

THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATION IN INTERORGANIZATIONAL
COORDINATION OF HEALTH SERVICES DELIVERY

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF HEALTH SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES
HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

BY
ELIZABETH MARBACH-HOPKINS, B.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

DECEMBER 1982

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Chapter	
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Study Design.....	5
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of Study.....	6
Methods.....	11
Instrument.....	11
Population and Sample.....	12
Limitations.....	12
III. Review of the Literature.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Historical Background.....	14
Communication.....	15
Coordination.....	16
Interdependence and Independence.....	17
Summary and Conclusions.....	18
IV. Findings.....	20
V. Discussion.....	39
Introduction.....	39
Coordination.....	39
Communication.....	42
Interdependence and Independence.....	45
Summary and Conclusions.....	46
Appendices.....	47
A. About Communications.....	48
B. Joint Programs.....	55
C. About Coordination - Working Together.....	56
D. Exempt Statement.....	61
E. Letters of Consent.....	62
References.....	65

List of Tables

Table		
1	Formal or Scheduled Communications.....	25
2	Informal or Unscheduled Communications Frequency of Amount of Time Spent on Certain Topics With Co-Workers.....	27
3	Informal or Unscheduled Frequency of Communication Amount of Time Spent on Certain Topics With Colleagues.....	30
4	Frequency of Communication Qualitative Aspects.....	31

Acknowledgements

This opportunity is taken to acknowledge my indebtedness to those people who made this thesis possible. I wish to thank my husband, Sumner, for his infinite patience; my friends and colleagues at Texas Woman's University for their guidance; the directors of the organizations who consented to help with the study, and the thesis committee, who contributed ideas and useful criticism.

I also wish to thank Jacqueline Barnes for typing the many revisions of this thesis.

Chapter I

Between the years of 1935 and 1955 social agencies across the country were struggling to identify and make visible the social and medical problems of the needy, particularly older individuals. Government through its public welfare programs did very little to identify the need for appropriate housing, more adequate income maintenance, constructive use of leisure time, special transportation needs, medical care, rehabilitative and selfcare programs, and other forms of community support systems. What was done was developed in an uncoordinated way. . . . The development of the systems and needed services were not universal. With the passage of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, the addition of the services was made universally possible. Public Welfare Programs began to give recognition to the need for a comprehensive, coordinated network of support systems for older individuals at the community level (Jacks, 1976, p. 82).

The aging individual is often the most disadvantaged person in Western society. "Neglect of older individuals and the lack of knowledge concerning aging coincide with a strong negative attitude toward aging and elderly persons. Basic needs frequently go unmet. Social and psychological needs are often ignored. Poverty, rejection, and misery are the common experiences of many elderly persons" (Gioiella, 1978, p. 395). These conditions exist despite the increased spending in health care. "Since the introduction of Medicare, the health of elderly persons has not measurably improved. Services are incomplete, often duplicative,

and not efficiently responsive to the needs of elderly persons" (Portnoi, 1979, p. 1387). The lack of proper organization of health care services is partly responsible. A level of coordination is required among agencies and providers of health care if a continuum of care is to be provided.

Health workers will need to shift their emphasis from death and disease to health and its fulfillment in order to promote a high level of wellness. To provide total health services, answering to the needs of the whole person, public and private funds will have to be provided. The development and evaluation of a network of services involves continuity, comprehensiveness, communication, and coordination. The dispensers of service will have to reach out with availability, accessibility, and acceptability of social and medical resources which affect the older individual's health status and overall well being. The combination of services will have to be community-based and consistent with the realities of each community. The services will have to be planned, using sound data on the community and its residents.

The issue of cost is a major one, which will not be directly addressed in this study, though its effects are indirectly felt; for as costs go up, services available to down. "The combination of increasing costs and demands is having two important consequences. First, medical services are increasingly regarded as a right, rather than a privilege. Second, there is a growing realization that the delivery of health services is a system

problem" (Howland, 1970, p. 268).

"The development of a community support system must be based on a clear delineation of responsibilities and an understanding of the need for, and potential value of, such services both to the individual and to the community" (Jacks, 1976, p. 93). The array of services in the community will need coordination. The current fragmented sources of funding will need coordination. The service delivery system will need coordination. "The complexity of the health services delivery system is evident in light of the unusually complex nature of services which are provided by a great many disparate groups of people organized in exceedingly complicated relationships" (Hedinger, 1968, p. 2). "Coordination represents the extent to which each of the various interdependent parts of a social system functions each according to the needs and requirements of the other parts and of the total system" (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1962, p. 273).

Thinking in terms of systems seems the most appropriate approach in conceptualizing a comprehensive coordinated network of health care facilities. "A system is an organized collection of interrelated elements characterized by a boundary and functional unity" (Dechert, 1964, p. 110). "A community health care giving system is a 'system of systems' and is comprised of a host of organizational or agency systems at different levels" (Baker & Schulberg, 1970, p. 190). The system is, then, a complex network

of interrelated organizations. The amount of interrelation a degree of organization of the elements "Coordination means integrating the various parts of system" (Hage, 1974, p. 28).

According to Dechert (1964), the integrated activity of large social groupings is the product of effective communication.

"Communication is the degree to which information is transmitted among the members of a social system" (Price, 1972, p. 58).

Coordination and communication play roles, then, in the integration of activities among organizations.

Chapter II

Study Design

Statement of the Problem

The problem under investigation concerns the role of communication in interorganizational coordination among agencies and providers of health care to elderly individuals of Houston-Harris County, Texas. These various organizations must be linked to produce a common output. "Coordination means integrating the various parts of an organization" (Hage, 1974, p. 28). How then, does the flow of communication affect the linkage mechanism joining organizations? The measures of concern are certain forms of coordination and communication and the impact of these exchanges on services. Such a problem belongs to the philosophical field of methodology, which is the analysis of procedures, and consists of how one would measure the linkages through which information is transmitted and the affects on service provision. The unit of analysis for this study is the organizational entity, the provider agency. Variables of analysis are: (a) types of communication, (b) interdependence and independence of the organization, and (c) programed and nonprogramed coordination. This study, which is methodologically descriptive, will consider the questions: (a) What is the extent and purpose of communication among providers? (b) What affect organization interdependence and independence has on linkage? (c) What affect coordination has on agency relationship

and service delivery?

Purpose of the Study

This thesis concerns the role of communication in coordination of service delivery among provider organizations of health care and its affect on agency relationships.

Social groups have long been thought of as complex communications nets. The relations of organizations are thought to form systems or subsystems within the larger system of society. Organizations are linked to coordinate activities, and the dynamics of interchange among organizations provides a model for conceptualizing linkages using communications and feedback concepts.

The pattern of communication among provider organizations was explored with the possibility of gathering data to show the coordination links among organizations, with communication as a mechanism which links the segments of the system together.

The concepts of interdependence and independence were introduced in order to measure the degree of coordination. The degree of coordination depends upon adequate communication. The patterns of interdependence and independence are the account organizations take of each other. Organization interrelationships are indicated by the number of joint programs in which the organization participates.

The purpose of this study is to contribute to an understanding of the communications process among organizations, why certain communication patterns exist, and how the organization's interde-

pendence affects communication outcomes--that is, coordination of service delivery.

The considerations of this study are expressed here in terms of goals and objectives. Such goals and objectives will cover the previously state variables of analysis.

Communication

Definition. Price (1972) defines communications as "the degree to which information is transmitted among the members of a social system. He distinguishes four types: (a) formal and informal, (b) vertical and horizontal, (c) personal and impersonal, and (d) instrumental and expressive" (p. 58). Hage (1974) defines communication as "verbal interactions about tasks and gives two types: (a) scheduled and (b) unscheduled" (p. 151). Georgopoulos and Mann (1962) further distinguish six aspects of communication: (a) adequacy, (b) amount, (c) frequency, (d) qualitativative, (e) informality, and (f) direction; and define communication function from the organization standpoint as transmission of relevant information necessary to coordinate activities.

This study was concerned with (a) adequacy, (b) amount, (c) frequency and (d) direction. To obtain this data a questionnaire was developed using material from Hage and Georgopoulos and Mann.

Goal. The schedule classified types of communication, among the sample organizations, according to the definitions stated above, using the schedule of questions in appendix A, and by objectives as follows.

Objectives. To obtain perceptual data as follows:

1. About the adequacy of communication schedule question 9
2. About amount of communication schedule questions 7, 8, 12, and 14
3. About scheduled or formal communication schedule questions 16, 17, and 18
4. About unscheduled or informal communication schedule questions 1 and 2
5. About direction of communication schedule questions 3, 5, 13, and 15
6. About frequency of communication schedule questions 4, 6, 10, 11, and 19

Interdependence and Independence

Definition. Interdependence means "that two or more organizations must take each other into account in order to best achieve their individual goals" (Litwak & Rotham, 1970, p. 149). The condition of functional interdependence constitutes the basic need for coordination among organizations. Linking together illustrates the concept of functional interdependence" (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1962, p. 274). "There are several possible measures of organizational interdependence among social welfare and health organizations. Among these are:

1. The number of cases, clients, or patients referred or exchanged.
2. The number of personnel lent, borrowed, or exchanged.

3. The number, sources, and amount of financial support.
4. The number of joint programs. (Aiken & Hage, 1968, p. 379).

This study was concerned with the number of joint programs, defined as those programs involving the commitment of resources-- personnel, finances, space--by all participating organizations.

Goal. This study identified interdependence among organizations, by determining the number of joint programs with other organizations among the sample organizations, by use of the question in appendix B, asked of the head of each organization.

Objectives. The schedule questioned the head of each organization to obtain a list of all joint programs that the organization has been involved in for the past two years, whether terminated or not, according to the above definition, to determine linkages among organizations.

Coordination

Definition. "Coordination means that the efforts and work activities of groups are regulated, articulated, and related to one another in certain ways, in terms of time and space and according to certain principles; and must not be confused with cooperation which means working together for the accomplishment of some goal" (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1962, p. 273). "Coordination of separate organizations that are fairly autonomous is interorganizational. Coordination of the units of a single organization is intraorganizational. Although both types of coordination are the same in principle the mechanisms blend into one another along a continuum"

(Mott, 1968, pp. 9-10). "Coordination means integrating the various parts of an organization, it is a group process" (Hage, 1974, pp. 28-29). "Coordination is, then, the degree to which each of the various interdependent parts of a social system operates according to the requirements of the other parts and of the total system" (Price, 1972, p. 84).

This study was concerned with two categories of coordination: (a) programed and (b) nonprogramed. "Programed coordination may be defined as planned activities, that is, they are timed and regulated, and linkages in the system are established and articulated to fit the program involved. Nonprogramed coordination makes allowance for adjustments which are required to meet organizational needs that arise in the day-to-day operations of the system--needs that cannot be satisfied through advance formal planning" (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1962, p. 278).

Goal. This study identified coordination, according to the above definition, among the sample organization, and classify these events into two categories, programed and nonprogramed, through the use of the schedule of questions in appendix C.

Objectives. To obtain perceptual data as follows:

1. About programed coordination schedule questions 5, 8, and 9
2. About nonprogramed coordination schedule questions 4, 6, 11, and 12
3. About cooperation schedule question 3
4. About frequency of communication related to coordination

schedule question 7

5. About reliability schedule questions 2 and 10
6. About relationship and position in organization schedule questions 1 and 13

Method

Using survey analysis an understanding of the nature of the interdependencies of the health service delivery agencies, as an organizational system, constitutes the research task of this study. Specifically, the role which communication plays in the coordination of health service delivery.

The unit of analysis for this study is organizations, not the individual respondents who represent the organization.

Interorganizational analysis looks at how two or more formal organizations relate to each other. The interconnectedness of a system is measured by interdependence of the agencies; that is, the account each agency must take of the other in order to accomplish its goal. Interorganizational relations involve crossing organizational boundaries. To accomplish these transactions organizations must operate together. One mechanism is through a communication network.

By means of a questionnaire administered in three health and welfare organizations, which provide client services in a large Southwest metropolis in 1982, data was gathered for analysis.

Instrument

The instrument for this study is a questionnaire (See Appen-

dices A, B, and C) developed by Georgopoulos and Mann and modified for organizational research. The instrument also contains questions taken from a study by Hage to determine scheduled and unscheduled communications.

Population and Sample

The population consists of three health and welfare provider organizations. Two are voluntary non-profit, one is a private profit agency;

Respondents within each organization were selected by the following criteria:

1. All directors and department heads.
2. One-half of the staff, conveniently selected, in departments of less than ten.
3. One-third of the staff, randomly selected, in departments of more than ten.

Limitations

There are limitations to what was done.

1. Out of more than 388 agencies offering services only three were chosen.
2. The majority of the sample came from one organization.
3. The total sample was not randomized, some respondents were conveniently selected.

Chapter III

Review of the Literature

Community health care services are complex, uncoordinated resources incapable of providing adequate delivery of health care. In the dynamics of health care delivery flexibility and adaptability are called for. Coordination of the activities of health care organizations to provide a network of health care service is a possible solution for the systems ineffectiveness and inefficiency. It is increasingly difficult for health care organizations to go on detached and uncoordinated. The concept of teamwork must be recognized. No single organization is able to provide all health care services.

A community health care system is comprised of organizational agencies at different levels. Interorganizational coordination considers the various patterns of linkages among these health care provider organizations. Interdependence is a primary attribute of a health care system. Communication is required for coordination. "The greater the efficiency of communication . . . the greater the tolerance for interdependence, the greater reliance on coordination" (March & Simon, 1958, p. 162).

The 1950's saw the emergence of the systems theory from biology and engineering into organizational theory. A systems approach to organizational research entails a study of the interaction patterns of various organizations. Formal organizations

are a particular type of social system. Modern social life demonstrates wide-spread organizational involvement. Organizations and organizational networks are a part of the social structure of society.

Historical Background

Prior to the 1960's most research on organizations was in the field of intraorganizational relations. In recent years the literature exploded with articles on interorganizational relations. These contributions notwithstanding, there are widespread calls for additional research. Etzioni (1960) specified interorganizational relations as one area meriting intensive empirical study. Levine and White (1961) stated that little effort has been made to appraise the interrelationships that exist within the community. Litwak and Hylton (1962) "cite a major lacuna in current sociological study is research on interorganizational relations-- studies which use organizations as their unit of analysis" (p. 395). According to Brinkerhoff and Kunz (1972) the area of interorganizational analysis is underdeveloped. Evans (1976) stated that the study of interorganizational relations is high on the research agenda and we can expect progress in the study of interorganizational systems.

In General System Theory von Bertalanffy (1968, p. 9) stated that the theory of formal organizations is "framed in a philosophy which accepts the premise that the only meaningful way to study organization is to study it as a system. . . ." General system theory emphasizes wholeness, interrelatedness of parts, complexity, and processes. . . . "Modern

organization theory leads almost inevitably into a discussion of general system theory, treating organizations as a system of mutually dependent variables (Scott, 1963)."

"Using a systems approach to community programs, the concept of of general system theory attempts to take a comprehensive view of all component parts and their interplay" (Raeburn, 1979, p. 290). Since von Bertalanffy defines "systems as complexes of elements standing in interaction" (p. 33), and "all formal organizations are embedded in an environment of other organizations . . . a subsystem of the more inclusive social system of society" (Evans, 1976, p. 119), "knowledge of the characteristics of systems, especially social systems, is becoming essential for understanding organizations" (Huse & Bowditch, 1979, p. 36).

Parkman (1972) analyzes the definition of system to signify a collection of individual components that express the whole, by virtue of the mode of interrelationships. "A system is an organized collection of interrelated elements characterized by a boundary and functional unity. The concept of system emphasizes the reality of complex relational networks and permits the analysis of mutual casual processes involving interacting entities" (Dechert, 1969, p. 111).

Communication

The development of the modern theory of communication is closely connected with system theory. "The general notion in communication theory is that of feedback" (von Bertalanffy, 1968, p. 42) and "feedback is a continuous flow of information between a

system and its parts" (Huse & Bowditch, 1977, p. 50). Communication is a mechanism which links the segments of the system together. "Communication acts not only as a stimuli resulting in action, but also as a control and coordination mechanism" (Scott, 1961, p. 48).

"For many years organizational theory has analyzed social groups as a complex communications nets characterized by a multiplicity of feedback loops. One of the transactional processes that occur may involve the transfer of information. The integrated activity of social groupings, is then, the product of effective communication" (Dechert, 1969, pp. 105-115).

Interorganizational relations involve crossing organizational boundaries. The adequacy of communication linkages for transmission of information is a factor in coordination of organizations.

Coordination

"Coordination means integrating the various parts of an organization" (Hage, 1974, p. 28) and "coordination can be achieved through planning or feedback" (March & Simon, 1958, p. 160). When organizations are staffed with a diversity of personnel communications are a vital source of coordination, for "communications in organizations are basically transactions between individuals" (Hall, 1972, p. 271). If coordination can be achieved in the two ways suggested by March and Simon, (1958, pp. 158-169) with feedback representing the obtaining of information, and planning

defined as programed interaction, then coordination can be

"viewed as representing the processes of articulation and the state of adjustment among the elements of the organization and can be defined as the extent to which the interdependent parts of the organization function according to the needs and requirements of the other parts and of the total system" (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1962, p. 303).

Coordination then depends upon adequate communication and feedback.

For an organization to maintain independent activity the organization must be able to handle the communication required for coordination. Interdependencies increase the likelihood of developing efficient communication. Communication channels can be deliberately planned or develop through usage. The communication network grows in response to need for specific kinds of communications.

Interdependence and Independence

Interdependence, defined by Litwak and Hylton, (1962) means "two or more organizations must take each other into account if they are to accomplish their goals" (p. 401). Interdependence is the minimum condition for any form of linkage among organizations. The interdependence of the parts of the system is one important factor affecting coordination among relatively autonomous organizations. "The response of organizations to interdependence takes two forms, conflict and cooperation" (Mott, 1968, p. 14). The processes of both conflict and cooperation are required, at any given time, in interorganizational coordination.

One concept of interdependence focuses on interorganizational exchanges. Elements that are exchanged fall into three categories:" (a) referrals of clients, (b) giving or receiving of labor services, and (c) the sending or receiving of resources other than labor services, including funds, equipment and information" (Levine & White, 1961, p. 589). "Another measure of the degree of organizational interdependence is the number of joint programs a local organization has with other organizations. The establishment of a joint program is viewed as a type of organizational exchange" (Aiken & Hage, 1968, pp. 370-373).

The key to interorganizational linkage is the notion of partial interdependence. There must be certain areas in which each organization is independent of the others while other areas are interdependent" (Litwak & Rotham, 1970, p. 148).

Summary and Conclusions

Organizations are interrelated and not independent of one another. Organizations face the problems of coordination. Large numbers of organizations find difficulties in establishing communications, the formal linkages between them. Organizations are systems that have input-output and are involved in transactions between systems. From the survey of the literature it would seem that there is diversity in the linkage mechanism among organizations. Linkages can exist on a continuum "from the extreme of impersonal rules, to the use of special linkage organizations, to informal 'friendship' type contacts" (Litwak & Rotham, 1970, p.

147). There also exists a multiplicity of barriers to establishing coordinating relationships among organizations.

In this study the concern was with those variables which can affect interorganizational relationships: (a) communication, (b) coordination, and (c) interdependence.

Chapter IV

Findings

This study is an inquiry into the role of communication in interorganizational coordination of health services delivery among community service organizations. Three organizations are involved in the study. Two of the organizations are non-profit providing services to older adults. The third organization is a for-profit agency which provides home health care.

Accordingly the study does not purport to cover the entire health services delivery field nor to generalize the results to all health service delivery organizations, although many of the findings may be relevant to several different kinds of organizations.

The research focused on the agency as an on-going organization and on certain of its major departments not on individuals within the organization.

The health service delivery system consists of many different interacting organizations designed to accomplish certain objectives through the varied efforts and proper allocation of all resources and facilities.

To establish contact with the organizations involved in the study the researcher talked with the director of each organization. The purpose of the study was explained and each director decided to cooperate.

The required data was obtained from the respondents by means of standardized questionnaires (see Appendix A and C). The directors responded to an additional question (see Appendix B) which was an open ended question for data relating to inter-dependence.

Two of the organizations responded to the questionnaires without the presence of the researcher. The third organization requested the researcher administer the questionnaires in person.

Following the collection of the data the completed questionnaires were reviewed. The data was then tabulated to obtain frequency distributions of responses for each question, with the exception of the open-ended questions, in the questionnaire and separately for each respondent organization. Tabulations were obtained separately for each of the three organizations, and for all organizations combined. The data from these tabulations were then converted into percentages, showing the percentage of respondents, in each case, who gave a particular answer to a particular question. Each response was valued to form a six point ordinal scale with values ranging from 1 to 6. Mean scores could then be obtained for each organization, for combined organizations, and for individual items on the questionnaire. Mean scores allow rank ordering of the organizations according to the magnitude of respective mean, arrayed in relation to one another, from highest to lowest.

The total number of available respondents from the three organizations turned out to be 22. The majority of respondents answered all or virtually all of the questions contained in the questionnaires.

The presentation of the data is in relation to the questions as they appear on the questionnaires, with respect to each of the variables.

Data About Communication

I. Adequacy

A. How you feel about kind of communication you receive from colleagues

#1	#2	#3	C	
60%	50%	80%	63%	very adequate
26%	-	20%	22%	fairly adequate
6%	50%	-	9%	completely adequate
6%	-	-	4%	rather inadequate

II. Amount

A. Average amount of time per week, talk with colleagues

#1	#2	#3	C	
53%	100%	80%	63%	more than 4 hours per week
20%	-	20%	18%	between 2 and 4 hours per week
20%	-	-	9%	between 1 and 2 hours
6%	-	-	9%	between 1/2 and 1 hour

B. Variation in length of time or how often talk with colleagues

#1	#2	#3	C	
46%	50%	-	36%	small amount
26%	-	20%	22%	moderate amount of variation
6%	-	60%	18%	large amount of variation
6%	50%	20%	13%	extremely large amount of variation
13%	-	-	9%	a very large amount of variation

- C. Number of times per week confer with people in other organizations range from 0 to 25.
- D. Number of contacts with people in other organizations over one year range from 0 to over 1200

III. Formal or Scheduled Communications

- A. Committees or meetings
 - 1. number of meetings range from 0-9,
 - 2. meet from 0-6 times per month
 - B. Types:
 - 1. Departmental
 - a. Number of meetings attended - 12
 - b. Proportion attending - 48%
 - 2. Organization - Wide
 - a. Number of meetings attended - 10
 - b. Proportion attending - 58%
 - C. Number of times per month committee meets

8 met once	2 met every 3 months
2 met 4	1 met every 6 months
1 met twice	
 - D. Hours per month spent in meetings or committees range from 1-30 with an average of 4.6.
- Refer to Table 1 for responses.

Table 1.
Formal or Scheduled Communications

	Departmental	Organization Wide	Meetings per month	Hours per Month	Member
Classification of Meetings					
Prof. Advisory Council		X	1/6 - 1/3	1.5	5
Discharge Planning Assoc.		X	1 - 1/3	7	1
Adv. Board		X			1
Case Management Meeting	X		4	3	6
Screening Unit Meeting	X				1
Administrative	X		8	20 - 30	3
Inform. - Support Adv. Comm.	X		1	1	2
Community Serv. Coord. Mtg.	X		1		6
Forms Comm.		X	1	1	3
Social Service Meeting		X	1	1 - 2	4
Homenakers Meeting	X		1	1.5	1
Team Meeting		X	1	1.5	2
Directors		X	1	2	2
Community Serv. Staff	X		1	1	2
Foster Care Staff	X		3	6	1
Retreat Comm.		X	1/4		3
Foster Care Coord.	X				1
Procedures		X			1
Texas Youth Look at Aging Comm.			1/3		1
Life After Work	X		1/3		1
Vol. in Nursing Homes	X		1/3		1
Community Serv. Adv. Com.		X	1/3		1

IV. Informal or Unscheduled Communications

A. Average amount of time per week you talk with certain persons

#1	#2	#3	C	
20%	50%	60%	27%	between 2 and 4 hours
26%	-	-	18%	between 4 and 6 hours
6%	50%	20%	13%	more than 6 hours
20%	-	20%	22%	between 1 and 2 hours
20%	-	-	13%	between 1/2 hour and 1 hour
6%	-	-	4%	less than 1/2 hour

B. Refer to Table 2 for how often you talk with this person about the items listed.

V. Direction of Communication

A. Position of person you most frequently talk with

#1	#2	#3	C	
33%	-	60%	36%	my immediate superior
26%	-	20%	22%	the same level as mine
26%	50%	20%	27%	position lower than mine
13%	50%	-	13%	higher position - not my immediate superior

Table 2.
Informal or Unscheduled Communications
Frequency of Amount of Time Spent on Certain Topics With Co-Workers
Proportions of Respondents

2. How often do you usually talk with this person about each of the following things?

	Once A month or less often (1)	Two or three times a month (2)	About once a week (3)	Several times a week (4)	Once A day or more often (5)
About ways in which patient care could be improved	#1 26%	20%	33%	13%	6%
	2		50%	50%	
	3	20%		80%	
	C	22%	31%	36%	9%
About ways in which supervision could be improved	#1 26%	20%	33%	13%	6%
	2		50%		50%
	3	20%	20%	40%	
	C	22%	31%	18%	9%
About work	#1	6%	6%	20%	66%
	2				100%
	3				40%
	C	4%	4%	27%	63%
About employee wages, hours, or benefits	#1 46%	20%	26%	6%	
	2	50%		50%	
	3	40%			
	C	45%	18%	9%	
About ways in which working relations between organizations could be improved	#1 26%	33%	20%	20%	
	2		50%		50%
	3	40%	20%	40%	
	C	18%	31%	22%	4%
About ways in which satisfaction or morale among personnel could be improved	#1 40%	26%	20%	6%	6%
	2		50%		50%
	3	20%	40%	26%	20%
	C	31%	27%	9%	13%
About things, people or happenings outside the organization	#1 13%		40%	26%	13%
	2	50%			50%
	3	20%	60%	20%	
	C	9%	40%	27%	13%

B. & C. Job titles of people conferred within a typical week.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Intraorganization</u>	<u>Interorganization</u>
Coordinators	86%	18%
Directors	45%	40%
Outreach Workers	22%	
Social Service Personnel	4%	18%
Information & Referral-Intake	27%	13%
Case Worker	72%	27%
Senior Homemaker	22%	4%
Case Manager Supervisor	27%	4%
Liaison Worker	4%	
Special Project Worker	4%	
Executive Director	9%	4%
Supervisor	18%	22%
Community Development Specialist	9%	4%
Technical	4%	9%
Volunteers	4%	9%
Librarian	4%	4%

D. Types of contacts involved with people in other organizations:

Seeking information	22%
Request interagency collaboration	9%
Arranging services	36%
Negotiating formal agreements	27%

Providing data	22%
Report of client status	22%
Inservice	4%
Recruit, train volunteers	4%

VI. Frequency of Communication

A. How often confer with people other than at meetings
in a typical week:

1. range from 3 to 109,
2. average 21 times

B. Times in a typical week confer with each of these
people:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Average</u>
Coordinator	4-25	9.2
Director	1-20	6.8
Outreach Worker	1-14	5.5
Social Service Personnel	2-10	3
Information & Referral-Intake	1-7	4.5
Case Worker	1-25	8
Senior Homemaker	4-25	11
Case Manager Supervisor	1-7	3.6
Community Development Specialist	2	2
Technical Personnel	5	5

- C. Refer to Table 3 for how often you usually talk about the items listed with your colleagues.
- D. Refer to Table 4 for how often you and your colleagues confer in the ways listed.
- E. Times in a typical week you confer with people in other organizations at meetings:
 - 1. range from 0.25 - 5,
 - 2. average 1.7 times
 - 3. frequency distribution
 - 9 at least once
 - 2 twice
 - 2 3 to 5 times
 - 2 4 times

Table 3.
 Informal or Unscheduled Frequency of Communication
 Amount of Time Spent on Certain Topics with Colleagues
 Proportions of Respondents

10. How often do you usually talk with your colleague about each of the following things?

	Once A month or less often (1)	Two or three times a month (2)	About once a week (3)	Several times a week (4)	Once A day or more often (5)
About ways in which patient care could be improved	#1 6%	20%	33%	26%	13%
	2		50%		50%
	3			80%	20%
	C 4%	13%	27%	36%	18%
About ways in which supervision could be improved	#1 26%	33%	33%	6%	
	2		50%		50%
	3 40%		60%		
	C 27%	18%	45%	4%	4%
About work	#1 6%		13%	40%	40%
	2				100%
	3			60%	40%
	C 4%		9%	36%	50%
About employee wages, hours, or benefits	#1 80%	20%			
	2	50%	50%		
	3 40%	40%	20%		
	C 59%	27%	13%		
About ways in which working re- lations between organizations could be improved	#1 40%	26%	26%	6%	
	2		50%		50%
	3	20%	40%	40%	
	C 27%	22%	31%	13%	4%
About ways in which satisfac- tion or morale among personnel could be improved	#1 33%	33%	13%	20%	
	2		50%		50%
	3	20%	40%	40%	
	C 22%	27%	18%	27%	4%
About things, people or hap- penings outside the organization	#1 33%	6%	33%	13%	13%
	2		50%		50%
	3		40%	60%	
	C 22%	9%	27%	27%	13%

Table 4.
Frequency of Communication
Qualitative Aspects
Proportions of Respondents

11. Check in the appropriate column below how often you and your colleagues confer in the following ways:

	Once A month or less often (1)	Two or three times a month (2)	About once a week (3)	Several times a week (4)	Once A day or more often (5)
Give you directions or orders	#1 6%	20%	33%	13%	26%
	2	50%		50%	
	3 40%		60%		
	C 13%	18%	22%	22%	18%
Explains things or gives information and suggestions	#1 6%	6%	20%	40%	26%
	2			100%	
	3		20%	60%	20%
	C 4%	4%	18%	45%	22%
Asks for your sug- gestions or opinions	#1	6%	33%	46%	13%
	2		50%		50%
	3		20%		80%
	C	4%	31%	31%	27%
Asks you for informa- tion, explantation, or clarification	#1	13%	20%	46%	20%
	2		50%		50%
	3			60%	40%
	C	9%	18%	40%	27%
Criticize you, refuse to help, or is un- necessarily formal	#1 73%	6%	13%		
	2 100%				
	3 100%				
	C 63%	4%	9%		
Gives excess, un- necessary information or comments	#1 33%	13%	6%	26%	6%
	2 50%				50%
	3 40%	40%	20%		
	C 36%	18%	9%	18%	9%

Data About Interdependence and Independence

Four respondents completed the questionnaire requesting information regarding joint programs. In place of requesting the executive director to participate in two of the agencies, the directors of the departments of services respond. These directors have line authority and more involvement with the actual operation of the agency. The other agency has only one director. The actual numbers of agency involvement:

Agency	Agency Involved With
#1	#2 NC
	#3 Y

Agency	Agency Involved With
#2	#1 NC
	#3

Agency	Agency Involved With
#3	#1 Y
	#2

Data About Coordination

I. Programmed or Planned Coordination

A. How well established are routines of organizations

#1	#2	#3	C	
53%	50%	100%	63%	fairly well
33%	50%		27%	very well
6%			4%	extremely well
6%			4%	not to well

Organization Rank

1 3 2

B. All related activities well timed

73%	100%	100%	81%	fairly well
6%			4%	very well
6%			4%	not so well
6%			4%	poorly timed

Organization Rank

3 2 1

C. Well planned work assignments

#1	#2	#3	C	
53%	50%	80%	59%	fairly well
33%	50%	20%	20%	very well
6%			4%	extremely well
6%			4%	not so well

Organization Rank

3 2 1

II. Nonprogrammed or General Coordination

A. Avoid creating problems with each other

#1	#2	#3	C	
40%	50%	80%	50%	to a fair extent
26%	50%	20%	27%	to a great extent
26%			18%	to a very great extent
6%			4%	to a small extent

Organization Rank

2 3 1

B. Do job properly and efficiently

#1	#2	#3	C	
53%	50%	20%	50%	to a great extent
46%	50%	80%	50%	to a fair extent

Organization Rank

3 2 1

C. How clients feel about how smoothly personnel work together

#1	#2	#3	C	
40%	50%	80%	52%	fairly smoothly
26%	50%		22%	very smoothly
26%			15%	do not work smoothly
4%			6%	do not work smoothly at all

Organization Rank

1 3 2

D. How good are your working relationships with people
from other organizations

#1	#2	#3	C	
46%	50%	40%	45%	very good
33%	-	60%	40%	good
-	50%	-	4%	excellent
13%	-	-	9%	fair

Organization Rank

2 3 1

III. Cooperation

A. People working together do their full share

#1	#2	#3	C	
46%	50%	40%	40%	the majority do
46%	50%	20%	45%	nearly all of them do
		40%	9%	about half do
6%			4%	less than half do

Organization Rank

1 3 2

IV. Frequency of Communication Related to Coordination

A. People get together from different organizations to discuss problems

#1	#2	#3	C	
40%	50%	40%	40%	most of the time
20%	-	40%	22%	about half the time
20%	-	20%	18%	less than half the time
6%	50%	-	9%	nearly always
13%	-	-	9%	always

Organization Rank

2 3 1

V. Reliability - direct measure of coordination

A. Organization been able to achieve singleness of direction

#1	#2	#3	C	
53%	50%	80%	59%	to a considerable extent
6%	50%		9%	to a very great extent
26%		20%	22%	to a fair extent
13%			9%	to a small extent

Organization Rank

1 3 2

B. How well are all things geared for good client care

#1	#2	#3	C	
46%	50%	20%	40%	very well
40%	50%	80%	50%	fairly well
13%	-	-	9%	not so well

Organization Rank

2 3 1

VI. Relationship and Position

A. Role in organization:

Directors	1
Department Directors	3
Case Managers	4
Supervisors	3
Coordinators	5
Case Workers	3
Special Project Staff	1
Specialist Community Outreach & Development	1
Social Worker	1

B. Organizations most contacted:

Of 21 various organizations most frequent contact was with:

TDHR	-	38%	AAA	-	14%
Hospitals	-	28%	VC	-	14%
SA	-	28%	SCS	-	19%
UW	-	28%	NH	-	19%
SSA	-	23%	HHHC	-	19%
HHM	-	14%	VNA	-	9%
Miscellaneous-		4%	TDH	-	9%

Chapter V

Discussion

This study was concerned with the role of communication in interorganizational coordination of health service delivery among provider organizations. The data was collected to determine if communication networks among organizations affect the coordination of activities.

The researcher was interested in the factors of communication, interdependence, and coordination as they relate to each other in interorganizational relationships. The unit of analysis is the total organization.

One of the problems all complex organizations face is coordination. Organizations have specialized roles, a condition which favors interdependence. Interdependence exists when two or more organizations, in order to achieve their individual goals, must take each other into account. Interdependence becomes a condition which favors formation of linkages.

The organizational system is imperfectly coordinated. The exchange of information among the different organizations of the system is accomplished through communication. Adequate communication should facilitate coordination.

Coordination

Coordination can be viewed as the processes of articulation and state of adjustment among

different organizations, and is the extent to which the interdependent organizations function according to the needs and requirements of other organizations and of the total system (Georgopoulos & Mann, 1962, p. 303).

Coordination activities can be divided into two categories, programed or planned and nonprogramed or general.

Scheduled questions 5, 8, and 9 are measures of programed coordination. These questions are concerned with organizational interaction that is planned. These interactions include: (a) the timing of activities, (b) planning assignments, and (c) establishing routines.

Obtaining mean scores shows that all organizations in the study felt:

- (1) That all activities in the everyday routine are fairly well timed.
- (2) That the work assignments of people from different organizations who work together are fairly well planned.
- (3) That the routines of different organizations that have to work together are fairly well established.

Schedule questions 4, 6, 10 and 11 are measures of nonprogramed coordination. These questions are concerned with organizational interaction that is not planned. These interactions include: (a) how activities fit together, (b) the extent that people work together smoothly, (c) the extent organizational members avoid creating problems, and (d) the extent

work is performed without getting in each other's way.

Using mean scores the following conclusions can be observed:

- (1) That people from interrelated organizations make an effort to avoid creating problems to a fair extent.
- (2) That people from different organizations who have to work together do their job efficiently from a fair to a great extent of the time.
- (3) That the activities around the client fit together fairly well.
- (4) That clients feel that the various personnel work together fairly smoothly.

Two of the questions, numbers 2 and 10, are included as reliability measures. The means for question 2 are 1.5, 2.2, and 2.4. The means for question 10 are 2.5, 2.6, and 2.8. Question 10 is also a direct measure of coordination. The findings agree with the over all mean scores of 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8. Organization number 3 ranks highest in overall coordination. In achieving singleness of direction, question 2, organization number 1 ranks highest.

Question 3 deals with cooperation. How well different organizational personnel work together. The mean score of 2.7 indicates respondents felt that nearly all personnel do their full share to make working together easier.

Question 7 deals with frequency of communication related to coordination. How often people from different organizations get together to discuss problems in their working relationships. The

mean score of 3.3 indicates respondents felt that most of the time people get together for this purpose.

Question 12 deals with the existing arrangements in the system which allows people from various organizations to maintain working relationships. A mean score of 2.5 indicates most respondents felt working relationships were very good.

Communication

Communication is not only the transmission of relevant information, but also the degree to which such information is conveyed among the members of a social system. Any organizational system can be thought of as a communication network, some pathways being more important than others. Communication is the medium for exchanging ideas. Communication forms a linkage between organizations.

Communication is distinguished, most commonly, as formal or scheduled, and informal or unscheduled. Communication relative to the task of the organization is verbal interaction involved in the achievement of organizational goals and includes such things as giving or requesting information, opinions, and suggestions.

Schedule or formal communications in organizations consist of committees and meetings. These may be further classified as organization-wide and departmental. The measures consist of the numbers of meetings attended and the proportion attending. The frequency, or number of hours spent per month is requested cognitive of the situation that some organizations might have

infrequent lengthy meetings. The measure of the average number of meetings attended per month reflects the intensity of the flow of communication. The measure of the proportion involved in meetings is the degree of access to the flow of information.

Unscheduled or informal communication is spontaneous interaction that occurs among organizational members. This information was obtained from questions 4, 5, and 6. The measure of volume and direction of communication was obtained from the number of different persons with whom communication occurred, and the frequency of these contacts. The frequency also measured the intensity of information flow.

The amount of informal communication among members of an organization was obtained by question 1. The mean score was 3.8 or people who work together talk to one particular person between 2 and 4 hours per week. In question 7, the amount of time spent talking with colleagues, was more than 4 hours per week.

In time spent communicating about certain topics with co-workers, (see Table 2), mean scores for each item ranged from 1.9 to 4.5. This means most time was spent talking about (a) work, (b) about patient care, (c) about happenings outside the organization, (d) about improvement in supervision and relations between organizations, (e) about personnel morale, and (f) finally about wages or benefits.

In time spent talking with colleague about the same topics (see Table 3) mean scores ranged from 2.4 to 4.2. Work was the

first topic of conversation followed by: (a) patient care, (b) happenings outside the organization, (c) wages, (d) supervision, (e) morale, and (f) relations between organizations.

From these data one would conclude that whether talking with co-workers or colleagues work is the prime topic of conversation. Not until the fourth item on the list does deviation occur.

The measures of adequacy and frequency of communication with colleagues was measured by questions 8 and 9. The kind of communication received from colleagues had a mean score of 2.2 or most respondents felt communication was very adequate. The amount of variation in length of time or frequency of communication with colleagues was a very small amount.

To measure the direction of communication, question 3 requested the position of the person talked with most frequently. This question is not scaled. Percentage is used to determine direction. In this study the immediate superior had the highest percentage -- 36%; followed by persons in a lower position. From these data one finds support in the establishment of a relationship which keeps communication channels open.

The qualitative aspect of communication was measured by scoring the responses to question 11. The mean scores ranged from 3.7 to 1.0, indicating that asking for information or clarification is the item with the highest rank; while criticism has the lowest.

To obtain data relative to informal communications with people in other organizations questions 12, 13, 14 and 15 parallel those

used for intraorganization data. The frequency of interorganizational communication ranged from 0.25 to 5. The direction was both up, directors, and down, case workers. This would support the establishment of a relationship for keeping communication channels open. The types of contacts involved range from arranging services to inservice and training.

The exchange information among organizations is a matter of communication. Communication may affect coordinaton indirectly, through problem solving; or directly, by linking together interdependent activities of the system. Adequate communication practices make for better coordination.

Interdependence and Independence

No organization can be considered truly independent. Every organization affects another. Interdependence suggests complementary functions. Interorganizational linkages are formed on the bases of states of interdependence.

Using a definition of joint programs to mean those programs involving commitment of resources by all participating organizations a list was compiled to determine which organizations actually had such commitments. The data revealed that such programs did exist, but that they were limited. The three agencies in the study were linked with each other. Two of the agencies were linked with agency NC. Two of the agencies were linked with agency Y. None of three agencies were all linked to any one agency.

Summary and Conclusions

Interorganizational relations have been long neglected. Most work has been done on single organizations. This researcher has attempted to look at coordination, communication, and interdependence and independence as they relate to organizations in relationship to each other.

The health service delivery system has failures and shortcomings. The present arrangement is fragmented and uncoordinated, and a form of comprehensive program is called for. The systems approach provides a framework for such a program; a network of community agencies linked to provide comprehensive community health care.

Interdependence is the condition which encourages formation of linkages. The fact that organizational activities are contingent on one another gives rise to the need for coordination. Adequate communication practices among provider organizations should facilitate coordination.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

About Communications

1. When people work together they talk about work, their personal interests, and other things which may or may not be related to the job. Think of that person in this organization with whom you usually talk the most. Then check the average amount of time per week you talk with this person while at the organization. (Check one.)

- ☐ 1. I usually talk with this person less than 1/2 hour per week.
- ☐ 2. Between 1/2 and 1 hour per week
- ☐ 3. Between 1 and 2 hours per week
- ☐ 4. Between 2 and 4 hours per week
- ☐ 5. Between 4 and 6 hours per week
- ☐ 6. I usually talk with this person more than 6 hours per week.

2. How often do you usually talk with this person about each of the following things? (Check one.)

Once A month or less often (1)	Two or three times a month (2)	About once a week (3)	Several times a week (4)	Once A day or more often (5)
---	--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

About ways in which
patient care could
be improved

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

About ways in which
supervision could be
improved

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

About work

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

About employee wages,
hours, or benefits

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

About ways in which
working relations
between organizations
could be improved

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

About ways in which
satisfaction or morale
among personnel could
be improved

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

About things, people
or happenings outside
the organization

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

3. What position in the organization does this person with whom you talk most frequently have? (Check one.)
- ☐ 1. This person has a position lower than mine
 - ☐ 2. This person has a position at the same level as mine
 - ☐ 3. This person is my immediate superior
 - ☐ 4. This person has a position higher than mine (but is not my immediate superior)
4. In every position it is sometimes necessary in fulfilling one's job to confer with other people. How many times in a typical week do you confer with people here in the organization other than at committee meetings?
5. What are the job titles of these people?
6. How many times in a typical week do you confer with each of these persons?
7. On the whole, what is the average amount of time per week you talk with your colleagues?
- ☐ 1. Less than 1/4 hour per week
 - ☐ 2. Between 1/4 and 1/2 hour per week
 - ☐ 3. Between 1/2 and 1 hour per week
 - ☐ 4. Between 1 and 2 hours per week
 - ☐ 5. Between 2 and 4 hours per week
 - ☐ 6. More than 4 hours per week
8. How much variation is there in the length of time or in how often you talk with your colleagues?

- ___ 1. There is an extremely large amount of variation
- ___ 2. A very large amount of variation
- ___ 3. A large amount of variation
- ___ 4. A moderate amount of variation
- ___ 5. A small amount of variation
- ___ 6. An extremely small amount of variation
9. In general how do you feel about the kind of communication which you receive from your colleagues.
- ___ 1. Completely adequate
- ___ 2. Very adequate
- ___ 3. Fairly adequate
- ___ 4. Rather inadequate
- ___ 5. Inadequate
10. How often do you usually talk with your colleague about each of the following things? (Check one for each item.)

	Two or			Once A
Once A	three	About	Several	day or
month or	times a	once a	times	more
less often	month	week	a week	often
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

About ways in which
patient care could
be improved

About ways in which
supervision could be

	Once A month or less often (1)	Two or three times a month (2)	About once a week (3)	Several times a week (4)	Once A day or more often (5)
improved	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
About work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
About employee wages, hours, or benefits	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
About ways in which working relations between organizations could be improved	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
About ways in which satisfaction or morale among personnel could be improved	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
About things, people or happenings outside the organization	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

11. Check in the appropriate column how often you and your colleagues confer in the following ways: (Check one for each item.)

	Two or			Once A
Once A	three	About	Several	day or
month or	times a	once a	times	more
less often	month	week	a week	often
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Give you directions

or orders

Explains things or

gives information

and suggestions

Asks for your

suggestions or

opinions

Asks you for infor-

mation, explanation,

or clarification

Criticize you, refuse

to help, or is un-

necessarily formal

Gives excess, un-

necessary information

or comments

12. How many times in a typical week do you confer with people
in other organizations?

13. What are the job titles of these people?
14. Over a period of one year what is the number of contacts you had with people in other organizations?
15. What types of contact were involved?
16. Now we would like to find out about the committees and staff meetings. Please list all staff committees or meetings of which you are a member.
17. How many times per month does the committee meet?
18. On the average how many hours per month do you spend in meetings of this committee?
19. How many times in a typical week do you confer with people in other organizations at meetings?

Appendix B

Joint Programs

Please list every joint program that your organization has or has had with other organizations over the past two years.

A joint program may be defined as those programs involving the commitment of resources--personnel, finances, space--by all participating organizations. A joint program may be viewed as a type of organizational exchange.

Appendix C
Working With Each Other

1. List the organizations with which you usually have the most contacts in connection with your work:
2. In your opinion, to what extent has this organization been able to achieve singleness of direction in the efforts of its many groups, departments, and individuals?
 - ___ 1. To a very great extent
 - ___ 2. To a considerable extent
 - ___ 3. To a fair extent
 - ___ 4. To a small extent
 - ___ 5. To a very small extent
3. Do people from different organizations who have to work together do their full share so that each contributes to making the other person's work a little easier?
 - ___ 1. They all do their full share
 - ___ 2. Nearly all of them do their full share
 - ___ 3. The majority do their full share
 - ___ 4. About half do their full share
 - ___ 5. Less than half do their share

4. To what extent do the people from interrelated organizations make an effort to avoid creating problems or interference with each other's duties and responsibilities?

☐ 1. To a very great extent
☐ 2. To a great extent
☐ 3. To a fair extent
☐ 4. To a small extent
☐ 5. To a very little extent

5. In general, how well established are the routines of the different organizations that have to work with one another?
(Check one.)

☐ 1. Their routines are extremely well established
☐ 2. Very well established
☐ 3. Fairly well established
☐ 4. Not too well established
☐ 5. Their routines are not well established

6. To what extent do people from different organizations who have to work together do their job properly and efficiently without getting in each other's way? (Check one.)

☐ 1. To a very a great extent
☐ 2. To a great extent
☐ 3. To a fair extent
☐ 4. To a small extent
☐ 5. To a very small extent

7. How often do people from different jobs and organizations get together when needed to discuss and try to do something about problems and differences arising in their working relationships with one another? (Check one.)

- ☐ 1. Always they get together for this purpose when needed
- ☐ 2. Nearly always
- ☐ 3. Most of the time
- ☐ 4. About half of the time
- ☐ 5. Less than half of the time they get together when needed

8. To what extent are all related things and activities well timed in the everyday routine of the organization? (Check one.)

- ☐ 1. All related things and activities in the everyday routine are perfectly timed
- ☐ 2. They are very well timed
- ☐ 3. They are fairly well timed
- ☐ 4. They are not so well timed
- ☐ 5. They are rather poorly timed

9. How well planned are the work assignments of the people from the different organizations who work together? (Check one.)

- ☐ 1. Extremely well planned
- ☐ 2. Very well planned
- ☐ 3. Fairly well planned

- ___ 4. Not so well planned
- ___ 5. Not well planned at all
10. How well do the different jobs and work activities around the client fit together, or how well are all things geared in the direction of giving good client care? (Check one.)
- ___ 1. Perfectly
- ___ 2. Very well
- ___ 3. Fairly well
- ___ 4. Not so well
- ___ 5. Not at all well
11. In general, how do the clients feel about how smoothly the various personnel around them work together? (Check one.)
- ___ 1. The clients feel that the personnel work together completely smoothly
- ___ 2. The clients feel that the personnel work together very smoothly
- ___ 3. The clients feel that the personnel work together fairly smoothly
- ___ 4. The clients feel that the personnel do not work together smoothly
- ___ 5. The clients feel that the personnel do not work together smoothly at all

12. On the whole, how good, would you say, are your various dealings with people from other organizations in connection with your working relationships with these people? (Check one.)

___ 1. Excellent

___ 2. Very good

___ 3. Good

___ 4. Fair

___ 5. Rather poor

13. What is it that you do in this organization?

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The thesis entitled "THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATION IN INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL COORDINATION OF HEALTH SERVICES DELIVERY" by Elizabeth Marbach-Hopkins was judged to be exempt from Human Subjects Review because it involves the use of data acquired through a questionnaire returned anonymously.

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.

Home Health-Home Care, Inc.

3009 Strawberry
PASADENA, TEXAS 77502
Phone...946-5251

Elizabeth Hopkins
5014 Waycross
Houston, Texas 77035

Dear Ms. Hopkins:

Home Health-Home Care, Inc. will be pleased
to take part in your study of the role of
Communication and Interorganizational
Coordination.

Sincerely,

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.



TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION

TEXAS RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF MENTAL SCIENCES
1300 Moursund, Texas Medical Center, Houston, Texas 77030 713 797-1976

JOSEPH C. SCHOOLAR, Ph.D., M.D.
DIRECTOR

Gay E. Miller M.D.
Commissioner

November 3, 1982

Ms. Elizabeth Hopkins
Texas Womans University
1100 M.D. Anderson Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77030

Dear Ms. Hopkins

The staff of Texas Project for Elders would be delighted to participate in your study on the role of communications in interorganizational coordination.

We thank you for wanting to include us and look forward to learning about your results.

Sincerely,

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.



Serving The Aging Since 1893

Sheltering Arms

a united way agency

November 9, 1982

Ms. Elizabeth M. Hopkins
5014 Waycross Drive
Houston, Texas 77035

Dear Ms. Hopkins:

This letter is to express the willingness of Sheltering Arms to participate in your study of the Role of Communication in Interorganizational Coordination. I am looking forward to receiving the results. We appreciate the opportunity to assist you in this project.

Sincerely,

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.

References

- Aiken, M., & Hage, J. Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structure. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33, 912-929.
- Baker, F., & Schulberg, H.C. Community health care-giving systems. In A. Sheldon, F. Baker & C. P. McLaughlin (Eds.), Systems and medical care. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1970.
- Brinkerhoff, M. B., & Kung, P. R. (Eds.). Complex organizations and their environments. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1972.
- Dechert, C. R. The development of cybernetics. The American Behavioral Scientist, 1965, 8, (10), 15-20.
- Etzioni, A. A sociological reader on complex organizations (2nd. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Evans, W. M. Organization theory structures, systems, and environments. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.
- Georgopoulos, B. S., & Mann, F. C. The community general hospital. New York: Mac Millan, 1962.
- Gioiella, E. C. Aging: A reappraisal. Nursing Forum 1978, 18, (4), 395-404.
- Hall, R. H. Organizations: Structure and process. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Hage, J. Communications and organizational control cybernetics in health and welfare settings. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.
- Hage, J., Aiken, M., & Marrett, C. B. Organizational structure and communications. American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, 860-871.
- Hedinger, F. R. The systems approach to health services: A framework. The University of Iowa, 1969.
- Howland, D. Toward a community health system model. In A. Sheldon, F., Baker & C. P. McLaughlin (Eds.), Systems and medical care. Cambridge, Mass. The MIT Press, 1970.

- Huse, E. F., & Bosditch, J. L. Behavior in organizations: A systems approach to managing (2nd ed.). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.
- Jacks, M. H. The history and organization of community support systems. In W. C. Martin & A. J. Wilson (Eds.) Aging and total health. St. Petersburg: Eckerd College, 1975.
- Levine, S., & White, P. E. Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1961, 5 (4), 583-601.
- Litwak, E. & Hylton, L. R. Interorganizational analysis: A hypothesis on coordinating agencies. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962, 6 (4), 395-420.
- Litwak, E. & Rothman, J. Towards the theory and practice of coordination between formal organizations. In W. R. Rosengren & M. Lefton (Eds.), Organizations and clients. Columbus, Ohio: Charles G. Merrill, 1970.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Mott, B. J. Anatomy of a coordinating council. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963.
- Parkman, R. The cybernetic society. New York: Pergamon Press Inc., 1972.
- Portnoi, V. A. A health-care system for the elderly. The New England Journal of Medicine, June 1979, 300, 1381.
- Price, J. L. Handbook of organizational measurement. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1972.
- Raeburn, J. M., & Seymour, F. W. A simple system model for community programs. Journal of Community Psychology, 1972, 7, 290-297.
- Scott, W. G. Organization theory: An overview and an appraisal. Journal of Academy of Management, 1961, 4 (1), 40-54.
- von Bertalanffy, L. General system theory foundations, development, applications. New York: George Bratiller, 1968.