporting knowing CWB staff "very little," and half reported this about BCS staff, the other large public agency. In contrast, all the school social workers, with one exception, reported knowing the social workers of PCS and CRC, the small private agencies, either "fairly well" or "very well." In general, the perceptions of school and agency social workers (Table 25) were consistent in their reports of how well they knew each other. The one exception was that the school social workers reported knowing the BCS staff significantly better than the BCS staff reported knowing the school social workers professionally.

To the extent that social workers "knowing" each other better facilitates communication on a line level and, therefore, coordination of services between agencies, to that extent coordination between the schools and small, private agencies is facilitated to a greater degree than with the large public agencies in this community.

Organizational goal attainment.—The concept of organizational goal attainment as a central dynamic in organizational behavior has been noted. Determinants of coordination—shared goals, complementary resources, mechanisms for controlling resources, and domain consensus—all involve contributions to organizational goal attainment. It was also noted that formal statements are
### TABLE 24
SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS' FAMILIARITY WITH
AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS (S#21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 25
AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS' FAMILIARITY WITH
SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS (A#40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not always reflected in organizational behavior because of differences between formal and informal organizational priorities and goals. A necessarily limited effort in the context of this study was made to explore the importance of agency-school coordination to the organizations involved, to note staff efforts to strengthen coordination, and if further efforts appeared desirable, to identify the obstacles to such efforts. The thrust of this cluster of questions was to relate school-agency coordination to organizational goal attainment.

An open-ended inquiry was made (A#39, A#48) of the agency social workers of how they felt the schools could be more effective in helping the agencies carry out their functions and how closer worker relationships with the schools could help the agency social workers be more effective in their own performance. The intent was to get some reading of the organizational and individual staff motivation for strengthening school-agency coordination from the latter viewpoint.

Five of the nine BCS social workers responded positively to A#48, a central emphasis being on the need for better school-agency communication around shared problems and more joint planning. The school was viewed as an important part of the child's and agency's larger family-community concerns. Three of the five FCS social workers
responded positively, focusing on their desire that the schools provide more direct service to students and their families and free the family agency for more services. It was also felt that improvement of the classroom environment, particularly through school social workers interpreting more and helping teachers, would be of help to agency clients. All eight of the CWB staff felt that closer coordination could help them better provide services and perform better. The range of reasons included the value of early identification of problems (particularly through the signals of truancy and neglect noted in the schools and communicated) to reduce later crises, the need for greater mutual familiarity by school and CWB staffs of each other's programs, and the need to more effectively share services. The clinic social worker opposed closer coordination of services with the schools, feeling it would worsen the situation and take up patient clinical time. Clearly, and consistent with previous data, the line social workers of the two public agencies, particularly the CWB, felt more strongly the need and value of closer working relationships with the schools than did the private agency staffs. In the case of the family agency, a significant consideration is that the school system-FCS relationship is already clearly the best of the group of social agencies.
It can be seen from the following analysis of the narrative content in response to how the staff social worker feels that the agency can better be helped by the schools that this overlaps significantly with the previous inquiry about performing more effectively with greater coordination with the schools. That is, more effective school-agency coordination would both assist individual staff members operationally and assist the organization in its goal attainment, as seen by line staff. Some of the responses relate to agency benefits if the school system had more special educational resources available, which is not essentially a matter of school-agency coordination. Also, some references to the idea that the schools should provide more direct counseling service may appear somewhat in conflict with the agency staff desire for earlier identification of troubled children and referral by the schools. But the two involve separate issues—one related to more effectively helping children by reaching them earlier, and the other having to do with which organization should provide particular services.

**Summary of categorized responses of respondents to §39**

1. Earlier identification and referral of children with difficulties. BCS(4), CWB(2), CPC(1)

2. More direct counseling by school with children
and family members. BCS(4), CWB(1)

3. Better grasp by schools of agency functions. CWB(1), FCS(1)

4. More follow-up after referral, more investigation of truancy. CWB(1), FCS(1)

5. More school resources generally, more special classes and placement. BCS(1), CPC(1)

6. Better coordination and cooperation, more case conferences. BCS(1), CWB(1), FCS(1)

7. Miscellaneous—facilitate Beadelstan, more interpretation to kids, and pay for agency counseling (FCS).

The last two inquiries then did help identify particular ways in which the line social workers felt that more effective school-agency coordination and more resources of the schools could help the social agencies provide better services to their clients and help individual social workers perform more effectively. It need be kept in mind that while there are shared school-agency goals, and elements of organizational interdependence that do promote coordination of services, the school system as a whole secures more direct services from the social agencies and is more dependent on them for help than the social agencies receive from and are dependent on the schools in carrying out their functions.

In view of the identification of the organizational
pects of agency-school coordination, an inquiry was made as to how the agencies and Special Services as a staff attempt to improve service coordination (A$47, S$23).

From an analysis of narrative content, the following summarized findings emerged:

BCS.—There was clearly a lack of any direct participation of line staff in such efforts. Several social workers noted a meeting about six months earlier between the district supervisor and other administrative personnel with Special Services of the school system to try to remedy the problems of working relations, and they received little feedback in addition to not participating. The BCS staff feels little involved in staff efforts to strengthen coordination with the schools.

CWB.—It was striking that all eight social workers stated they had no knowledge of any efforts being made as a staff to improve school-agency coordination.

FCS.—Special Services staff was encouraged to attend FCS case conferences involving school-referred cases. A major impetus toward effective FCS-school coordination had been initiated in recent months by the agency's volunteer school liaison worker. There are occasional meetings with Special Services involving agency line staff to discuss working relations, identifying and attempting to resolve issues (such as the referral process
from the schools), making suggestions, and school and agency staff members having an opportunity to get to know each other better in the process.

**CPC.**—Social workers from Special Services rotate in attending the clinic's medication group. Periodically the Medical Director met alone with Special Services staff around issues identified by school staff. The clinic also invites Special Services staff to observe the clinic program directly to clarify questions raised about clinic functions.

**School social workers.**—All six noted that periodically (annually or less) Special Services initiated meetings with representatives of the social agencies, with the exception of the CWB, to identify and attempt to resolve questions of policies, procedures, and programs involving the school system and agencies, with case situations used illustratively. With BCS and CPC meetings were usually with agency administrators while with FCS line staff members were also involved. FCS has also initiated interagency meetings focusing on program level school-agency considerations such as the referral process. Two school social workers noted that a joint meeting had been requested with the CWB to discuss new policies but this never took place.

In summary then, Special Services, primarily
through the school social workers, took greatest initiative on a staff-wide level in attempting to strengthen coordination with the social agencies by arranging interorganizational meetings to consider questions of policy, programs, and procedures. Of the social agencies FCS took the most initiative in such efforts and involved its line staff at times. The line staffs of the public agencies were removed from any level participation in interagency efforts to strengthen coordination.

Benefits were clearly noted to be derived from more effective school-agency coordination, and an inquiry was made (A#34, S#36) to rate the importance of this need for greater coordination. The responses (Table 26) essentially reflected the previously noted narrative findings. The school social workers responded to the social agencies collectively. The largest number of responses were "very important." The largest number of FCS responses were only "moderately important." The mutually acknowledged generally good school-FCS coordination that already existed did not make the current need as great as for the other social agencies. The only response of "little importance" came from the clinic's social worker, consistent with previous opposition to involvement with the schools. With this dominant expression of the need for more effective school-agency coordination of services, what in fact happens
### TABLE 26
**IMPORTANCE OF NEED FOR GREATER COORDINATION (A#3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>SSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (MD)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of little importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (SW)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 27
**DESIRE FOR GREATER EFFORT TOWARD COORDINATION (A#49, S#37)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desire</th>
<th>SSW</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FES</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizationally to meet this need?

After exploring efforts made to improve school-agency coordination, an inquiry (A#49, S#37) was made of whether agency and school social workers would like to devote "significantly more effort" to developing greater cooperation. The response was overwhelmingly positive in each organization that such greater effort be made, with the single exception of the clinic where the social worker responded negatively (see Table 27).

What were seen then by the line staff as the obstacles to devoting more effort to developing school-agency cooperation (A#50, S#38)? From Table 28 it can be seen that lack of staff time was clearly the most frequent explanation given by agency and school social workers as the primary obstacle to devoting greater staff effort to make school-agency coordination more effective. Interestingly, with the two public agencies, particularly with the CWB, the second most important reason noted was the low priority placed in their agencies on such a need. Administrative attitudes and behavior in this area were later explored and revealed how organizational priorities as administratively defined became a major obstacle to efforts to strengthen school-CWB coordination.

What factors would enhance school-agency coordination of services (A#51, S#39)? One factor was in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>SSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lack of staff time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Low priority by your agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lack of interest by schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Difficulty identifying problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
choices for the school social workers that was not in the question to the agency staff—"greater familiarity with each other's programs." This had been included in the questionnaire for the school social workers prepared after the one to agency staff. These findings showed a considerable spread (Table 29) with "time for conferences," "emphasis on need for coordination," and "greater clarity of mutual goals" all high in frequency and rank order. The two large public agencies, BCS, CWB, placed greater emphasis on "need for greater clarity of goals" than did the two smaller agencies. While all six school social workers noted "time for conferences" as a factor enhancing coordination, only two selected this as first choice. There was generally a wide spread of responses, indicating no single dominant factor that would strengthen coordination.

Characteristics of the school system as a factor influencing coordination of services.——Particular emphasis has been placed on the characteristics of the school system organizationally and institutionally as they may influence patterns of school-agency coordination. Several areas were suggested as factors, including the organizational complexity of the schools, the component of authority in public education, and differences in school-agency objectives.

Two questions directly explored the effects of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>SWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greater clarity of mutual goals</td>
<td>3 2 1 1</td>
<td>2 3 1 0</td>
<td>0 2 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Better working relationships between social workers</td>
<td>1 1 4 1</td>
<td>2 0 1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Greater emphasis on need for coordination</td>
<td>2 2 1 2</td>
<td>0 3 3 1</td>
<td>3 2 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 3 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More time for conferences</td>
<td>0 2 1 3</td>
<td>4 2 1 1</td>
<td>3 0 1 1</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 1 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Greater familiarity with each other's programs</td>
<td>Only on questionnaire for school SW 1 1 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—For FCS "other" is a "crisis"; for CPS "accessibility."
conditions and characteristics of the public schools as they at times may hinder provision of services between the schools and social agencies. An open-ended inquiry (A#52, S#40) was followed by a rank ordering of factors that might have such a negative influence. There were 34 items noted by the agency social workers in response to the open-ended questions, including multiple responses and "nothing to cite" type responses from five of the eight CWB social workers who throughout have been relatively removed from interaction with the school social workers. The clinic psychiatrist was also included.

Content analysis shows the categories and numbers in that category.

1. Lack of sensitivity to and understanding of individual needs of students by school staff, particularly teachers (6).

2. Inadequate school resources, programs, and services, particularly for special educational and non-instructional needs such as special services (6).

3. Excessive tendency to push out (suspensions, exclusions) of regular classes, and seek placements, or to push up and out through social promotions, etc. (6).

4. Excessive focus on discipline and authority (4).

5. Insufficient reaching out to children and parents within an 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. structure (3).
6. Administrative complexity and time lags (3).

7. Poor curriculum (2).

8. Psychiatrist and clinic's social worker emphasized the problem of different goals. The schools focused on getting difficult students out of the system or keeping and controlling them in school. This was not a primary concern of the clinic which related to the total individual.


Of the six school social workers, four identified inhibiting school characteristics. These included teachers seeing children only within the school setting rather than as a whole, the 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. limitation of school services, and the shortage of Special Services staff. Two responses will be fully noted because of the basic areas of consideration.

Schools are rigid bureaucracies—difficult to modify programs and curriculum on behalf of clients. If agencies request certain actions our hands are tied. System is geared to masses, not individuals, and agencies are geared to individuals, not masses. We have to tell the agencies we can't do this or that.

Lack of clarity between Special Services and other school personnel and within our own (child study) teams. There are different points of view and lack of clarity about who has responsibility—and less certainty and clarity in representing the school position. Very essence of school structure demands conformity. Sometimes makes special educational programs difficult. Trying to modify structure.
Questions (A#53, S#41) were the same as the open-ended ones, but required that identified school characteristics impeding coordination be rank ordered. As Table 30 indicates, there was a considerable spread in responses by agency social workers, with "variety of school staff to which to relate," "lack of clarity around the decision-making process," "differences in school-agency objectives," and "schools' emphasis on discipline" being somewhat more conspicuous. The school social workers rank ordered these same factors with the addition of one item applicable to their internal functioning--"differences between social work and educational interpretations of the function and goals of Special Services intervention." Strikingly, five of the six school social workers selected this as first choice, and the sixth as second choice (see Table 31). The remaining responses were scattered. The specific meaning of this overwhelming first choice could not be revealed by this study, but the previous school social workers' responses quoted above shed some light on this. The response (of five of six school social workers) does reflect known social work-educational differences of the views of the roles and functions of social workers in the schools, which led to the item being included in the question, and which are noted in the
### TABLE 30
SCHOOL CONDITIONS HINDERING COORDINATION WITH SCHOOLS RATED BY AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS (A#53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. I—Very often/often</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Variety of staff to which to relate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Lack of clarity regarding authority in decisions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Changing of school functions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Differences in school-agency objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School emphasis on discipline and authority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Time lag in decision making</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Rank order 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Variety of staff to which to relate</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Lack of clarity regarding authority</td>
<td>0 1 2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Changing of school functions</td>
<td>0 2 1 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Differences in school-agency objectives</td>
<td>0 0 1 2 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School emphasis on discipline and authority</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Time lag in decision making</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Differences in social workers' and educators' perceptions of role of Special Services</td>
<td>5 1 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What emerges from this inquiry is not only identification of public school characteristics that at times hinder school-agency coordination of services, but that the agency and school social workers share significantly similar views of such negative institutional and organizational conditions. It appears that both groups of social workers are at times locked into similar constraints against effective cooperation. It would also appear that sharing acknowledgment of such limitations may contribute to a better mutual understanding and some additional cooperative efforts around modifying and more effectively negotiating the school system.

Idiosyncratic component in interorganizational exchanges.—One of the variables proposed that could influence interorganizational exchanges (coordination) was the idiosyncratic characteristics of the line staff representing the school system and social agencies in their transactions. Though the form and dimensions of this factor could not be precisely determined, the indications were that it was a significant one. Of 23 agency social
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102 workers (A#41), 12 (over 50%) stated that there have been times that they have or would have preferred to have (the distinction could not be adequately made) avoided working with a particular school social worker. This proportion was not even greater because six of the eight CWB respondents replied negatively, with several noting that they did not have sufficient contact with the school social workers on which to respond about particular ones. Five of the six school social workers responded positively to this same question (S#43). The examples given by the social workers responding positively fell into two major categories—with inevitable overlapping. Eight gave examples of negative personality characteristics and interaction and six gave examples of ineffectiveness in performance. The reasons for avoidance noted by the BCS social workers in their examples were dominated (4 of 5) by considerations of personality characteristics, while the examples given by the school social workers were dominated (all five) by questions of level of effectiveness (competence) of performance, with two also including negative personality characteristics.

In a subsequent question (A#42) agency social workers rank ordered characteristics of social workers as a basis for avoidance of a particular staff member. As noted in Table 32, three of the agency staffs rated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>SSW</th>
<th>DCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Professional competence</td>
<td>1 2 1 0 0</td>
<td>2 2 0 0 0</td>
<td>3 2 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 2 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Status in school system</td>
<td>0 1 1 4 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 2 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 4</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Personality characteristics</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 3 2 2 0</td>
<td>3 2 3 1 0</td>
<td>2 0 1 2 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Working relationships</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 3 3 0</td>
<td>2 3 1 3 0</td>
<td>0 3 1 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Commitment to helping</td>
<td>0 1 1 2 0</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 3 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Other: SSW—orientation; CWB—willing to extend self. (1 SW; 1 MD)
professional competency as the most important consideration, with personality characteristics a close second. Commitment to a helping role was central to the FCS respondents. The school social workers responded to the same question (S#44), and as Table 33 indicates, four of the five selected personality characteristics as the most important factor, followed by professional competence.

The inference from these findings is that there is a widespread preference at times for avoiding working with a particular social worker from another organization. The extent to which this preference is reflected in actual behavior is not clear, though such avoidance does occur. The two most significant characteristics determining this preference for avoidance involve level of competence and negative personality characteristics, with the illustrations not coinciding with the rank order of characteristics in the responses of either the agency or school social workers.

The element of social workers seeking out or having a preference for a particular social worker was explored as possibly influencing interorganizational exchanges (coordination). As in the avoidance inquiry, 12 of the 23 agency social workers noted in A#43 that at times they sought or would have preferred to work with a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>SSW</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>PCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Professional competence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Status in school system</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Personality characteristics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Working relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Commitment to helping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
particular social worker. Only one of the eight CWB social workers responded this way, again with the indication that one reason was that there tended to be such limited contact with school social workers that it was difficult to have a basis for such preference. Four of the six school social workers responded positively (S#42). The characteristics noted in examples given by both agency and school social workers of the social workers they have sought out or would prefer all involved considerations of competency and effectiveness as a practitioner—good communication and cooperativeness, reliability, commitment, and knowledgeability, including familiarity with programs.

In the ranking order of characteristics (A#44, S#44), professional competence again clearly dominated the positive characteristics, except for the clinic social worker who noted only personality characteristics. The family agency put equal weight on commitment and working relationships as professional competence.

Overall, it can be stated that the preference and tendency to at times avoid or seek out working with particular social workers in another organization is a rather widespread occurrence in school-agency transactions. This occurs least where there is least exchange—on the part of the CWB staff members who tend to feel they have insufficient contact with the school social workers on which to
base such a response. It is also relatively clear that the primary characteristics involved in avoidance preferences relates to negative personality characteristics of the social workers at least as importantly if not more so than to the effectiveness of these individuals. The characteristics of the social workers preferred by both school and agency social workers was based almost entirely on various expressions about the competency of the social workers, with personality characteristics constituting little central basis for such selections.

The avoidance-seeking out tendencies of line staff, which apparently operate fairly generally, can be considered to influence interorganizational transactions by contributing to the quality and quantity of exchanges.

While we have no direct evidence, it may be inferred that in some situations avoidance-seeking out tendencies may influence communication patterns and what happens operationally. For example, this may determine whether an exchange is initiated in cases of marginal need, or the extent to which situations or issues may be explored. An assessment of how idiosyncratic characteristics of individual staff members may influence interorganizational exchanges requires further exploration. How aware are staff members of the negative responses they may generate in their working relationships with
other organizations? It can be inferred that the quality of purposeful communication and coordination of services is positively or negatively influenced by patterns of seeking out or avoiding particular staff members in other organizations. This may also have implications for the usefulness of staff having greater opportunities to get to know each other better as individuals filling particular organizational roles.

This focus on idiosyncratic staff characteristics as an influence on interorganizational exchanges may engender a tendency to explain too much in terms of subjective and personality characteristics rather than in organizational terms, but the first does influence the second.

School liaison worker at FCS.—One staff member was interviewed who had a special position related to agency-school coordination of services. This staff member was a volunteer who had been a resident, teacher, and principal in the community for many years until mandated retirement from the public school system. A position of "school liaison worker" was developed at FCS, the purpose of this being "to coordinate our efforts with those of the schools and keep channels of communication open." The agency, in announcing this new volunteer position, noted that FCS had been "unable to maintain in-depth liaison
with the school system." The functions of the school liaison worker were to review all new intakes from the school system, confer with FCS social workers regularly about developments particularly related to school experiences, maintain contact with relevant school personnel, apprising them of agency developments and recommendations while also transmitting school developments and recommendations to FCS. The school liaison worker did not have regular direct contact with family agency clients, and the social worker maintained basic management and responsibility in the case while providing direction to the school liaison worker. This position had been in operation for several months at the time of the study.

The school liaison worker, volunteering about half time weekly on a flexible schedule, felt that the program was facilitating agency-school coordination as intended. She felt able to communicate effectively with the family agency social workers as well as being very positively accepted by school personnel, so that agency-school exchanges were increased and their quality improved. The various references by family agency and school social workers were all positive in relation to how the school liaison worker position was constructive in improving interorganization communication, including school visits that ordinarily would not be made.
To maximize the effectiveness of a liaison position, certain necessary precautions in the implementation of the concept are necessary, as demonstrated by problems experienced by a mental hygiene clinic and state mental hospital using a clinic liaison social worker. The primary need operationally is to clearly and jointly define the role and functions of this position within and between the organizations involved and for the staff member in that position to be clear about and pursue these inter-organizational functions without contamination from other roles and functions. There had been some concern amongst FCS social workers about possible role confusion, but roles were defined with sufficient clarity and so implemented that no significant problems of this nature had arisen.

Findings and Analysis of Data from Administrators

In relation to their organizations, administrators traditionally are (a) more remote from the consumer population of their organizations than line staff, (b) more focused on the organization's total operation in relation to functions and goals than those directly providing services, and (c) directly and indirectly take a major role
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in shaping the patterns of interorganizational exchange and coordination. In varying degrees and forms these characteristics of administrators were operative in this study and provided data from a different perspective than line staff. Half the administrators still provided some direct services, and represented the disciplines of social work (FSC, CPC, BSC, CWB), education (Special Services), psychology (Special Services), psychiatry (CPC), and law (CWB). While these administrators were interviewed at length, their total number was small and their responses should not be over-generalized. The goal was to get information from these administrators about their perception of school-agency exchanges and influences on interorganizational coordination, particularly within the framework of exchange theory.

The sharing by organizations of common goals is usually considered a positive force for coordination of services. All administrators identified their formal organizational goals as primarily involving direct services to children and family members—so all shared common goals on this broad level. This common goal of services to children occurred in different though interrelated areas—alleviating obstacles to education (Special Services), providing counseling (FCS), psychiatric treatment (CPC), providing financial assistance and related social
services (CWB), providing protective and placement services (BCS), etc. All administrators voiced their views that the schools and social agencies were interdependent and each could profit in attaining its goals through help from the other. This was true even of the CWB administrators whose verbalizations were found not to be supported by their actions.

For coordination to be positively affected by shared goals, there need be complementary resources exchanged between the organizations. This condition creates varying kinds and degrees of interdependence between organizations in providing its services. Each of the organizations in the study provides relatively specialized services, and all could continue to function if services from the others were no longer available. With the exception of the CWB administrators who stated that their programs would be minimally affected, all the other agency and school administrators viewed their organizations as being negatively affected to a significant degree by the loss of services from the other. School services included information about school adjustment, diagnostic evaluations, and modification of school programs. However, these losses would not be basic to the operation of the social agencies. Special Services, however, which makes considerable referrals for direct and
ongoing services—counseling, financial assistance, protective and placement, etc., admittedly would suffer a "serious blow" by loss of these services from the social agencies. These data indicate the greater degree of dependence of the schools on the agencies to achieve special services and educational goals than the social agencies have on the school system in providing its services. The relative significance of these school-agency exchanges for the organizations involved will help shape the administrative priority given by each organization to making school-agency cooperative efforts effective. It can be inferred that the Director of Special Services, who considered the availability of social agency services as crucial, would be very supportive of his staff devoting efforts toward such ends. It can also be inferred that the CWB administrators, viewing school services currently as being of minimal significance, would give least support to staff efforts to strengthen school-agency coordination of services. Both inferences proved correct based on responses of this study.

Administrative perceptions of the flow of exchanges were that the clinic, family agency, and BCW all noted that a substantial proportion of requests for services came from the public schools, and much more services flowed to the schools than were received. CWB administrators
considered the exchange of services with the schools about equal and on a low level. The Director of Special Services noted more referrals were made to the family agency than it could handle, but services were about equal with BCS. The Special Services Coordinator viewed total services between the schools and social agencies as comparable in magnitude. The private therapeutic agencies most clearly provided more services to than received from the schools.

Pursuing the role of goal attainment as a particular administrative concern, how did they view their organizations as being assisted by help from the other? Clinic administrators noted that improved communications with the schools could help their therapeutic effort by a better understanding of children's functioning in school. Also, there could be better resolution of school referrals the clinic considered essentially educational rather than pathological in causation, with the school experience requiring modification. The BCS administrator felt earlier and more complete information from the schools, more direct services by the schools, and a better understanding of BCS limitations would relieve pressure on BCS. The family agency executive noted that BCS could have its waiting list reduced by the schools providing or paying for services. CWB thought earlier identification by the
schools of neglect could help CWB intervene more effectively. Special Services administration felt expanded agency services, agency staff coming into the schools more frequently, and providing more systematic information to the schools could further assist the educational program. Each described specific benefits in terms of organizational self-interest.

Domain consensus was seen by administrators as an important determinant of coordination. The most conspicuous area, noted by representatives of BCS, FCS, and the CWB, involved the view that the schools, particularly when truancy was involved, did not assume sufficient responsibility in directly dealing with some problems before requesting services of the agencies. Again, the clinic director felt some school referrals centrally reflected educational problems rather than psychotherapeutic ones. A second significant theme involved differences between schools and BCS and CPC as to which organization properly should provide testing and diagnostic evaluation. The clinic and BCS administrators believed the schools did not do all the workups they should while the Special Services staff members noted BCS requested testing and other services it should itself be providing, particularly when some of the youngsters were not active cases within the school program. None of the questions of domain
consensus involved overlapping or duplication of services but rather administrators identifying another organization (primarily school system) requesting services it should be providing. In particular, administrators from all agencies other than the clinic felt the schools should provide more direct counseling services. The director of Special Services considers this not an educational responsibility, and legally and financially an inappropriate school function. At the same time "counseling" is one of the formal functions identified by Special Services, so that defining the boundaries of "counseling" becomes crucial.

Responses to problems in school-agency coordination were widespread. One leading factor was the referral process—schools referring people for services that were not appropriate or for which they were not sufficiently prepared to accept. Another conspicuous factor was determining areas of school-agency responsibility, which is closely related to domain consensus. Lack of time to discuss situations was a prominent but not dominant factor in the rankings. Insufficient familiarity with programs reflects the more general problem of interorganizational communication noted repeatedly by administrators (Table 34).

Administrative ratings of effectiveness of school-agency coordination were as follows:

County Psychiatric Clinic--Executive Director: fair
Medical Director: poor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>Special Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Referral process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Duplication, overlapping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Determining areas of responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Agreeing on objectives/decisions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Having sufficient time to discuss</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Being sufficiently familiar with programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (need liaison person to schools)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These ratings were very similar to those of the line staffs, except for the high rating by the Director of Special Services.

Within this assessment of effectiveness, administrators (who exercised the most critical influence on use of staff resources) all rated the need for greater coordination between agencies and schools as "very important" except for Director of FCS who considered such need of "little importance" because current coordination was good. They all responded "yes" to the question whether more staff time should be devoted to strengthening school-agency cooperative efforts, except the Director of FCS. Though the Director of Special Services had also rated coordination as good, he felt additional efforts still needed to be expanded to strengthen school-agency coordination. This position was consistent with the school system's considerable dependency on services of the agencies.
An inquiry was made, in view of the clearly identified need and greater staff effort warranted, of the obstacles to implementing such efforts (Table 35).

The public organizations, including the schools, all identified lack of time as the most important obstacle to devoting more time to the much needed strengthening of school-agency coordination. Clinic administrators made reference only to the characteristics of their social worker supervisor in the children’s service who operated as if in a closed service delivery system in spite of administrative pressures to open up the operation. It was conspicuous that administrators of the two large public agencies and the schools all emphasized the considerable legislative constraints on the use of their organization’s resources because of mandated programs while the two smaller private agencies indicated much greater flexibility programmatically. Yet considerable variations and extensions of programs within the public agencies and schools exist in the state which indicate administrative feasibility if there is first administrative desire. The inference is that organizational priorities in use of time as perceived by administrators is a central element in determining whether additional staff efforts should be devoted to the ends of more effective coordination between schools and social agencies, developing joint programs,
TABLE 35
ADMINISTRATORS' RANKING OF OBSTACLES TO IMPLEMENTING GREATER EFFORTS AT SCHOOL-AGENCY COORDINATION (#23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>Special Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lack of time</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Low priority in your agency</td>
<td>0 0 3</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Low priority in other organizations</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Difficulty identifying problems</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (personality, attitude of social worker)</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—FCS not listed because of negative reply to previous question.
etc. Also, the circular or inconsistent responses of particularly the public agency administrators reflect to some degree the difference between formal organizational goals and lip service and organizational behavior.

Factors that would tend to enhance school-agency coordination as perceived by administrators was explored (Table 36). Responses were widespread. Considering first three rankings of possible six, the leading factors were greater familiarity with programs by other organizations, closer working relationships between social workers, and more time available. These positions can be translated into requiring more time to communicate more effectively—a recurrent theme. Special Services focused on the need for greater clarity of mutual goals. Improved communications about matters such as program familiarity would appear best accomplished on a staff-wide basis. What are the staff efforts and administrative encouragement to improve school-agency coordination? Clinic administration's efforts are to encourage branch offices to reach out and visit schools, invite school staffs to case conferences, to keep schools informed on cases, and have new staff members visit schools with supervisor who provides continued orientation. The administrators report that the social worker in this branch office resists interaction with the schools. As previously reported, the social
TABLE 36
FACTORs TENDING TO ENHANCE SCHOOL-AGENCY COORDINATION RANKED BY ADMINISTRATORS (N=24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>Special Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Greater clarity of mutual goals</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Closer working relationship between social workers</td>
<td>3 2 3</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Greater emphasis on need</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. More time available</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Greater familiarity with programs</td>
<td>1 3 2</td>
<td>2 0 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Clearer identification of issues</td>
<td>0 4 0</td>
<td>No significant problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (need for systematic communications)</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
worker does resist interaction with the schools in case situations. The family agency director emphasizes his staff developing familiarity with community resources and programs as an ongoing part of supervisions. New staff members have a reduced caseload to provide time for this. The public agencies, the CWB minimally, orient new people to the schools as part of a general training program, with ongoing orientation through the supervisor. BCS has some rare inter-staff contact with Special Services, CWB none. Attempts by schools and BCS to resolve issues never include BCS line staff, while Special Services line staff is prominently involved, as is FCS line staff. Special Services administrators report encouraging staff to improve cooperation efforts, which includes participation as school representatives on community councils, etc. In general, school social workers take the greatest initiative in developing school-agency coordination.

The question of how problems of interorganizational coordination were resolved was explored with the administrators. This at least indirectly relates to organizational control of resources (Table 37). Almost universally administrators, as had line staff, identified contact between individual social workers as the most frequent vehicles for resolution of problems of coordination. This is followed by conferences with supervisor. If the
### TABLE 37

**ACTIONS TAKEN TO CLARIFY OR RESOLVE QUESTIONS OF SCHOOL-AGENCY COORDINATION RANKED BY ADMINISTRATORS (#13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>Special Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Telephone social worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Face-to-face conference with social worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conference with supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conference with administrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discuss in staff meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Meeting between school-agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>freq. 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


issue is not an isolated one, on infrequent occasions there may be discussion at a staff meeting, and on very infrequent occasions representatives from two staffs may attempt to deal with the larger issues that ultimately affect individual cases. An example of the latter situation is FCS questioning Special Services referral process and initiating an inter-staff meeting to identify, discuss, and resolve the issues. Whether questions involving coordination are part of a specific case situation, as usually occurs based on narrative data, or the problems that have developed are of a more general nature, responses to this question clearly indicate that the dominant efforts to clarify or resolve such questions occurs between individual staff members of Special Services and social agency. There is very limited use made of conferences with administrators, discussions at staff meetings, or interorganizational meetings. Operationally it can be anticipated that existing patterns would be dominant since direct service usually involves individual staff members. It can also be inferred that more service-wide patterns of resolution of problems of coordination need be developed and implemented to reduce and more effectively handle individual problems of coordination.

One area of interest explored as it relates to possible influence of schools organizationally and
institutionally was how school characteristics might at times negatively influence school-agency coordination. The open-ended question resulted in scattered responses that included criticism of school authority, limited perspective of children by schools, particularly teachers, self-defeating use of suspensions, and difficulties in dealing with such a complex system as the public schools. Most social agency administrators expressed some criticism of this nature. The Director of Special Services emphasized the great difficulty of getting things done because of the bureaucratic morass of the school system.

Another question requested that school conditions and characteristics be ranked in accordance with how they tended to hinder school-agency coordination (Table 38). Responses were scattered. The most frequently noted and highest ranked factor was differences in objectives between schools and social agencies. This was accompanied by a major emphasis on organizational characteristics—the lack of clarity about exercise of authority and the variety of school staff to whom to relate.

From an organizational perspective, social workers are the school system's link to the social agencies and community. They are in a central position to help agency staff negotiate the school system and to help bring agency insights and recommendations involving particular students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>Special Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Variety of staff to which to relate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Lack of clarity regarding authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Changing school functions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Differences in school-agency objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School emphasis on discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Time lag in decision making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into the educational process. Based on the difficulty of modification of school decisions and programs, such efforts require strengthening. Reports from the social workers' interviews indicate that the school social workers need to be more readily accessible to agency staff to help accomplish this. Beyond the specifics noted in the rankings, there was a widespread negative response to some of the perceived institutional characteristics of public education in this system, which was also noted by the line social workers. These negative attitudes that impedeschool-agency coordination cannot be resolved by developing procedures.

An inquiry was made about the possible contribution of a central coordinating council to strengthen interorganizational cooperative efforts. All agreed, with differing degrees of support, that such a council would be a good idea. It could provide a vehicle for organizations to become better aware of the programs of others, to jointly develop priorities of services, could encourage more effective interagency coordination of individual members, and could be a political pressure group in the community. At the same time, there was a pervasive cautiousness about such a council being effective in practice and warranting staff time. This skepticism was based on experiences directly or indirectly with
other efforts of this nature, and the lack of functioning in this area of the existing council that could have such a role.

A review of the findings, and analysis of interviews with the administrators lead to certain implications. Shared goals existed, and all but the CWB administrators recognized this and in various forms and degrees were actively interested in effective school-agency coordination of services. CPC and BCS administrators in particular noted that no one organization could fully provide for the needs of people with whom they were working, and required the cooperation of other services. Yet organizationally, except for school-BCS differences in assessing interdependence, and school-CWB relatively equal by limited exchanges, the flow of exchange of resources to the schools was greater than to the social agencies. Special Services goal attainment, being most dependent on the services of the agencies, also was most active in strengthening interagency coordination. This was a position of the line staff as well as administrators. The concept of complementary resources and attendant interdependence of organizations as a significant factor influencing coordination appeared to be supported in this study.

Assessment of effectiveness of school-agency coordination was very similar with line staff and
administration. Organizational characteristics appeared related closely to the kinds of efforts to make school-agency exchanges more effective. Administrators of the large public agencies emphasized the constraints of legislatively mandated programs as a hindrance in use of staff resources generally, including staff time involving activity to make coordination with the schools more effective. Actual efforts by these organizations in part were the least active operationally, because of a "lack of time." The low organizational priority as a basic influence on such efforts was most graphically noted by the CWB administrators' position that their program (as they conceived of it) would be minimally affected by the loss of school services. While it can be demonstrated that other county welfare boards in the state with the same legislative imperatives and constraints have developed broader, more varied and flexible programs, it can also be said that the public agencies overall have more legal and fiscal constraints than the private agencies in program development.

Problems of coordination emerged in several categories. There was a general and persistent position by administrators of all agencies that the schools at times could and should provide more direct services for which they were responsible rather than request such services of
the agencies. This type of lack of domain consensus at times involved legal considerations, at other times differences in understanding or interpretation of an organization's functions and programs. Another very significant area involved school conditions and characteristics, a persistent and pervasive view that institutionally schools were not sufficiently flexible and sensitive to individual needs and exercised excessive authority. Organizationally, the schools were viewed as highly complex with a slow-moving and unclear decision-making process—the latter view shared by the Director of Special Services who emphasized the bureaucratic impediments to interorganizational coordination. Throughout, questions of differing school and agency objectives were identified as contributing to problems of coordination, and lack of agreement on school-agency responsibilities generally and in specific situations. Some of these difficulties probably involve attitudinal and philosophical positions in relation to public education as well as what occurs operationally, and total resolution of organizational differences is highly unlikely.

Administrators had expressed a widespread need for greater "communication" between schools and agencies to facilitate coordination of services. An inquiry was made about the nature and extent of contact between
administrators of agencies and schools, which presumably could also influence coordination through communication patterns on the executive level. Findings were that there was very limited direct contact. All social agency administrators noted a very infrequent (apparently less than annual) contact around some interorganizational problem area (such as school referrals to FCS). FCS also recently involved with school central administration around development of joint service program in new school-community complex. The Director of Special Services noted such contact as almost nil, except with BCS around establishing a liaison person at BCS to coordinate handling of school district payments for special educational needs for BCS clients. In summary, then, the extent of contact between school-agency administrators was very limited, and when it did occur it was around a particular task—to resolve some persistent problem or develop some particular coordinated effort, to handle some mutual program need. The CWB administrators had no contact with school administration during the previous year. On very infrequent occasions the Superintendent of Schools would be contacted to clarify the availability of federal funds for special educational needs. Interorganizational contact of administrators around program and policy development was very limited.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The main objectives of this study were (a) to examine and analyze the transactions between one urban public school system and several key social agencies in the community, and (b) to gain an understanding of the factors that influence patterns of interorganizational coordination of services. Exchange theory provided a framework for interorganizational analysis. Extensive structured interviews were conducted with all the line social workers of the schools (Special Services) and social agencies, and their key administrators. The data included statistical estimates and narrative content. The study did not include an evaluation of organizational effectiveness. Coordination of services constitutes only one component of organizational activity.

The shared goals of the public schools and social agencies, a factor encouraging interorganizational coordination, is the concern for the welfare of children and provision of services to them. More specifically, about half of the caseloads of BCS, FCS, and CPC resulted from
referrals from the public schools. An estimated one-quarter of the public school population comes from families receiving public assistance from the CWB. Since family, neighborhood, and school adjustment of children are often interrelated, the schools and social agencies in essence share complementary resources. However, organizational interdependence can be examined as a determinant of coordination. The schools were significantly more dependent for direct services on the agencies in facilitating the educational process and meeting student needs than the social agencies were on the school system in facilitating their programs. This assessment by line staff and administrators (with some variations) characterized current transactions, not what possibly could occur or what was optimal. The number of joint school-agency programs involving specifically structured sharing of resources to implement mutually desired services was very limited. Since joint programs can foster organizational interdependence, limitation of such programs reduces one element that can contribute to school-agency coordination of services. Consistent with the schools experiencing the greater organizational dependence is the overall thrust that the schools (through Special Services and particularly its social workers) initiate significantly more contact with the social agencies than the reverse. Agency
social workers identified questions of agency-school coordination as a more important reason for individual contacts with school social workers than the latter did for contacting agency social workers. As a staff, however, school social workers clearly initiated greater efforts on a program-wide level to strengthen interorganizational coordination than the social agencies as a whole.

Throughout the study there was clearly a lower level of transactions and coordination between the schools and the public assistance agency than with any of the other agencies, with little effort at this point by either organization to change this situation. The school social workers appeared resigned to the incapacities of the CWB, and the administration of the CWB had very little organizational motivation (low priority) to modify the situation.

A central problematic factor in the coordination of services, perceived primarily by agency line staff and administrators, was the achievement of consensus as to organizational domain, with particular focus on responsibilities of the public schools. There were persistent responses from agency staff indicating that the schools were periodically requesting services they should provide themselves, and were referring youngsters and family members for various levels of counseling when the school problems were essentially educational in nature. It was noted
that the schools tended to try to get the public agencies in particular to put pressure on family members to achieve greater cooperation around educational matters. School personnel noted the useful information, diagnostic testing, and school-funded special educational programs that were provided by the public school system. School staff defined the problem primarily on the basis that the agencies do not have the capacities to meet their responsibilities. To note this domain "dissensus" is not to convey that these differences constitute daily grinding organizational strains, but that such differences were pervasive and recurrent theme in the study. These problems of coordination of school-agency services reflect some of the professional experiences of this writer in this community. It appears then that inadequate resources and blurred areas of organizational responsibilities (and their interaction) contribute to problems of coordination of services.

One negative influence on school-agency cooperative efforts, rather widely expressed by agency staff in particular, were the institutional and organizational characteristics of the public school system--exercising excessive authority, being too rigid, not individualizing student needs, and being too complex and slow moving organizationally. All but one of the school social workers selected as the most important characteristic of the
schools that hinder school-agency coordination of services
the "differences between the social workers' and educators'
perceptions of the functions and goals of Special Services." 
This then represented some lack of clarity of the functions
of Special Services generally and social work in particular
within the school system. Such differences in perception
of the roles of the school social worker are characteristic
for this field of social work practice.

Emerging sharply were the similar school-agency
perceptions of their efforts at coordination as they varied
in accordance with organizational characteristics of the
social agencies. The most effective cooperative efforts
were with the relatively small, private family agency with
an almost fully professionally educated stable staff which
had comparatively manageable caseloads. The least effec­
tive transactions of the schools were with the large pub­
clic assistance agency with no professionally educated line
staff, greater staff turnover, and with enormous caseloads.
The family agency also had the unique arrangement of a
staff member (volunteer) serving as a school liaison worker.
The clinic had essentially similar positive organizational
attributes as noted for the family agency, including the
most important one for the school social workers--total
professionalism of staff. However, the highly idiosyn-
ocratic closed system orientation of the clinic's supervisory
social worker to service delivery of his agency militated against effective agency-school coordination. The essentially similar school-agency ratings of effectiveness of their working relationships were paralleled by ratings of professional familiarity between the school and agency social workers—greatest between the school social workers and FCS, least with CWB, and in between with CPC and BCS. The ratings of relative familiarity of agency social workers with the disciplines and functions of members of the child study teams (social workers, psychologists, and learning disability specialists, with psychiatrists as consultants) reflected the same differences between agencies. No respondent considered him or herself "very well" informed about child study team roles and functions.

When considering the informal or idiosyncratic factors in transactions between organizational representatives, the study revealed the very widespread expression by school and agency line staff that they have, or would have preferred to if possible, either avoided or sought out working with a particular social worker. Data does not adequately distinguish between preference and actually carrying out such choices, but instances of in fact seeking out or avoiding particular social workers were noted in the narrative material, at times with sharp feelings.
Professional competence was the primary characteristic related to seeking out a particular social worker and negative personality characteristics was the primary basis for avoiding a particular social worker. While the study could not explore the specific nature and effect of these informal seeking-avoidance patterns on the operational level, organizational transactions and coordination of services could be expected to be influenced by such patterns.

There was conspicuous inconsistency between widespread expression by line staff and administrators of agencies and the school system of the need for greater effort and time to be devoted toward strengthening school-agency coordination of services contrasted to the limited organizational efforts toward such ends. The greatest expression of need to improve coordination with the schools came from the line staff of the CWB, also voiced by its administrators, but administratively the least effort in this direction was made by the CWB. This situation highlighted the gap that can exist between the formal or "paper" goals of an organization and administration's operational goals. CWB administration has been confining its organizational interests to income maintenance, with little priority on the programmatically very important "designated services" to strengthen family life
of recipients. This stance limits agency resources that will be expended in strengthening coordination of services with the schools.

It was apparent that to a considerable degree most questions that arose around the need to clarify or coordinate services between schools and agencies were handled on a case-by-case basis on a daily operational level. If there was sufficient recurrence so that questions became issues, some infrequent efforts were made on some higher staff level between schools and agencies other than the CWB to resolve differences or improve some procedures. The school social workers tended to take initiative in these matters, though FCS did so after persistent dissatisfaction with some aspects of referrals from the schools. Line staff of the public agencies appeared almost totally without participation in matters relating to policies or procedures affecting their organizations' transactions with the schools.

The inquiry of administrators about their views of the use of some coordinating council to help facilitate interorganization coordination was essentially equivocal. There tended to be support on principle, but much question about the effectiveness of such a council operationally. In general there appeared a disinclination to commit staff time to such a participation. An inference
might also be drawn that there was a guardedness about the
possibility of some loss of organizational autonomy.

Implications and Recommendations
Implications can be drawn from the data of this
case study that lead to some suggested courses of action
that potentially can strengthen the coordination of school-
agency services to children. While such expectations may
appear to reasonably flow from an assessment of the inter-
agency transactions, there is no assurance that hoped-for
positive consequences will necessarily occur. For one
thing, the study does not exhaust in breadth or depth all
the factors that influence interorganizational transactions
and coordination. Another is that inadequate implementa-
tion of a positive plan, or unintended negative conse-
quences of some arrangement may occur. For example, on
principle joint programs and liaison staff roles tend to
make interorganization transactions and sharing of
resources more mutually effective. However, the price in
loss of individual organizational autonomy in the first
instance, or insufficient coordinated planning in the sec-
ond may block the expected positive outcomes.

Ultimately, there is a realistic limit to how much
investment of resources--particularly the frequently
referred-to staff "time"--any one organization considers
warranted in the context of its overall goals and
self-interests. Efforts schools and social agencies will devote to strengthening cooperative efforts and services will be primarily influenced by how each organization administratively and on the operational level assesses the importance and effectiveness of such efforts to achieving its own functions and goals. Administration at the CWB in particular gives little priority on cooperative efforts with the schools, emphasizing organizational constraints of time and personnel. However, the private counseling agencies clearly, and the Bureau of Children's Services to a less clear degree, provide greater exchanges in the form of services to the public schools than are received. It is reasonable conceptually to expect improved school-agency coordination with an evening of exchanges. The school could provide greater exchanges by a greater flexibility in modification of the educational program and decisions involving their clients attending or particularly those students and family members who so often have been referred by the schools for agency services. Another form of the schools possibly providing greater exchanges to the social agencies would be through the provision (or financing) of more direct (counseling) services suggested a number of times. This would reduce some pressure for services on social agencies. This question of school domain is explored further in the section
"For Future Study."

It has been largely seen that the vast bulk of interorganizational transactions take place on a daily operational level around services to particular clients, and this is to be expected. It has also been reported that various problems exist in efforts to coordinate services, and with infrequent exceptions most difficulties around cooperative efforts are manifest and are attempted to be resolved on a case-by-case basis by line representatives of the schools and social agencies. Individual positive working relationships may well facilitate service delivery (including some corner cutting), or on occasion be impeded by conflicts. Without questioning the centrality of the direct service role in carrying out organizational functions, and the individual patterns of interorganizational coordination that can be established, the study suggests that relatively greater effort need be made on a program and staff-wide basis within and between organizations to strengthen cooperative efforts. One caution is that the influence of the informal system of working relationships is not clear. Interagency coordination requires greater regularization of interorganizational procedures, such as the referral process. This approach of greater formalizing of procedures can be applied to resolving organizational differences, and reaching
agreements about conditions that would warrant special handling of particular situations. This approach to coordination focuses on integration of service programs as contrasted to the ad hoc case level. Of course, efforts of this nature have been made (FCS and an example is its dissatisfaction with some school referrals), but to a very limited degree. After problems of interagency coordination have persisted on a daily operational level without resolution, efforts at resolution on a service level have tended to be made.

The implementation of a greater focus on an organization-wide approach to schools-agency coordination of services also requires a greater emphasis on staff meetings within and between agencies. Case situations will continue to contribute toward clarification of what is happening operationally and what problems have been emerging. However, the need exists to generalize from these individual situations and identify issues and possible solutions. This approach also requires greater staff level discussion. Special Services, with the greater needs for the services of the social agencies, gives questions of coordination of services greater attention than do the social agencies. On a staff-wide level, the public agencies, particularly the CWB, gives such matters almost no attention. Perhaps even more important is the need for
greater interagency exchanges involving both line and administrative personnel. With the almost universal expression of desire for greater coordination of school-agency services by agency line staff, they are almost totally removed from any participation in matters affecting such cooperative efforts, within or outside their organizations. More frequent meetings of school and agency staff could contribute to greater familiarity with various services and limitations, the organizational opportunities and constraints involved in service delivery, and the development of more effective approaches to identification and resolution of obstacles to more effective cooperative efforts. Also, there could be some developing of greater familiarity as individuals in professional roles between staff members.

The particular form and extent of such interagency efforts would be shaped by the particular agency's relationship to the schools. With the realistic limits of staff time devoted to such ends, committee representation could be used, and in instance of shared interests the school staff could meet with staff of more than one social agency. There are no assurances about the outcome of greater intra- and interorganizational staff deliberations, but such focused and task-oriented efforts represent a need based on findings of this study. Whether such efforts
ultimately are operationally effective in facilitating interorganizational coordination and improving services would have to be evaluated.

The social agencies raise questions periodically about the appropriateness of some school referral flowing from a different interpretation of the presenting problem, and later differences of school-agency objectives may emerge. The implication is that wherever possible the referring agency (usually through the school social worker) be represented at the initial agency case conference when disposition is usually made. This joint conference could contribute to reducing strains of differing organizational assessments, expectations, and views of domain. Such a practice is not new, but little employed.

Based on theoretical and operational grounds, it is suggested that coordination between agencies can be facilitated by the development of joint programs that reflect and meet needs of each of the organizations involved. One example revealed in the study was the provision by the Board of Education, rent free, of office space in a school in a low income neighborhood, to be staffed by the family agency which was expanding its outreach services. This outreach office services primarily children and families of this large school-community complex. Joint programs require some loss of total autonomy
of each of the organizations involved, clarity of shared agreements, and good communication patterns in order to be effective. The existence of complementary resources to meet interdependent needs are two influences that shape coordination, and can shape it productively with adequate planning. The recommendation for a greater agency-wide focus, and more intra- and interagency meetings that consider matters of school-agency coordination also provides greater opportunity for identifying and developing innovative joint programs.

The social worker has been identified as the primary school link to the social agencies, taking initiative in contacting the agencies and coordinating services. The negative attitudes of the school social workers to a non-professionally educated staff suggested by the study needs to be examined by the school staff to facilitate cooperative efforts through greater exchanges. The negative effects of tensions between professionally and non-professionally trained social workers on interagency coordination are maximized in relation to the two large public agencies where the need for more effective school-agency coordination and services to children are great. A development in recent years has been the increasing number of undergraduate programs in social welfare, with increasing numbers of non-master's degree social workers entering the
field who have had specific preparation for social work. (Many of the non-professional degree social workers in the study have had related undergraduate majors, such as psychology and sociology, but very few in social work.) This study suggests that educationally graduate schools of social work should focus increasingly on more effective working relationships between professional degree and non-professional degree social workers—a trend already evident.

In the great organizational complexity of the public school system there is some general lack of agency clarity around authority and decision making in the schools. This suggests that the school social workers as a primary school links to families and communities need make a special effort to act more effectively as the schools' link to the agencies. Generally, school-agency cooperative efforts can be served by the school social worker being the primary school staff member to whom the agency relates when agency-school exchanges are involved. Every agency case is not active with a school social worker, initiating such involvement may be a somewhat lengthy process, and with the social worker moving between several schools contact is not always easy. These conditions contribute to other school personnel being contacted directly when this may complicate coordination. There are already
indications from the findings, practice, and literature of significant lack of clarity of the school social worker's role in the schools, which is also a source of lack of clarity for agency staff at times. To make efforts at coordination more effective, the school social workers need to further clarify their own roles, a major professional task. In relation specifically to school-agency coordination of services, the school social worker needs to be as clear and available as possible to agency staff about their own roles and availability to help agency staff negotiate the complex school system.

The effective use by FCS of a "school liaison worker" focuses on the concept and model of such a staff member to strengthen interorganizational coordination. An agency liaison person can facilitate interorganizational communications by becoming related to, accepted by, and securing access to interacting organizations in a form ordinarily not feasible for individual staff members. A lack of sufficient familiarity with other programs has been noted as contributing to problems of coordination, and a liaison person can enhance such familiarity for total staff. The liaison worker can help identify the need for and contribute to the development of policies and procedures necessary for facilitating more effective interorganizational exchanges. The use of staff resources
for such a position—paid or voluntary, full or part-time—devoted to such activities will be determined essentially by organizational priorities placed on the need to strengthen interagency coordination. The model of an interagency liaison position should be considered by the public school system and social agencies, with the possibility of developing joint arrangements.

Conspicuous throughout the study was the consistent and mutually acknowledged very poor level of coordination between the county welfare board and the public schools which were attended by very large numbers of children who were recipients of public financial assistance. In spite of considerable social and emotional needs as well as a variety of material needs experienced by families and their children in the schools, the CWB administratively was almost exclusively focused on the provision of financial assistance with minimal organizational concerns with the legally mandated social services. The organizational constraints of very large caseloads and inadequate resources of staff and programs to meet overall needs of recipients can be readily demonstrated, and low administrative priority is given to social services. Yet other county welfare boards operating within the same administrative framework have been able to devote substantially greater resources to interagency coordination. If it can
be demonstrated that cooperative efforts with the public schools could contribute toward strengthening of family life and self-sufficiency, which would help the county welfare board in reducing financial assistance directly or indirectly, there would be more organizational motivation to make greater cooperative efforts with the schools. The director of the county welfare board emphasized the lack of time and staff toward more effective coordination of services with the schools, but agreed verbally to attempt some such efforts on a limited demonstration basis. The school social workers and representatives of other agencies question the capacity of the county welfare board to modify its practices and function in a more constructive way on behalf of their recipients. With the school's dependency on agency services, it would appear reasonable that Special Services, whose social workers generally view the CWB as lacking the will or capacity for more effective cooperative efforts with the schools, should initiate efforts toward some joint, mutually beneficial school-CWB program. This could also contribute to meeting the needs of children—a shared organizational goal.

For Future Study

There are several areas emerging from this study that warrant systematic exploration and analysis.
1. While the study focused on what is happening between organizations within the context of the programs of these organizations, the actual transactions in delivering services were conducted primarily between the individual line representatives of the schools and social agencies. There were widespread statements by these social workers of their actions in or preference for seeking out or avoiding particular social workers in other organizations. Particularly expressive were the negative feelings toward some social workers viewed as having negative personality characteristics. These idiosyncratic responses to representatives of other organizations may have a significant impact on the overall pattern of communication between schools and agencies. However, the actual nature, effect, and extent of this informal element in interorganizational transactions has yet to be determined. The informal system of relationships may both facilitate and hinder coordination. This is one element influencing interorganizational coordination that is not part of exchange theory.

2. A very provocative finding was that all but one of the school social workers ranked as first, the remaining one rated as second, that the most important condition of the schools negatively effecting coordination of services with the schools was "differences in the social
worker's and educator's interpretation of the goals and functions of Special Services." It can be strongly inferred that this position at least partly reflects the already identified differences in the perceptions of educators and social workers of the roles and functions of school social workers. Such a lack of clarity of the social work functions in the school can also cloud the perceptions of the social workers in the social agencies with which the complex school system is interacting. A study of the nature, dimensions, and possible consequences of such differences as they affect school-agency transactions could be both revealing and useful in working toward more effective coordination.

3. It was never part of this study nor is it often a part of related studies, but the clients or consumers involved in the transactions between organizations providing services on their behalf have not been a source of data. A study of client experiences, perceptions, and assessments of the interorganizational transactions may contribute to more effective school-agency arrangements on their behalf. One area that has already been identified is the position expressed by the counseling agencies that referrals are periodically made by the schools of families insufficiently motivated for or unclear about the services.
4. A general issue that was highlighted by questions of domain consensus that arose was the extent to which the public schools could or should provide more non-instructional services, particularly of a counseling nature. The form and extent of such services, provided primarily through Special Services, varies considerably among school districts according to the resources and orientation of the particular district. In a sense such services could be considered as an extension of New Jersey state legislation (Beadelston) mandating each school district to provide special educational needs of its students. Or a local district may budget for such services. Such non-instructional services clearly do not include legally defined services such as protective services. The focus on the counseling services is consonant with the traditional concerns of the schools with the mental health of the students and, to a lesser extent, of the educational program, to reduce obstacles to and to facilitate the educational process. Many educators and taxpayers would oppose an intensification of such direct non-academic services, and this writer is not taking a position on the matter at this point. However, different views do exist between (and within) the schools and social agencies of the boundaries of non-instructional services appropriate to the schools, and this "dissensus" negatively affects
coordination of services. The domain and boundaries of the non-instruction school roles need be reexamined.

5. Lastly, it need be noted that any effort to modify interorganizational patterns to produce particular consequences, in this case more effective coordination of services, requires a systematic process. The dysfunction need be identified, the current situation assessed, the remedy and its form of implementation identified, and the results in terms of the objectives evaluated. Many apparently good ideas have not resolved problems or provided new positive inputs into organizational functioning because of inadequate planning or unintended consequences.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AGENCY SOCIAL WORKERS
The purpose of this study is to secure information about the patterns of interaction and coordination between the Elizabeth Public Schools and selected social welfare agencies in that community providing services to children. This study will not attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of services of any organization. All information will be handled confidentially and will not be identified as coming from you or your agency. Your thoughtful responses will be appreciated.

Agency:
Job Title:
Approximate age:
Sex:
Race:
Highest educational level:
Years of experience as a social worker
  Before professional degree (if has one):
  After professional degree:
Length of time with agency:
Length of time in present position in agency:
Full or part time (if latter, % time):
Approximate caseload—Individuals:
  No. of groups and membership:
Time interview began:
Time interview ended:
1. What do you understand to be the official functions and goals of your agency?

2. What specific services and programs are offered by your agency?

3. What are your primary duties and with what particular services and programs are you involved?

4. Are you or have you been a member of any social welfare committees, organizations, task forces, etc. (aside from general membership in an organization) in which school social workers or other school representatives are participants? Please identify.

5. How much professional contact have you had with public school social workers the last 6 months, aside from your caseload? Or the past year, if none in 6 months? Please describe circumstances of the two most recent contacts.

6. Thinking in terms of your caseload and other agency responsibilities, about what do you estimate to be the frequency of your contact with school social workers?
   a. 1/week or more
   b. 1/2-3 weeks
   c. 1/month
   d. < 1/month
   e. 1/6 months

7. Will you estimate the total number of contacts with school social workers during the past 6 months, related to case situations?
   a. 1-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-15
   d. 16-25
   e. 25

8. Would you estimate the proportion of exchanges you initiate with school social workers compared with those initiated by school social workers with you?

9. Will you note in order of frequency the reasons for your contacting school social workers in your capacity as a staff member, starting with most frequent. Within the total number of contacts please rate the relative frequency of each reason.
(1) Very often  (2) Often  (3) Occ.  (4) Rarely or never

a. Request for service
b. Exchange of information around joint case
c. Securing of some general information about possible services
d. Some need to clarify and coordinate services of agency and school
e. Other (identify)

10. What and when were the reasons for the two most recent such contacts?

11. Will you note in order of frequency the reasons for contact with you initiated by school social workers, starting with most frequent. Also, please rate relative frequency of each reason.

(1) Very often  (2) Often  (3) Occ.  (4) Rarely or never

a. Request for service
b. Exchange of information around joint case
c. Securing of some general information regarding possible services
d. Some need to clarify and coordinate services of agency and school
e. Other (identify)

12. What and when were the reasons for the two most recent such contacts?

13. Would you estimate the total number of contacts with school representatives other than social workers during the past 6 months.

   a. 1-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-15
   d. 16-25
   e. 25

14. Will you note in order of frequency the purposes for contact with you initiated by school representatives other than social workers, starting with most frequent. Also, please rate relative frequency of each reason.

(1) Very often  (2) Often  (3) Occ.  (4) Rarely or never

a. Request for service
b. Exchange of information around joint case
c. Securing of some general information about possible services
d. Some need to clarify and coordinate services of agency and school
e. Other (identify)

15. What and when were the reasons for the two most recent such contacts?

16. Please note in order of frequency, the purposes for your contact with school representatives, other than a social worker, starting with most frequent. Of total number, please rank relative frequency of each.

(1) Very often (2) Often (3) Occ. (4) Rarely or never

a. Securing information about school adjustment of a youngster known to agency
b. Request for modification of a school program
c. Exchange of information on an ongoing basis
d. Making an agency recommendation
e. Administrative clearance for school visit
f. Other

17. What and when were the reasons for the two most recent such contacts?

18. Would you estimate the proportion of exchanges between yourself and school personnel other than social workers that you initiate compared to what they initiate.

19. In order of frequency, who contacts you from public schools starting with most frequent? Also, please rate relative frequency of each.

(1) Very often (2) Often (3) Occ. (4) Rarely or never

a. School social worker
b. Teacher
c. Psychologist
d. Principal
e. Guidance Counselor
f. Others

20. In order of frequency, please rank who you contact within the school system, starting with the most frequent. Of total number of contacts please rate relative frequency of each.

(1) Very often (2) Often (3) Occ. (4) Rarely or never
21. Please note in order of importance, starting with the most important, reasons for your deciding to contact a school representative rather than the school social worker. Within this total of contacts please rate the relative frequency of each reason.

(1) Very often (2) Often (3) Occ. (4) Rarely or never

a. No school social worker is currently active in the case and it is difficult or time-consuming to begin to involve one
b. It is more direct and effective to contact a principal or teacher directly than to go through a social worker who services a school only part time
c. Another child study team member is more actively involved than the social worker
d. Administrative clearance or approval is being sought for some action
e. You would rather not work with the particular social worker
f. Other reason (specify)

22. About what proportion of your caseload involves children who attend the public schools?

23. About what proportion of children in your caseload have been referred by the public schools?

24. How familiar are you with the different non-instructional professional disciplines available in the school, about how many of different professions are employed in Child Study Teams, and their functions? (check it)

25. Do you believe there is some lack of differentiation between non-instructional services of the public schools (such as through Special Services) and the services of your agency? Be specific as to any overlapping, duplication, etc. that you feel may be related to this lack of differentiation, and illustrate.

26. In school referred cases the average frequency of contact between the agency and school social worker would be estimated at:
27. What kinds of problems arise in coordinating your services with those of the public school system? List in order of importance, starting with most important.

(1) Very often (2) Often (3) Occ. (4) Rarely or never

a. Referral process, including preparation of people involved
b. Duplication or overlapping of services
c. Determining areas of mutual responsibility
d. Agreeing on objectives or decisions
e. Having time to discuss situations
f. Other (identify)

28. Identify the last two instances or types of some problem in coordination of services with the public schools.

29. In order of frequency, starting with most frequent, which of the following actions need by finally taken to clarify and resolve questions involving coordination of services with the public schools? Please rate relative frequency of each action.

(1) Very often (2) Often (3) Occ. (4) Rarely or never

a. Telephoning the school social worker
b. Having face-to-face conferences
c. Discussion with your supervisor
d. Conference with your chief social worker or executive director
e. Discussion in peer group
f. Discussion in a staff meeting
g. Other

30. In the two most recent situations cited (#28) please note the process by which the question of coordination of services was handled.

31. When was the last occasion and what was the situation in which you discussed with your supervisor matters pertaining to working relationships with the public schools?

32. When was the last time and what was the situation in which there was discussion in a group meeting involving
working relationships with the public schools?

33. On a day-by-day level, how effective do you consider efforts at coordinating your services with those of the public schools?
   a. Good
   b. Fair
   c. Poor

34. How important do you view the need for greater coordination with the public schools?

35. Have you been asked by school representatives to provide services that you feel should be handled by the schools, including Special Services staff? Identify the type situations you have in mind and illustrate two most recent examples.

36. Do you believe the public schools in your community are doing as much as, less than, or more than you expect in the area of providing services to school children with social and emotional problems—outside the primary instructional programs?
   a. As much as
   b. Less than
   c. More than

37. Please be specific about the basis for your views.

38. How were such questions (cited in #35) resolved if efforts at clarification were made by the agency? Describe process.

39. In what ways, if any, do you believe that the public schools might better assist your agency in carrying out its own functions? Illustrate.

40. Professionally, how well do you know most of the school social workers in the community under study?
   a. Very little
   b. Fairly well
   c. Very well

41. Have there been instances in which you have avoided or would have preferred to avoid contact with a particular school social worker? No names. Any illustrations?
42. In order of importance, what characteristics would be involved, if you did have a choice, in avoiding a particular staff member?
   a. Level of professional competence relating to knowledge and skills
   b. Status in school system
   c. Personality characteristics
   d. Personal relationship
   e. Other (identify)

43. Have there been instances in which you have sought out or would have preferred to seek out a particular school social worker? No names. Any illustrations?

44. In order of importance, what characteristics would be involved, if you did have a choice, in seeking out a particular staff member?
   a. Level of professional competence relating to knowledge and skills
   b. Status in school system
   c. Personality characteristics
   d. Personal relationship
   e. Other (identify)

45. If you were seeking to stretch or make an exception in securing some action or service in the public schools for a client, whom would you contact in the school system and why? Can you cite any such recent instances? (No names)

46. Would you estimate on the average how much time you spend on exchanges with all school personnel (telephone contacts, conferences, reports, school visits, etc.).
   a. < 1 hr/month
   b. > 1 hr/month
   c. 1-2 hrs/month
   d. 2-3 hrs/month
   e. 3-4 hrs/month
   f. > 4 hrs/month

47. In what ways, if any, does your agency attempt as a staff to improve the coordination of its services with those of the public schools?

48. Do you feel that you could be more effective in your agency performance by a closer working relationship with the public schools? In what areas and ways?
49. Do you feel that you would like to be able to devote significantly more effort to developing cooperative working relationships with the public schools?

50. If yes, please list in order of importance the reasons for your not being able to do so.
   a. Lack of staff time
   b. Low priority placed on such needs in your agency
   c. Lack of interest of other agencies
   d. Difficulty in identifying the nature of the problems
   e. Other (identify)

51. What factors do you think tend to or would enhance coordination of services between your agency and the public schools? List in order of importance.
   a. Clarity of mutual goals
   b. Good working relationships between social workers
   c. Emphasis on need for coordination
   d. Time for conferences
   e. Other (identify)

52. In your experience with the public schools are there conditions that tend to hinder your providing services as effectively as you would like to be able to do? If so, please illustrate specific type situations.

53. Do you feel any of the following conditions exist at times in schools and tend to hinder providing services as effectively as you would like? Please note order of importance, and relative frequency of each category.
   (1) Very often (2) Often (3) Occ. (4) Rarely or never
   a. Variety of staff members to whom you have to relate at different times
   b. Lack of clarity as to who exercises what school authority in different case situations
   c. Keeping up with changing school functions and programs
   d. Differences of objectives between agency and schools
   e. School's emphasis on discipline and authority
   f. Time lag in decision-making by the school system
   g. Other (identify)

54. If you had your choice as to which public school you would most prefer to be involved with in your practice, which school would you select? For what reason?
55. If you had your choice as to which public school you would least prefer to be involved with in your practice, which school would you select? For what reason?

56. Any final comments regarding agency-school coordination of services?
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS
Interview Schedule for School Social Workers

The purpose of this questionnaire is to secure information about the patterns of interaction and coordination between the public schools and selected social welfare agencies in the community providing services to children. This study will not attempt to evaluate the general effectiveness of services of any organization. It is intended to help better understand the factors that contribute to how organizations coordinate services. All information will be handled confidentially and will not be identified as coming from any one individual. Your thoughtful responses will be appreciated.

Job title:

Approximate age:

Sex:

Highest educational level:

Years of experience as a social worker

Before professional degree:

After professional degree:

Length of time with this school system:

Schools services, by grade level only:

Approximate active caseload (families/youngsters):

Time interview began:

Time interview ended:
1. Briefly, what do you understand to be the primary functions and goals of Special Services in your school system?

2. Briefly, what are the primary services that you provide in the schools?

3. Are you now or have you been a member of any social welfare committees, councils, task forces, workshops, etc. (aside from only general memberships in an organization) in which social workers of social agencies serving your school district are participants? If so, please describe. Have any social workers from FCS, BCS, or CWB been involved?

4. Would you estimate generally about what proportion of your cases involve youngsters or their family members who within a six-month period after being newly referred to you or reopened are referred to some social welfare agency in the community for some service not provided by the public school system.

5. Thinking of services to children, what are the five social welfare agencies or organizations with which you become most frequently involved in your caseload, regardless of who makes the contact or for what purpose? Please list in order of frequency, starting with the most frequent.

6. How would you rank the frequency of exchanges between yourself and the following agencies, starting with the most frequent contacts?
   - FCS
   - CPC
   - BCS
   - CWB

7. Thinking in terms of your caseload and any other agency responsibilities, about what do you estimate over an extended period to be the average frequency of your contact, for any purpose, through any means, regardless of who makes the contact, with representatives from the following agencies:

FCS—Family & Children's Society
CPC—County Psychiatric Clinic
BCS—Bureau of Children's Services
CWB—County Welfare Board
8. Would you estimate the proportion of contacts you initiate with each of the following social agencies compared with the proportion each initiates with you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Would you rank in order of frequency the reason for your contacting representatives of each of the listed agencies. Omit any reason that never occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will you rate the relative frequency of each reason for each agency.

(1) Very often/often  (2) Occ./rarely

10. Approximately when and what were the reasons for the two most recent such contacts you can recall you made with each agency?

11. Will you rank in order of frequency the reasons contact with you is made by representatives of the same four agencies. Note any reason that never occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will you rate the relative frequency of each reason for each agency.

(1) Very often/often  (2) Occ./rarely

12. Approximately when and what were the reasons for the two most recent contacts you can recall initiated by each of these agencies?

13. At times does there appear to you any lack of clarity about the difference between some of the services of Special Services in schools and the services of any of the social agencies noted? If yes, what are such areas or types of situation?

14. Do you find that representatives of any of the social agencies listed at times think that the schools themselves should provide services being requested by the schools of the social agencies? Such services may include counselling, investigations, arranging for medical exams, psychological testing, etc.

15. If yes, please identify types of situations with examples involving each of the agencies if possible.

16. What kinds of problems arise in coordinating Special Services with those of each of the four agencies? Rank in order of importance.

FCS CPC BCS CWB

a. Questions around referral process
b. Determining areas of responsibility of school and social agency
c. Agreeing on objectives or decisions of school and agency
d. Maintenance of sufficient contact between school and agency when joint situations are involved
e. Questions of capacity of agency or its staff to carry out its responsibilities
f. Insufficient clarity or grasp of functions of one organization by another
g. Other (identify)

17. Please note one, or two if possible, specific instances or types of problems of coordination with each of the agencies.
18. Specifically, what approaches were used to attempt to resolve question of coordination of services identified in previous question?

19. In order of frequency, starting with most frequent, which of the following actions is finally taken to clarify and/or resolve questions involving coordination of services with the social agencies?

   a. Telephone discussion with the agency social worker
   b. Having face-to-face conferences with agency social worker
   c. Discussion with administrative person in Special Services
   d. Informal discussion in peer group
   e. Discussion in a Special Services staff meeting
   f. Arranging meeting with agency administration
   g. Other (identify)

20. How effective do you consider efforts to resolve any question of coordination of services with each of the agencies, and why?

   a. Very effective
   b. Fairly effective
   c. Little effective

21. How well do you feel you know most of the social workers of each of the previously noted agencies with whom you have contact?

   a. Very little
   b. Fairly well
   c. Very well

22. Through what means have you sought to become familiar with the programs, policies, and procedures of the above-noted agencies? Please note the activities involving each agency.

   FCS  CPC  BCS  CWB

23. What actions have Special Services initiated as a staff
to enhance the mutual working relationships between the public schools and the social agencies noted that service your school district?

24. When and what was the most recent occasion in which you discussed with an administrative person in Special Services matters pertaining to the working relationships with the social agencies noted?

25. When was the last occasion and what was the situation in which there was discussion in a staff meeting of working relationships with the noted social agencies?

26. In order of importance, starting with most important, to what agency characteristics would you attribute differences in the kinds of interaction between yourself, as a school representative, and the social agencies, recognizing that the factors are interrelated?

   a. Stability of staff composition
   b. Size of caseload
   c. Educational level of staff
   d. Particular social goals and orientation of the agency
   e. Other (identify)

27. How do these agency characteristics tend to affect how you as a school representative interact with those agencies?

28. Are there particular characteristics of the two public agencies compared to the two private agencies that influence your efforts at coordination of services? Please note characteristics involved and effect on working relationships.

29. Briefly, how would you characterize the pattern of exchange and coordination between yourself as a school representative and each of the following agencies? Use as few or as many of choices as you want and add your own to "other".

   FCS  CPC  BCS  CWB

   1. We keep trying to get them to do their job.
   2. We generally understand each other and try to work things out.
   3. They're so swamped I don't expect much.
   4. We tend to have disagreements as to what needs to be done.
   5. Have little contact with the agency except for
occasional very pressing situations.
6. We both keep trying to improve our cooperative efforts.
7. We generally have a good mutual understanding.
8. They're not that interested in working together.
9. We really don't know enough about what they're doing.
10. Other (identify).

30. Do you believe that each of the following social agencies does as much as, less than, or more than you expect it could do in meeting the needs of children in the public schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>CPC</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>As much as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Less than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>More than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. If you had more time available would you tend to provide significantly more direct services to children and family members and make fewer referrals to community agencies for such services as counselling of children and family members? To what extent?

32. What other conditions determine your involvement in providing continued direct service to children and family members rather than referring them to private agencies?

33. If counselling resources in a community are not available, and there is too long a wait for such help, how does this usually affect your own working efforts with this youngster and family members? In order of importance:

1. Extend direct counselling services within the school
2. Try to locate or arrange for resources not previously identified
3. Accept that there is little that can be done
4. Try to approach problems differently
5. Encourages involvement in community development of needed resources
6. Efforts to modify school or agency policy
7. Other (identify)

34. Would you note two recent situations in which you had to deal with the reality that a referral could not be made as you would have liked, and how you responded to this?

35. Overall, how would you characterize your working relationship with each of the following agencies:
36. From your overall perspective, how important do you view the need for more effective coordination of services between the public schools and the social agencies?

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Of little importance

37. Do you feel that you would like to be able to devote significantly more effort to developing cooperative working relationships with the social agencies?

- Yes
- No

38. If yes, please list in order of importance the reasons for your not being able to do so:

- Lack of staff time
- Low priority placed on such needs in school system
- Lack of interest of social agencies
- Difficulty in identifying the nature of the problems involved
- Other (identify)

39. What factors do you think tend to or would enhance coordination of services between the social agencies and the public schools? List in order of importance.

- Greater clarity of mutual goals
- Better working relationships between social workers of schools and agencies
- Greater emphasis on need for coordination
- More time for conferences
- Greater familiarity with each other's current programs
- Other (identify)

40. In your interaction with social agencies, have there been any conditions or characteristics of public schools that have tended to hinder your functioning as effectively as you would like to be able to do? If so, please identify these conditions and illustrate their effects.

41. Do you feel any of the following conditions exist in the school system that at times hinders your coordinating
services with agencies as effectively as you would like? Please list in order of importance.

a. Variety of school personnel to whom you have to relate at different times about case situations
b. Lack of clarity as to who exercises what school authority in some case situations
c. Some lack of clarity or changing patterns of the boundaries of non-instructional school services
d. Differences at times in objectives between the schools and social agencies
e. Emphasis in schools on discipline and authority
f. Time lag in decision-making by the school system
g. Differences between social work and educational interpretation of the functions and goals of Special Services intervention
h. Others (identify)

42. Do you at times either seek out, or would seek out if you had an opportunity to do so, particular social workers in any of the agencies? No names. If yes, please note bases for such preferences.

43. Do you at times either avoid, or would avoid if you had an opportunity to do so, particular social workers in any of the agencies? No names. If yes, please note bases for such preferences.

44. Please rate in order of importance the characteristics that would tend to determine who you would prefer to work with or avoid:

Seek Out  Avoid

a. Level of professional competence (knowledge and skills)
b. Personality characteristics
c. Working relationship with staff member
d. Commitment to helping role
e. Other (identify)

45. Do you have any final comments regarding conditions or characteristics that influence patterns of interaction between the schools and social agencies noted? Any suggestions to enhance the coordination of services?
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AGENCY AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
The purpose of this study is to secure information about the patterns of interaction and coordination between the public schools and selected social welfare agencies in the community providing services to children. This study will attempt to evaluate the general effectiveness of services of any organization. It is intended to help better understand the factors that contribute to how organizations coordinate services. All information will be handled confidentially and will not be identified as coming from any one individual.

Approximate age:

Sex:

Highest educational level and major:

Professional background (type positions):

Length of time with this organization:

Former positions with this organization?

Time interview began:

Time interview ended:
Interview Schedule for Social Agency and Special Services Administrators (Special Services represent public schools)

1. Briefly, what do you understand to be the official functions and goals of your organization?

2. Briefly, what are the primary services and programs offered by your organization to achieve these goals?

3. In view of the reality of limited resources, does your organization have priorities of services or populations served? Please note any priorities.

4. Do you feel as an administrator that you have adequate control of how resources of your organization are used? Please clarify and illustrate.

5. (For Special Services administrators) In order of importance, what are the five social agencies, you consider most significant from the point of view of need for services to the public schools?

6. How would you compare the kinds and extent of resources expended by social agencies to meet school and school related requests for services compared to the public schools helping to meet the needs of the social agencies?

7. In what ways, if any, do you consider your community services to the public schools different from providing services to any other public or private agency or organization?

8. Do any special arrangements for financing of services to public schools exist or do you think should occur as compared to services to other organizations (for private agencies)?

9. How significantly and in what ways would your organization be affected by a loss of access to the resources and coordinated services between public schools and social agencies?

10. Can you illustrate how your organization can better achieve its own goals through availability of resources and coordination of services between school and agencies?

11. Are there areas or situations where it is administratively unclear at times whether the schools or a social agency should provide particular services? If so, illustrate types or specifics of such instances.
12. What kinds of problems arise in the coordination of services between the public schools and social agencies? List applicable items in order of importance.

a. Referral process
b. Duplication or overlapping of services
c. Determining areas of responsibility
d. Agreeing on objectives or decisions
e. Having sufficient time to discuss situations
f. Being sufficiently familiar with services and programs on the part of one or both organizations
g. Other

13. In order of frequency, starting with the most frequent, which of the following actions are taken to clarify, or resolve questions of coordination of services between the schools and social agencies?

a. Telephone contact between social workers
b. Face-to-face conferences between social workers
c. Conferences between social workers and supervisors
d. Conferences involving administrative personnel
e. Discussions in staff meeting
f. Meetings between representatives of school and social agency staffs

14. What is the nature and extent of your contact with administrative personnel of the other organization(s)?

15. What were the two most recent discussions you can recall with staff about matters pertaining to working relationships between the public school representatives and the social agencies?

16. In what way does your organization attempt as a staff to improve the coordination of services between the public schools and social agencies?

17. In what way is there administrative encouragement for your staff to develop and maintain familiarity with programs and services of other organizations?

18. On a day-by-day level, how effective do you consider efforts at coordinating services between the public schools and social agencies?

a. Good
b. Fair
c. Poor
19. How important do you view the need for greater coordination between the public schools and social agencies?
   a. Very important  
   b. Of moderate importance  
   c. Of little importance

20. In what ways do you believe the other organization(s) (schools/social agencies) can better assist your organization in carrying out its own functions?

21. Professionally, how well do you know the administrative personnel of the other organizations?
   a. Very little  
   b. Fairly well  
   c. Very well

22. Do you feel that significantly more staff time should be devoted to strengthening the cooperative working relationships between the schools and social agencies?

23. If yes, in order of importance please list the applicable reasons for not being able to do so.
   a. Lack of staff time  
   b. Low priority placed in such needs in your organization  
   c. Lack of interest of other organizations  
   d. Difficulty in identifying the nature of problems  
   e. Other

24. What factors do you think tend to or would enhance the coordination of services between the schools and social agencies?
   a. Greater clarity of mutual goals  
   b. Close working relationships between social workers  
   c. Greater emphasis on need for coordination  
   d. More time available for conferences etc.  
   e. Greater familiarity with services and programs of the other organizations  
   f. Clearer identification of issues  
   g. Other

25. Are there conditions or characteristics of the public schools from an administrative point of view that at times tend to hinder coordination of services between the public schools and social agencies?
26. Do you feel that any of the following conditions or characteristics of the public schools at times tend to hinder coordination of services between the public schools and social agencies?

a. Variety of staff members of school systems that have to be related to at different times
b. Lack of clarity as to who exercises what school authority in different situations
c. Keeping up with changing school functions and programs
d. Differences in objectives between agencies and schools
e. School's emphasis of discipline and authority
f. Time lag in decision making by school system
g. Other

27. As an administrator, what differences in perspective, if any, do you have from those of the line staff about the patterns of interaction and coordination of services between the schools and social agencies?

28. (For social agency administrators) Administratively do there appear to be any significant differences in patterns of interaction between your social agency and the public schools as compared to interaction with social agencies, public and private? Please describe.

29. How do you assist new staff members in becoming familiar with the services and programs of other organizations with which you exchange services?

30. How do you compare the effects of program or staff wide efforts to strengthen coordination of services to dealing with such matters on a case by case basis?

31. Do you feel that a central coordinating council in the community could contribute to strengthening interorganizational exchanges? Please elaborate.

32. What views and ideas have you had generally about your organization's involvements with other organizations in terms of strengthening your own functioning?

33. Are there any other comments you can make about the nature and patterns of interaction between the public schools and the social agencies, and how services might more effectively be coordinated?
The data were secured to possibly help identify some organizational dimensions through characteristics of its staff members. There are distinct differences in the characteristics of the line staffs of the five organizations in the study, noted in table on following page. The social workers of the school system and the two private agencies were all professionally educated and had considerable social work experience with one exception (the part-time case aide in FCS outreach office in a poor, minority group neighborhood), and averaging in their mid-forties. In contrast, none of the line social workers of the two large public agencies were professionally educated, had considerably less social work experience, and averaged in their late twenties and thirties (see table on following page).

The significance of these differences in age, education, and social work experience are not self-evident. Professional education of staff was overwhelmingly selected by the school social workers as the most significant characteristic of a social agency. The variables of social work experience and age were not addressed and their possible meaning would be speculative. The clustering of this descriptive data of the line staff is interesting. It reflects both the definite tendency of professionalism of the private (voluntary) agencies and the non-professionalism
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSW(5)</th>
<th>BCS(9)</th>
<th>CWB(8)</th>
<th>FCS(5)</th>
<th>CPC(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. late 40's</td>
<td>Av. 37</td>
<td>Av. 37</td>
<td>Av. 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40's-51</td>
<td>23-33</td>
<td>25-59</td>
<td>27-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All M.S.W. (Master's in S.W.)</td>
<td>All have Undergrad. degree</td>
<td>All have Undergrad. (except aide)</td>
<td>All M.S.W.</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-1/2 yrs. prior M.S.W.</td>
<td>Total 2-1/3 yrs.</td>
<td>Total 5.3 yrs.</td>
<td>10 yrs. prior M.S.W.</td>
<td>4 yrs. prior M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work Experience</strong></td>
<td>16 yrs. after M.S.W.</td>
<td>1-1/2 yrs. with BCS</td>
<td>5.2 yrs. with CWB</td>
<td>10 yrs. since M.S.W.</td>
<td>15 yrs. since M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 yrs. with schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1/2 yrs. with FCS</td>
<td>14 yrs. with CPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the staffs of the public agencies, and the usual (CPC is an idiosyncratic exception as noted) more effective communication between those of staffs of similar educational preparation.