DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 270 CE 035 296

AUTHOR Cummens, John A.
TITLE Vocational Education and Manpower Policy Harmonization.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 233p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Policy; Federal Government; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Job Training; Labor Force; *Labor Force Development; Policy; *Policy Formation; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Manpower Policy

ABSTRACT

The issues of harmonization and autonomy as they affect vocational education and manpower policy development and the implementation of program service delivery are analyzed. Some of the background issues that have affected the relationship of vocational education and manpower, in particular the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), are examined as well as the economic and labor market considerations and demographic and technological considerations that form the context in which these two areas function. Next, the context in which these two policy areas function as institutions is examined. (This context relates to their characteristics as institutions and as governmental organizations.) Interorganizational collaboration and coordination of vocational education and CETA are also addressed. Finally, the discussion focuses on formation of a vocational education policy. Considerations include a national versus nationwide policy, issues of policy harmonization for vocational education, and issues of policy analysis research and data needs. Six policy issues are then examined. (YLB)

Vocational Education and Manpower Policy Harmonization

by

John A. Cummens, Ph. D.

The Advanced Study Center

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education

The Ohio State University

Columbus, Ohio

1981

DEDICATION

In Memory of

Grant Venn

and

William Nagel

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

From 1974 to 1978 Dr. Cummens worked for the State of Illinois Manpower Agency, having served as both Assistant Director of Balance of State and Assistant Director for Interagency Coordination. On a year leave of absence (1975-1976), he served as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for public affairs. The preparation of this work took place during the year (1978-1979) that he was appointed Advanced Study Center Fellow of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

Dr. Cummens has published articles and presented papers on manpower, interagency coordination and human resource development. He holds a Ph. D. in Philosophy from Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, and a B.A. from Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois. He is listed in several national and international biographies, and he was an Education Policy Fellow of the Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Many of the ideas expressed in this work were first formulated during several years in manpower program administration. A formative influence during this time was Joan Wills. She has continued to offer clear and keen insights and valuable criticism, for which I am appreciative.

Without the foresight and intelligent support of Robert Taylor for the Advanced Study Center the present work would have been impossible. I am indebted to him for providing the stimulus for several of the central ideas, which he often expressed with characteristic accuracy. Sar Levitan's guidance is greatfully acknowledged. While this final product may have overrun the banks of the flow of our conversations, his suggestions have had a beneficial effect on the outcome.

Each of the fellows of the Advanced Study Center contributed a great deal by listening and critiquing the various stages of development. One regret is that my time with Grant Venn and Bill Nagel was too limited. They each have left an imprint on my life that I always will carry with me.

Special appreciation goes to my wife Linda. As editor, gad-fly and cheering section, she continues to provide me with the energy to perservere.

The demand that government be a "government of laws and not of men" is legalistic nonsense if taken literally. Government is necessarily in the hands of men. It is necessarily concerned with decisions. It is necessarily "political." It deals with matters in which assertion stands against assertion, interest against interest, creed against creed--with no infallible or automatic criterion which is best. There is no greater mistake than the attempt to take the politics out of government. If it is done by making a civil service bureaucracy omnipotent and by entrusting political decisions to the expert selected by the merit system of competitive examinations, it leads not only to the government of the least fit but straight to the tyranny of the printed form. And there is nothing more despotic than bureaucratic rules made absolute.

Peter F. Drucker

The Future of Industrial Man

(1942)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The outgrowth of this work comes from several years experience in the administration of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) from 1974 until 1978. The experiences of administering the state agency programs under CETA indicated a great divergence between the ideal and the real. While this federal manpower program was presented as a comprehensive approach to the manpower, education and training needs of the nation through a decentralized system of state and local program administration, the reality was that much of the division, overlap and duplication experienced in earlier manpower programs continued under CETA. These experiences were the lack of significant transactions between the employment service and local training agencies, the circuitous route that decision making at the local level had to travel through hierarchies of differing state levels and federal level agencies, and the split responsibilities between levels (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 128). In many respects the CETA program itself became an extension of local misunderstandings or lack of understanding, altered only in the extent to which the federal mandate and the legislation identified as an objective the comprehensiveness of a nation-wide manpower system.

A 1976 report from the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors found that the relationships between CETA prime sponsors and vocational education had improved, but that differences in philosophy, matters of turf protection, and controversies over the use of funds remained significant problems (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 81). This experience indicates that after peneral years under CETA, most of the fundamental problems of relating

program objectives and administrative structures continue. The problems which I faced in trying to relate state agency functions with local government responsibility and authority, and the diversity of state agency responsibilities spread among many state agencies, led me to question the federal mandate as an ideal and the implementation of manpower programs since the early '60s as a reality.

In addition, a year in Washington D.C., working in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, afforded me the opportunity of viewing the national policy-making context at close range. The experiences there indicated to me the extreme difficulty of grasping local concerns and local needs through national program implementation. The diversity of HEW's 130 agencies, as one federal department alone, and the difficulty of communicating between agencies or of coordinating the activities and objectives of the various agencies, highlighted the problems of a federal government approach as the main or sole approach to coordination of nation-wide program efforts. It still was evident that to achieve a certain degree of wholeness or integration, a national perspective was necessary. However, after my year in Washington it became even more evident that the strength of local government support and authority for running employment and training programs was a necessary element in achieving a nation-wide employment and training effort.

In facing these realities, and in trying to make some sense out of the confusion, overlap and lack of a coordinated perspective between state, local and national levels of government and between

agencies involved at each of those levels, I turned to various analysts and studies in an attempt to illuminate an approach to more efficient and effective program delivery and utilization of funds. The opportunity to step back from the context and to rely upon those analysts who have looked at various aspects of the problem, both from the manpower perspective and from education's perspective, and additionally from the perspective of governmental relations, provided a resource document in the form of the following work. While it does not stand among the works of policy analysis as an attempt to propose policy options, it nonetheless provides a general mapping of the terrain that I believe is important in understanding the institutional dynamics faced both by vocational education and manpower policy analysts in their attempt to relate their own policy area to other policy areas and the determinants of coordination at the policy level. In this respect, I raise questions and issues found in the literature as they relate to the issues which appear important and are oftentimes overlooked in much of the literature, specifically dealing with vocational education and manpower collaboration. It is for this reason that I have brought organizational analyses and interorganizational theory to bear on the manpower and vocational education context. The fact that this work is a prelude to a more systematic policy analysis, may be reflected in the definition of policy analysis which explains it.

> Policy analysis can be defined as the systematic investigation of alternative policy options and the assembly and integration of the evidence for and against each option. It involves a problem-solving approach, the collection and interpretation of information, and some attempt to predict the consequences of alternative courses of action (Ukeles, 1977, p. 223).

In this respect, I do not raise alternative policy options and assemble and integrate evidence for and against each option. The aim is to provide a focus on a direction that policy analysis should be taking and various elements that should be considered. The use of existing policy analyses, studies and research findings provides what I believe is evidence for my position. In an attempt to provide direction for those who would do further study, using the value of this approach, I have provided numerous citations to the sources of the ideas woven throughout the work. An extensive use of references has been provided to assist further analysis of specific areas. Quotation sources provided after direct quotations may be followed by other citations. The first citation is the original source; following citations refer to collaborative or additional sources. Throughout the work, various ideas are also identified by sources, either as the original source or as a collaborative or corollative source. This format followed is to provide the reader with an opportunity to go to the original source or to a source which would provide additional insight into the point being made.

In my experience at the state level, in the administration of manpower programs, one of my major responsibilities and interests was the coordination of various agencies and personnel involved in delivery of manpower services. As indicated earlier, oftentimes such agencies were either totally unaware of the existence and activities of agencies having similar objectives or addressed themselves to the same target population. In this respect, one of the necessary objectives, as I perceived it, was to bring

together the various actors and agencies in order to understand their functions and roles in coordinating services to clients. This involved many agencies at both the state and local levels. In this capacity, the state manpower agency worked with labor unions, the employment service, welfare agencies and many others. One of the most important relationships, and one of the most critical agencies requiring attention from the manpower agency, was vocational education. Perhaps more than any of the other agencies, the relationship between vocational education and manpower is the closest and at the same time has been the most neglected. Though rivalries have existed between the emerging or newly created manpower agency and other state and local agencies, the vocational education and manpower agencies oftentimes have had little to do with each other.

I might indicate that in my use of manpower throughout this work I am in agreement with Professor Carolyn S. Bell (Bell, 1976, p.11): "I find it difficult to use employment and training or another term to adequately express the concept of this policy area. Manpower, where it might be somewhat limiting, is the older term and has some facility. Given this viewpoint, we should be talking about human resources and realizing that our greatest and most valuable economic resource in this country consists of our citizens, particularly well-trained, intelligent humans who are able and willing to work. We need to think, as Professor Bell points out, of employment and training as an investment in human capital and as a way of developing potential talent so that manpower can be a word which encompasses this factor, but which may not in most instances convey this meaning.

In analyzing the relationship of manpower programs to vocational education programs, it is possible to look at the situation from a variety of perspectives.

> Any review of the present manpower organization must be concerned with four distinct areas: (1) the laws which set the stage for all manpower policy programs; (2) the systems for planning and resource allocation; (3) the operational machinery or delivery systems; and (4) the federal administrative structure through which the public responsibility must be effectively and efficiently discharged (Ruttenberg, 1970, p. 9).

My interest in the relationship between vocational education and manpower policy has focused primarily on the last two items, the interest in the operational machinery of each system and the federal administrative structure through which public policy is discharged as it effects program implementation.

In this regard, the identification of problems which I found to be most important to policy harmonization efforts centered on a few issues. First, it was obvious the mandates, missions and objectives, both within and between manpower and vocational education legislation have been confused and inadequately understood. The funding to local governments and to disadvantaged groups has focused on different areas and different objectives. These have not always been clearly identified nor have the means to achieve them been well-specified. The relationships between them have not always been clearly understood or adequately discussed. It has been, as George Brandon has pointed out, the proliferation of pieces of legislation to solve individually identified problems, with little or no thought to interaction or coordination of all the programs, which has characterized the development of manpower

legislation and delivery systems (Brandon, 1979, p.8). This is also true in terms of the relationship between manpower and other policy and program delivery areas.

A second problem was the resulting overlap and duplication from such confusion and ambiguity. The lack of coordination of policies, programs, objectives, mandates, legislations, institutions and organizations proliferated with the multiplicity of types of programs, authorizations and funding structures. This situation, of course, is not new. It has been characteristic of vocational education and most recently of manpower programs, although vocational education, having a much longer legislative history from the federal level, has spent considerably more time analyzing the problem. A Project Baseline assessment of the MDTA program, the predecessor of CETA, highlighted the high priority areas where improvement was necessary (Lee and Sarton, 1972, pp. 910-913). These areas included the costly duplication of effort, the fact that coordination and cooperation did exist and were working well in some states but needed to be expanded, duplication of resources which occurs as a major problem, the noticeable lack of coordination in welfare provisions, the problems of trainees drifting from one training program to another and becoming entrapped in recidivism, and finally, the fact that oftentimes federal funds were misdirected to clients or geographic areas. This assessment of MDTA has been echoed in assessments of the recent manpower programs under CETA. There have been some successes; there have been some noticeable attempts at coordination; there have been meaningful experiences provided to trainees who go on to successful job and professional enrichment opportunities.

But the overwhelming evidence, both statistical and anecdotal, has been that the lack of coordination of program planning, of policy development of legislation and of implementation has led to confusion and ambiguity on the part of participants, program administrators and policy analysts.

The third issue, which is only briefly addressed in the following work, but which has added to the confusions and ambiguity, is the fact that technological, demographic and policy harmonization issues also impinge upon manpower and vocational education seperately and in their attempts to collaborate. The changing work force, in its character and dynamics, and the changing technological impacts upon the work force and the world of work, also provide a context in which updating and changing the approaches to vocational education and manpower becomes important. While these might be secondary issues for some analysts or primary for others, my concern, however is to indicate a perspective for the consideration of the organizational and institutional issues related to harmonizing both vocational education, including their political character, in developing a nation-wide policy that includes the objectives and the mandates of each and harmonizes them effectively.

Recognizing that vocational education and manpower should collaborate more effectively requires attention to several factors affecting their individual perspectives and the means by which collaboration can be achieved. The first factor is the historical, political and institutional differences that have existed and continue to exist between manpower and vocational education policies and programs. For example, the creation of

the CETA program is basically a response to a national perception that existing policies and institutional structures had failed to achieve specific objectives. This was seen in the presidential message to Congress in 1972, which justified manpower reform.

1. The present categorial grants-in-aid system was not working and the nation needed a new manpower delivery system.

2. The optimum solution to the manpower problem was the transfer of basic authority and responsibility for program planning and delivery to state and local governments.

3. Decentralization of manpower program decision-making to state and local elected officials would provide increased opportunities for citizens to participate in their government.

4. State and local governments were closer to the manpower problem; sensitive to the individual needs of their constituents; and in the best position to design the most efficient and appropriate program responses (McPherson, 1976, p. 206).

These justifications are based on assumption as to the historical outcomes of manpower programs. They also assume based on assumptions of the outcomes of vocational education programs going back to 1917 and prior. Whether these assumptions are correct or incorrect, they have influenced the development of the existing relationship between vocational education and manpower and affect the possibility for policy interrelationships and harmonization.

A second factor is the need for an understanding of the institutional dynamics of interorganizational cooperation. On the more general level, to understand vocational education and manpower programs' historical past of interrelationship and the present situation, we must consider organizational factors and

look at them in terms of their internal dynamics and the context in which they relate or fail to relate. As the National Commission for Manpower Policy has stated,

> This interdependence of governmental policies and the effects on employment and manpower is not fully appreciated, and inadequate methodology and machinery exists for the assessment of the manpower impact of governmental policies in general and the consideration of mutually supportive options (NCMP, 1976, p.18).

The Commission raises the issue of determining the appropriate reach of manpower policy, a question that involves answering the issue of values. It also involves vocational education occupational preparation and its relationship not only to manpower programs but to the general policy area of education itself. It is a matter of emphasis, both in establishing objectives and means and is a matter of determining the best or most optimum modes for coordinating the activities of sometimes disparate and oftentimes conflicting institutional domains.

A third factor is the application of research to those factors as they affect various governmental levels and the plurality of actors involved in determining policy and in devising programmatic mechanisms for implementation. This is an important feature in determining collaboration because research has not been directed to the area of the functional dynamics of vocational education and manpower programs as they exist in the governmental context. The present federal system is such that the various levels of government often remain rivals and to a great extent independent centers of problem identification and policy making.

> This is not to say, necessarily, that the federal system is obsolete, Many of the geographic, economic, political, and

> ideological reasons that made it seem a valid scheme in an earlier age still pertain. But the point is that the barriers remain to impede accommodation. We do not get the kinds of action we come to want: integrated, unified, coordinated, innovative, these are the symbols of desire. They elude us because our problems are generated by relatively autonomous social forces and because our therapeutic techniques labor under the heavy hand of political tradition. And both techniques and problems search vainly for well-defined arenas of responsibility (Greer and Minar, 1967, p. 158).

It is just this level of dynamics that is required to understand more completely the reasons for the present relationships between vocational education and manpower programs at both the national and local levels.

A fourth area of concern is the determination of the extent to which a nation-wide policy can be developed to define realistically and meaningfully collaborative areas, goals and strategies with respect to education and manpower policies and programs. The extent to which each has its own mandates and the extent to which each has developed its own mechanisms limits and enhances possibilities of collaboration. But until these are understood more fully, grasping the extent to which a nation-wide or a national policy can achieve the goals established for it remains elusive. Each policy area faces issues of harmonization and autonomy with respect to all other areas.

I have chosen to deal with vocational education and manpower, using CETA as the current approach to manpower programs, and thus, using the federal government program initiatives as a touch point. And it is the aim of harmonizing these policy areas, and determining the degree to which their autonomy inhibits or contributes to the possibility of harmonization, that has

prompted this analysis. In using the term harmonization of policy, I refer to Hugh Eclo's characterization.

> Harmonization refers to the fact that policy development is having to become ever more attentive to issues of interdependence and reconciliation, both among public programs and between public and private sectors. To put it another way, partitions which were previously assumed to seperate policy areas are more often being called into question. Hard experience, not abstract analysis is generating this new awareness. The interplay of what were once thought to be erogenous factors for a given program is increasingly seen as integral to its very substance. This gradual disintegration of social policy boundaries is another instance of the familiar tendency for elements of complex systems to become both more specialized and more interdependent (Eclo, 1975, p. 404).

It is just this reference to hard experience which led me to consider the issues of harmonization and autonomy as they affect vocational education and manpower policy development and the implementation of program service delivery. What I have sought to indicate for vocational education and its relationship to manpower as another policy area, each must do, from its perspective, with respect to other policy areas.

I have also tried to consider the present manpower context in which collaboration with vocational education may take place. The context includes the aspects of the changing work place and the work force. As mentioned earlier, the technological and demographic factors that change the world in which vocational education and manpower operates, also changes the means by which they can relate to each other and those issues over which they may find commonality and disagreement. A central factor in this regard is the character of the American political and social system as it shapes public policy. In a pluralistic society, there is no unitary definition

of the public interest (Ukeles, 1977, p. 227). In such a situation, vying voices for the definition of public policy have established a variety of patterns of interaction, but nonetheless face the prospect of changing relationships. An example of this is that the federal government itself has been a source for fragmentation in policy (Schneider and Swinton, 1979, p. 15). In attempting to develop programs to meet social needs, the Congress and the administration of the federal government, have proliferated a variety of programs seeking to achieve individual and oftentimes collective aims and objectives.

> The contemporary intergovernmental problem dates to the mid-1960s when the Great Society spawned hundreds of new assistance programs, each earmarked to a particular social problem and each weaving its special relationship among functional cohorts at federal, state, and local levels. Much of the intergovernmental fragmentation was unplanned, more a product of the fabrication of hundreds of new assistance programs than of any special effort to tear apart state and local governments. So many new programs were established in so short a period of time and so little attention was given to the processes of administrative management that proliferation begot fragmentation.
>
> But some of it was intended, for the architects of the Great Society were in the business of redistributing governmental power. There were functional, political, and geographic pressures for fragmentation, and each took its toll on the hapless beneficiaries of federal largess. The functional motives were the most pervasive and powerful (Schick, 1975, p. 717).

In addition to the planned redistribution of political and governmental power, another motive of the programs of the 1960's was to take power from city halls and state houses and distribute it to those groups who had been previously disadvantaged by government programs. These attempts to achieve some very

fundamental changes within the political and social structure of the country have impinged upon the ability of these programs used to manage such changes to achieve other objectives, some more explicit and more highly defined than the two just mentioned.

It is often in the drive for quick and easy answers, which pushes us to the "comprehensive" solutions, that we find the limitations of such comprehensiveness. The attempt to achieve comprehensive solution proposes a definitive intervention into social and political processes in order to achieve change. But the whole fabric of the American social and political structure has exhibited that a certain caution exists which mitigates against such comprehensiveness and definitiveness in favor of pluralism and a dispersion of power. It was perhaps these factors which encouraged the emphasis upon decentralization and decategorization, may have achieved a certain degree of popular support. The reality has been that the enactment of CETA, and the extent to which the programs have been decategorized and decentralized, has not occurred without a great deal of struggle.

Only the original Title I programs were both decentralized and decategorized. This offered local officials the greatest amount of authority and flexibility under the federal manpower programs. However, there has been a gradual erosion of this freedom and flexibility for the local authorities since Congress has acted to control more of the CETA program by enactment of categorical sections added to the legislation and by insisting upon greater centralized administrative control through the U.S. Department of Labor (Mirengoff, 1978, p.86). This limits the local government options in using manpower resources. The limitation

of options through the limitation of resources affects the ability of local officials to achieve solutions that are relevant at their level. This also affects the ability of local decision makers to use effective means for collaboration that are relevant at their level. Furthermore federal administrative control involves them in situations of having to adopt national mechanisms, whether or not they have relevance for the local level objectives.

It must also be realized that the CETA program is not truly a comprehensive program (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 15). In this fact may lie both the strength and the weakness of achieving collaboration between manpower and vocational education programs. A truly comprehensive CETA program might make more difficult the possibility of achieving a meaningful collaboration with the existing vocational education structure. In addition, the CETA manpower program cannot be considered truly comprehensive since there are many other programs of the U.S. Department of Labor which account for more than half of the federal outlays for manpower programs. With funding distributed to other programs operating independently of the CETA program, the need for comprehensiveness raises the issue of harmonization between other semi-autonomous or autonomous programmatic entities at the federal level.

In addition, CETA, as with the general revenue-sharing experience, (Murphy, 1975, pp. 131-152) found that the program implementation became a cover for reducing funding in manpower programs, thus camouflaging a broad range of cutbacks in many areas (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 45) (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 37). This made it more difficult for state and local officials to achieve the

objectives established by the legislation, including the objective of comprehensiveness and programmatic interrelatedness. It may be observed, however, that of decategorization and decentralization it may be that decentralization has been more successful. This is not, however, due to a great deal of effort on the part of the federal government, but due more because of the efforts of state and local officials to secure for themselves greater control over the effects of resource distribution in their areas.

In terms of the issue of comprehensiveness, which is not synonomous with harmonization, it is not enough to say that bits and pieces of programs should be parts of a functioning whole. There are questions as to where the parts originate, their legislative and other historical precedents and mandates, and why they are separate from each other, and what is the commonality of objectives and operations. Until such areas have been examined, it is not possible to say in what form the various pieces, be they vocational education or manpower, can be fitted into a functioning whole. It is just such issues which I have tried to raise in the work that follows, in order that additional analyses and research may be conducted and so that more probing questions can be raised to assess the extent to which collaboration between vocational education and manpower is not only feasible but is desirable. Attention should be focused on the issue of the relative responsibilities that each area should have and the extent to which, given their present structural and institutional capabilities, they are able to achieve various objectives. As it has been observed that predicting the future of higher education is extremely difficult (Hartle, 1977, p. 199), the prediction of the

future of vocational education and manpower is also difficult. We will achieve more if we consider the task that of creation rather than that of prediction. But creation begins with things as they exist. Unless we come to the point of understanding the basic institutional dynamics and the extent to which the characteristics built into the systems through legislative initiatives and administrative decisions affect the character of these areas, we will not be able to understand the extent to which they are capable of interacting and the extent to which it is feasible for them to interact and the extent to which their independence should be sought.

Thayne Robson has indicated that in administering federal manpower programs specific problems arise which make program administration difficult (Robson, 1967). He lists these problems which provide an insight into the substantive issues that are raised in dealing with the broader issue policy harmonization. First of all, we are dealing with a limited amount of knowledge and the amount and kinds of manpower services needed by persons with given handicaps, educational, economic or other, to achieve success in the labor market. Also we have no standards against which selected services can be judged. Third, there is a lack of agreement on how best to deliver services to those who need them. Fourth, we are generally uncertain as to the realistic costs from serving identified needs of identified target groups. Fifth, programs are currently spread among a number of federal agencies, each operating with a great deal of autonomy and lack of

harmonization as well as spread between governmental and non-governmental agencies. Sixth, the multiplicity of manpower agencies at the state and local levels, both government and private, adds to the issues of duplication, overlap and lack of coordination. Seventh, there has been a failure to define clear administrative responsibility for developing fully legislated programs through the development of adequate policies and procedures. Eighth, there is a lack of adequately trained and an adequate number of staff at all levels. Ninth, technical assistance to state and local agencies from the federal government, and data for the administrators to manage the programs has been inadequate. Finally, a certain degree of parochialism inhibits local officials with respect to new or innovative methods and approaches generated by the federal government. It might be added, a better understanding at the national level could be developed toward the needs of the local level as to the realities with which the local elected officials must deal in implementing programs. With respect to these problems, I have indicated various areas of emphasis which should take a more central place in the discussion of coordination of vocational education and manpower programs. This assumes that vocational education and manpower will not be subsumed one under the other as a means of achieving collaboration. The assumption is that the continued dispersion and diversity of power and control of resources will continue to operate in such a fashion that collaboration between autonomous or semiautonomous institutional entities and mechanisms must be the means by which program harmonization and comprehensiveness can be achieved.

CHAPTER I.

THE BACKGROUND FOR A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION/CETA RELATIONSHIP

A. Mandates and Issues.

In order to project a relationship that could exist between vocational education and manpower programs it is helpful to review some of the relationships that have existed with respect to these two policy areas and also to look at some factors such as economic, labor market, demographic, and technological conditions which affect both areas. One of the most prominent features of the present relationship is that it has gradually emerged in a context of legislative activity. program development implementation and policy analysis which rather than having a comprehensive or overall planned character has the character of emergence. It is as though the two areas, vocational education and manpower, have responded sporadically to a variety of emphases and trends arising from economic, social welfare. law enforcement, educational and other forces which may lie primarily outside of the areas of responsibility for these two policy areas. A critical point for analysis and evaluation of the developing relationship between vocational education and manpower, most specifically the CETA program, is whether or not in the challenge faced by vocational education with the development in the early '60s of the manpower programs there has been significant redefinition of vocational education's mission or whether there has been primarily a repetition of previous approaches and, given either possible

response, the response has been one of successfully defining vocational education's role. One commentator, Norton Grubb, indicates that there has been largely a repetition of previously known approaches by vocational education.

> By now it should be clear that the claims made on behalf of vocational education, the arguments that prove politically persuasive, have displayed a remarkable similarity over the past hundred years. While some commentators have stressed the special role of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 in reorienting vocational education from narrowly defined skill training to more general training and to a concern with minorities and others who are "educationally disadvantaged," in fact neither of these ideas were new. A concern that vocational programs not give excessive attention to specific skills existed in the Progressive Era, as did a desire to have such programs serve to integrate immigrants and black migrants into the existing school systems and then into the system of industrial production unfamiliar to them. And conversely, specific-skill training has been diminished more in rhetoric than in practice, as the continuing efforts to broaden the scope of vocational education attest. (Grubb, 1979, p. 200).

One of the factors that has contributed to the apparent lack of focus or coherence in defining a mission for vocational education may be attributed to the related confusion of mandates for vocational education and manpower. In both instances critics have indicated that the legislative and administrative mandates for vocational education and manpower have been overlapping and confused. This confusion produces a confusion in mission and a confusion in evaluation of both areas. (NCMP, 1976, p. 10). (Ruttenberg, 1970, p. 98). (Mangum, 1969, p. 80). (U.S. HEW, Plan for Study of Voc. Ed., 1977, pp. 23-24). (Cameron, 1979, pp. 114-116). It has been observed that even as recently as the 1976 vocational education amendments there are a mix of constraints built upon contradictory theories. (Anton, 1979,

pp. 11-12). There has been not only a confusion of congressional mandates but there has been a confusion among the ranks of vocational education, also, for example, concerning mission.

> The result was confusion as to what the goals of vocational education should be: the reformers saw vocational education as a solution to short-run problems, or the training of unemployed workers for jobs in "demand" occupations in a relatively short period of time, whereas traditional vocational educators viewed the mission of vocational education as the preparation of students for a lifetime of work in a dynamic economy. Congressional mandates to set aside vocational education funds for special groups (the handicapped, disadvantaged, and, more recently, women) added to the confusion as did Congressional set-asides for types of vocational education (cooperative education, work study, and home economics). (Walsh, 1979. p. 236).

It has been observed that there were differences also in the interpretation in enacting the CETA legislation between (a) the House Committee Report which implies proportional treatment of disadvantaged groups and (b) the United States Department of Labor regulations implying preferential treatment. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 197). The examples of such confusion and such conflicting mandates are numerous, and throughout the rest of this work they will be referred to with respect to the various topics under discussion. What is important though is that there have been calls for, and continue to be calls for, clear and uniform regulations, clear and uniform legislation, and especially clear and uniform mandates not only for vocational education, but for related policy areas such as manpower. (U.S., HEW, Plan for Study of Voc. Ed., 1977, pp. 15-16).

In addition to the history of confusing mandates there

have also been a number of features in the actual operation of vocational education which have had an effect in limiting the relevancy of vocational education with respect to other programs and other policy areas, including manpower. The Comptroller General's report found that a number of factors limited relevancy of vocational education programs. Vocational education has not realistically or fully assessed labor market needs with respect to programs. The work experience activity has not been often an integral component to the vocational education curriculum. There has been a lack of attention to occupational guidance. The schools have not routinely and completely assumed responsibility for job placement assistance. There has been little or marginal follow-up of graduates and employers and there have been institutional barriers which have restricted access to training employment. (Comptroller General, 1974, p. 68).

On the manpower side three important deficiencies have been identified, which remain to be overcome if the objectives of a manpower policy are to be achieved. The first of these elements is the need for the coordination of institutions for implementation of programs and thereby the carrying out of policy. This coordination should include coordinating with other areas such as economic policy and social policy where there are manpower consequences. A second element is the need for substantial improvement in the techniques that are used to assess manpower consequences of decisions in related policy areas. And the third element is the need to increase significantly the base of information, data, and analyses that are available in terms of identifying

how the labor market operates and the type of data that are needed to make adequate policy analyses. (NCMP, 1976 b, pp. 26-27). These features which must be considered for the enhancement of coordination between manpower programs and other programs, especially vocational education; and they indicate that there are serious, deep problems in the current conceptualization of manpower and manpower policy and in the carrying out of programs. The interrelatedness and coordination of programs looms as an unresolved issue, often defeated by the very steps initiated to overcome the difficulties. One of the features that has been identified as having had over the years an increasing emphasis and effect in the coordination of programs, for example, has been that of excessive regulation by the federal government (Evans et al., 1969, p. 85).

There still remain, also, for manpower programs several issues related to distribution among program approaches, which have not been resolved and for which considered and continuing analysis is necessary. The issues have been raised most recently with respect to CETA.

> There are four principle issues associated with funding: the level of appropriations necessary to deal with manpower problems; the appropriate balance between subsidized public employment and other measures, particularly unemployment insurance, to alleviate countercyclical joblessness; the proportion of CETA funds that should be devoted to structural objectives vis a vis the proportion for counter-cyclical job creation; and the suitability of the allocation formulas for specific objectives of each title. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 242).

These four principle issues, as identified by Mirengoff, do not include another issue which has received, unfortunately,

little attention in most of the literature, from the point of view of manpower programs. This feature is the relationship of overlap and duplication between vocational education programs and manpower programs. There has been concern for excessive duplication and overlap (US Congress, Senate, 1968, p. 345). But this concern has not taken the form of analyzing the various aspects that have either contributed to or have formed obstacles to coordination. There has also been very little discussion of the extent to which coordination is desirable and the extent to which it is undesirable, the extent to which it is productive or counterproductive, and the mechanisms by which coordination can be achieved to effectively utilize the expertise and institutional capabilities of the various actors. In many respects, the development of the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs has been one of being influenced by political considerations, among others, which have led to the concessions on both sides, both with respect to the scope of manpower programs and with respect to the scope of vocational education. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, pp. 21-22). (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 2). Before we go into a more detailed analysis of the relationships between vocational education and manpower programs it would be helpful to look further at some of the conditions and considerations which form the context in which these two policy and program areas have been expected to coordinate their activities. These factors do not constitute all of the relevant situations or considerations but they constitute some of the major considerations

that anyone should take into account in deciding whether or not and the extent to which these two areas and institutions should cooperate.

B. Economic and Labor Market Considerations That Effect Vocational Education and Manpower

One of the first things to be considered when looking at vocational education and manpower relationships is the types of vocationally related factors of the labor market and the activities of vocationally related factors of the labor market as they effect not only the operation of programs but as they effect the development of policy. One of the primary considerations in terms of looking at labor market activities as they relate to vocational choices by individuals and as they relate to the attractiveness of certain types of vocational training and skill training is the extent to which, especially with respect to those disadvantaged persons that manpower and certain vocational skill training programs seek to attract, individuals face disincentives to give up income transfer payments or to upgrade their training skills and to leave a situation of unemployment when unemployment compensation relative to the rising tax rate, as exacerbated by increasing inflation, makes it less desirable or less of an incentive to seek employment in certain types of jobs. (Roberts, 1978, p. 23). (NCMP, 1976, p. 25).

Manpower, vocational education, and economic measures to change this situation are both causes of such situations, as well as victims. In terms of developing programs to satisfy the vocational needs of unemployed or underemployed persons, one

aspect of the debate, with respect to the demand for skills and the demand for workers, has centered around whether or not the inequalities of the labor market were due to an oversupply of opportunity for employment or whether it was its distribution that was at fault. The interpretation affects not only which individuals vocational training and manpower programs may seek to attract but also the design, operation and mixture of these programs that will be addressed to the specific analysis of the disfunctionality of the labor market in terms of demand and, consequently, the disfunctionality in terms of supply. (Mangum, 1969, p. 3). One result of misanalysis in terms of the lack of skilled workers in certain areas and the abundance of unskilled workers who could have been trained or skilled workers for whom there is low demand appears in the analysis of high cost of certain services. It has been argued that the high cost of certain services and the unavailability of trained workers (in the face of large numbers of unemployed) has been due to unnecessarily restrictive labor union practices which have kept people from entering certain trade areas, and therefore driving up the cost of services in these areas at the same time that many people are unemployed. Others have argued, however, that the high cost of services may be due directly simply to an inadequate number of trained workers, the fact that we have not in the skill training area provided the amount of training necessary for those areas in which there would be high demand. (Evans and Herr, 1978).

In terms of assessing those aspects of the labor market which are directly related to and affected by vocational training,

the question arises as to whether to try to deal with general labor market conditions or to deal more specifically with target policies. We have had in the past, in both manpower and in vocational education programs, attempts which are more specifically oriented to targeted policies and even to targeted populations. The question has been raised more recently whether or not national policy should deal with general labor market conditions. The issue at base is that there would be a differing set of policies, strategies, and programs depending upon which thrust one would take and understandably, the thrust that one would emphasize would be based upon one's analysis of the types of vocational related factors in the labor market that are relevant both to the labor market and its function and to the vocational training aspect and its function.

Both vocational education and manpower programs contribute to labor market conditions, in terms of alleviating labor market problems as identified by policymakers, as well as by contributing to both negative and positive conditions in the decisions made by policymakers. The origin of manpower programs, unlike that of vocational education, was an interest in stimulating national economic growth. (Thurow, 1979, p. 334). The expanded conception of manpower programs to deal with the economic plight of the economically disadvantaged people has helped to expand the conception of manpower programs. Vocational education has also experienced such an expansion, although to a more limited extent, with respect to its function as a factor of the labor market and with respect to its responsibility for assisting disadvantaged

persons. In this respect, both vocational education and manpower have been cast as policy areas from which program strategies are to be developed in the service of developing "human resources" as a factor in reducing unemployment and inflation. (Killingsworth, 1976, p. 72). In this respect vocational education has been identified as: (1) being responsive to national emergencies, (2) responsive to the forces of the labor market, and (3) having a high capability for regional and community development. (Swanson, 1979, p. 255). And most recently vocational education and manpower programs have both been called upon to assist in alleviating the extreme conditions of youth unemployment. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 123).

In terms of the utilization of various policy and programmatic approaches to deal with labor market conditions, the question has been raised as to whether or not vocational education is an effective tool in this area. Some have argued that vocational education is only effective in an economy where there are plenty of jobs. In a tight economy it simply functions as a means of shifting skilled workers within the queue of those people seeking jobs or within the queue of those people who have jobs, without actually changing the situation of the number of jobs. (Thurow, 1979, p. 325). Others have argued that with respect to increased training and other means to lower unemployment skill training cannot be effective without adjustments in the overall economic situation because of the trade-off situation between high inflation and low unemployment. The argument has been that we cannot achieve

a low rate of inflation and a low rate of unemployment at the same time. If this is the case then vocational training might have an unfavorable result in terms of training people and raising expectations for jobs that will not be available or on the other hand, helping to exacerbate the rate of inflation.

This argument, however, has been challenged. Professor Carolyn Bell, economist, has argued that it is precisely vocational education which can assist in reducing the conflict or apparent conflict between inflation and unemployment, and thereby achieving a balanced situation in which both objectives, low rate of inflation and low rate of unemployment, can be simultaneously achieved.

> Despite the fact that we now suffer from simultaneous inflation and unemployment, our national economic situation is still too often described in terms of the trade-off. What policy-makers have done is to lead us to believe that the trade-off also represents a policy choice. I do not believe that we need now be forced to make such a hard choice, to say that we prefer one evil to another. I do not believe that we can reduce unemployment without creating inflation and I think the United States public, without knowing it, has issued a challenge by way of that public opinion poll, a challenge to policymakers to revise their economic thinking.....It is possible to achieve both goals, to reduce unemployment and inflation, with the judicious use of manpower policy or, in economic jargon, by integrating microeconomic programs with microeconomic policy. (Bell, 1976, pp. 13-14).

Additionally, vocational education, besides being a source of training that can improve skills of workers in areas where skill demand is high or is projected to be, vocational education can be a source of data on what skills are available. It is also

possible through the vocational education data system to identify the transferability of skills to other vocational areas, thereby providing for lateral transfer of skills to areas where skill demand is increasing from areas where skill demand may be decreasing. The vocational education system itself has such information in terms of the skills and the number of people being trained in skills as well as the possibilities of such transferabilit of skills.

It thus becomes apparent that vocational education and manpower programs can have an edge as tools in the arsenal of labor market strategies. For example, retraining programs are a non-inflationary way of creating vacancies without creating labor shortages (CED, 1965, p. 36). (Levitt, 1976, pp. 81-82). (NCMP, 1976, pp. 46-47). And we have seen, as Bell argues, that manpower programs in general can be the difference in maintaining a low inflation rate and low unemployment at the same time. The central factor in seeing such training programs as having this dual function, and as functioning primarily as a tool of positive labor market strategies, is the awareness that economic policy takes into consideration the factor that human incentives are effective relative to inflation and unemployment. (Roberts, 1978, p. 20). However, such a position is not universally accepted and some people, for instance, Thurow, are skeptical that such a trade-off is possible and that training programs can have such a central place. (Thurow, 1979, p. 329).

In accepting that manpower programs and vocational training programs can have a role in labor market strategies, it is

imperative to determine which program types are most effective for specific target groups in given economic situations. (Schiller, 1978, p. 124). (NCMP, 1976, p. 57). And it is important to develop programs of training and re-training for emerging occupational fields (NACVE, 1975, p. 2). (International Labor Organization, 1975, p. 12). (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 110; p. 236). It is even asserted that education and training can be maximized during periods of recession (NCMP, 1976, p. 23). Such a position has been made by Willard Wirtz.

> Recession is a time when a sizeable percentage of the nation's work force is idle. It is a time when millions of people suffer both a loss of income and a loss of that feeling of adequacy and identity associated with holding a job. It is a time when tens of billions of dollars are paid out in additional Unemployment Insurance and Supplemental Unemployment Benefits negotiated through collective bargaining, food stamps, and welfare. This expenditure largely assumes that the recipients will be doing nothing but looking or waiting for work.
>
> It is a time when people who have skills - foremen, technicians - are available to teach others, and when the equipment of many businesses is under-utilized and can be used for on-the-job instruction. While not necessarily a result of recession, ours is also a time, and will be for many years, when there are teachers and professors who are available to teach those not needed at the work stations.
>
> Recession plainly is a time of national crisis. But it is also a time when the cost of educational renewal is at its lowest, when income support programs are already paying out money, and when whatever additional government expenditure is necessary is entering the economy when it is most needed. (Wirtz, 1975, pp. 117-118).

In a recession, as in other times, the vocational training programs can be used to increase that resource which, as Wirtz

indicates, is boundless, namely the increase of human capital. (Mirenqoff, 1978, p. 253). However, the policy issue of the interrelated effects of such training activities upon the fabric of economic development reamains a point in question. In the balance is the resolution of the appropriate roles for vocational education and manpower.

Another factor of the relationship between vocational training and manpower programs to the labor market is that there are extensive changes that are affecting the character of the labor market and it is just these training programs which will be able to help both workers and the work place adjust to the changes. The changes that are occurring include changes in wage rates and changes in rate structures. These changes have, and are having, profound effects upon workers. (Amara, 1978, p. 8). What is needed is to train workers for occupations and for the work force of the future. (Bell, 1976, pp. 19-21). (NCMP, 1976, p. 12). In this way several factors that are relevant to the proper functioning and efficient and effective functioning of the labor force will be built into the functions of the labor force, both through the proper utilization of workers and through proper attitudes on the part of the workers. The features that are most relevant to this situation is the development of positive attitudes of the workers toward work in the future. Second, it is necessary to make work opportunities more plentiful and work settings more responsive and flexible. Third, workers have to be more involved in the decision-making process. And fourth, there are many changes which have come about as a result of the growth of knowledge industries. (Gottlieb, 1977, p. 42). (Levitt, 1976, p. 95).

These are only some of the integral relationships between vocational education and manpower programs and the labor market, indicating that vocational training is itself a strategy which can be employed to positively effect various aspects of the labor market. But in order to utilize these strategies more effectively we need research to assess both the economic and non-economic effects of the manpower programs, most specifically CETA (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 256), and of vocational education. We need to know the vocational training effects of such aspects as subsequent earnings, various kinds of employment, stability, relationship of the job to training experience, improve offset savings, effects on social status and family, and other such factors. It is thus not without some doubt that we can positively assert that vocational education impacts on social and economic problems in ways that we must better come to understand (National Association of Directors of Vocational Education, 1976, p. 2). However, in understanding that vocational training programs and manpower programs are functioning in the same context of the labor market as strategies for positively effecting the workings of the labor market, it is important to understand that there are other factors impinging upon both areas which effect both their abilities to function and the types of strategies which are appropriate to their proper functioning. These effects include both demographic and technological considerations, especially as they affect the

relationships between vocational training and manpower programs.

C. Demographic and Technological Considerations Affecting Vocational Education and Manpower

There are many demographic factors which impinge upon and affect vocational training and manpower training. But it is important to focus on an aspect which at this time has taken high priority in the minds of most people with respect to the training needs of the United States. The demographic factor in question is the factor of youth unemployment. There have been many reasons given for focusing on youth unemployment.

> The intensive focusing of CETA services on youth can be attributed to a number of factors including: (1) awareness of the disproportionate employment disadvantages of youth, (2) adherence to traditional priorities and service patterns, and (3) the widespread belief that substantial gains and better final outcomes can be realized by concentrating employment and training efforts on younger client groups. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 92).

It is also the relationship between vocational training and manpower training that has surfaced most particularly in the relationship between the youth transition from school to work. Vocational education being primarily an institutional education activity and manpower training being an employment strategy for job development focus on the two aspects of this relationship between education and training and employment. High levels of youth unemployment have also contributed to a continued and increasing interest in this area. However, some of the factors that relate to youth unemployment should be considered with respect to the possibility of developing policies and particularly with

respect to emphases that have relationships to vocational education and manpower training as they relate to each other and as they should be relating to each other in the future.

High youth unemployment is unique to the United States. (Freeman, 1976, p. 43). The levels of youth unemployment and some of the problems experienced by youth seeking jobs in the United States tend to be, in many respects, problems unique to the United States. Also youth unemployment in the United States tends to be of short duration and due to entry and re-entry in large measure into the work force. Even though substantial youth unemployment has been noted as a particulary U.S. phenomenon, when young men marry, for example, their rates of unemployment fall sharply. (Freement, 1976). Characteristics such as this have led some, for example, Levitan, to argue that the major concern of youth unemployment should be focused upon the need to create jobs.

> Excepting a minority of youths who need special assistance to find and retain jobs, it would seem that all the help that most teenagers needed to function effectively in the work force was enough jobs to go around. In labor markets with large job deficits it's only to be expected that the inexperienced will be shoved to the end of the line and some will give up completely. My prescription for the day is that the best way to reduce unemployment - for youth as well as adults - is to create jobs. (Levitan, 1976, p. 64).

It may be the case that focusing a great deal of training and employment efforts on youth could be refocused to general employment considerations.

There is also the anticipated change in the work force participation rate of youth due primarily to a drop in the births,

and that will have consequent effects on the economy and related effects on youth unemployment. It is anticipated that the average annual increases in the civilian labor force of over 2 percent, which we have experienced in the 1960s and throughout the '70s, will drop to under 1 percent in around mid-1980. A factor contributing to this change will be the fall-off in birth rates. A second contributing factor will be the gradual slowdown of the rates of female participation in the work force. Although women will participate in increasing numbers, their rate of participation will begin to decrease. The estimates are that there will be three-quarters of a million fewer persons added to the labor force each year during the 1980s, or, put another way, employment growth will be half of what it has been in the last two decades. (Amara, 1978, p. 7). It has also been noted that there have been regular fluctations over the past several decades in youth unemployment and that the high levels of youth unemployment are not unique to this time. (Spring, 1976, p. 176). (Levitan, 1976, p. 62).

It is expected that with change in the birth rate and the resulting effects of relative numbers of youth entering the work force that there will be changes in the labor market demand for young people and for the training that young people will be expected to have as new entrants into the work force. Youth unemployment will be higher, as it has been higher, but there have been actually fewer dead end jobs. (US Congress, 1976, p. 48). It has also been noted that market factors have been

causing increased competition among young people in an emphasis on higher learning. These trends are expected to continue. (Bushnell, 1975, p. 18). (Levitan, 1977, pp. 54-55).

Some labor market analysts also indicate that many of the problems and the extreme effects of situations experienced due to youth unemployment are factors of the high relative numbers of youth entering the work force, that these situations will change and that problems will lessen because of the "aging" of the youth unemployment issues. (Norwood, 1977, p. 63). (Apker, 1979, p. 5). However, some, for example, Freeman, disagrees, believing that youth unemployment problems will not disappear as the youth cohort declines, but that their rate of unemployment will remain. If this is still the case, it may be that the youth unemployment problems, relative to the youth, will not decline, but their importance relative to the total labor market and other labor market conditions. The conditions which may emerge over the next twenty to thirty years may be less and relative allocation of resources may have to take this into consideration. Others, however, indicate that a large part of the current youth unemployment problem is associated with the general state of the economy which, as we have noted, fluctuates from time to time; that the teenage unemployment should decline as the economy recovers with a strength in the recovery felt also by the youth and that certain structural employment problems should be aimed at dealing with the youth unemployment issues as a pervasive and enduring factor. (Smith, R., 1976, p. 7).

The resulting changes in the relative numbers of youth facing unemployment and the possible aging of the unemployment problems indicates that the effects of these demographic factors and considerations for vocational training and manpower training programs will be vocational education's increased need to concentrate on older workers. (Norwood, 1977, p. 71). (Wirts, 1977, p. 36). And some have even predicted that by the end of this century youth unemployment will not be the issue but retraining of older workers will be the primary manpower and vocational training issue. (NACVE, 1977, p. 3). Along with this change of demographic factors effecting the labor market and consequently effecting training preparation for work there has been noted a consequent changing in the attitude of workers about the meaning of work and its place in an indivudual's life. This situation is expected to continue and to have increased ramifications throughout the work world as well as in the areas of training and education. (Gottlieb, 1977, pp. 44-45).

One of the areas in which changing work habits and the structure of the work world has been noted, which includes or may be a result of changing attitudes about the meaning of work, has been in the area of technological change. The change of technology itself affects not only the worker and the work place but also affects the training that a worker receives in preparation.

> There are two manpower aspects of technological change. First, the quality of labor input per unit of output usually tends to fall. As a result, technological change usually has an impact on total employment. Second,

> technological change usually involves a change in the nature or quality of the required labor input. Thus, there is an impact on occupational requirements. (OECD, 1964, p. 80).

One of the criticisms that has been directed against vocational education in this regard is that vocational education has failed to match the requirements of the changing economy and technology to the vocational needs and desires of individuals. (Evans et al., pp. 14-15).

Changing technology has not only affected workers' attitudes but has also affected the type of work that people do and the type of training necessary to carry out that work.

> Technological change will be both a cause of and a response to trends in the labor force. Rapid changes in technology will continue to escalate the demand for skilled workers in certain professional and technical occupations - design, marketing, and services centered in advanced technology industries, including data/word processing, communications, pharmaceuticals, instruments, and transportation equipment. (Amara, 1978, p. 9).

There will also be an increased percentage of workers that are underemployed due to having more skills than are currently required for the job or by being trained for higher level jobs than those in which they are currently employed. (Gottlieb, 1977, p. 47). It has also been noted that there will be an increased professionalization of the work force and that the training required to fill these more professionalized positions will itself increase. (Ginzberg, 1979, p. 48). (Norwood, 1977, pp. 68-69).

The effects of changing technology on occupational trends and demands will be various. The number and types of jobs

available will be fewer. For example, in the unskilled positions there will be adjustments in traditional entry level and career ladder professions. The length and type of training necessary for newer skills in jobs will increase. There will be more preparation needed and larger numbers required for professionals to do the training. And finally, advances in management innovation will have effects that will be far more extensive than those experienced by the economy due to technological innovation. (Levitt, 1976, p. 72). In these respects it will be necessary for vocational education and other training institutions to realize the need to adjust. However, vocational education has time with which to adjust to most aspects of technological change.

> Vocational education institutions cannot be expected to foresee technological changes that would occur decades hence and adjustment to these changes can best be made on the job and should be of little concern to the vocational educator. The task of vocational educators is to keep pace with changing technology and adjust their course content to current changes in the marketplace.
>
> The most detailed data needed by the vocational educator are one to five year projections. While these are preferably derived from careful analysis of a variety of economic factors, they can also be estimated from a simple extrapolation of recent trends mixed with a good dose of insights into local conditions. It is a fair bet that recent developments will continue over the next three to five years. (Levitan, 1977, p. 60). (Wirtz, 1975, p. 108).

Even though many American workers make three to four occupational shifts in the course of their lifetime, as a consequence of technological changes and shifting labor market demand, vocational training is able to project those changes

which will affect the fundamental differences that training addresses. There must be a realization that the degree of change relative to training is not the same for all aspects of the work situation. Evans has pointed out that attitudes have a low rate of change, processes have a medium rate of change, and products have a high rate of change. Therefore, the response to the future shock of technological change as it affects vocational education and training can take into consideration those aspects which are most important for people to learn over a long span and those aspects which can best be learned on the job as rapidly changing technological factors.

Having looked at some of the background issues that have effected the relationship of vocational education and manpower, and the economic and labor market considerations and demographic and technological considerations that form the context in which these two areas function, we now turn to an examination of the context in which these two policy areas function as institutions. This context relates to their characteristics as institutions and as governmental organizations.

CHAPTER II

THE GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS CONTEXT

A. Federal Deferral to States and Local Governments

One of the most prominent features in the relationship between vocational education and manpower, most specifically the CETA program, is that the manpower programs since 1974 have operated under a federal policy of decentralization and decategorization. For our discussion here the most important feature is that of decentralization. Decentralization as a policy affects the elements of the authority and operational capacity and structure of institutions in their implementation of programs. In this respect the aspects of decentralization affect both the CETA program and its abilities to relate to other programs. Vocational education, with its own history of legislation and institutional and organizational arrangements, must interface with a system that in many respects differs but in many respects has the same missions as itself. One prominent feature of decentralization is that:

> Decentralization must take place within a previously centralized organizational environment. It is not just the opposite of centralization, which would be anarchy, but represents a third alternative. The reality of decentralization can be measured by the amount of authority delegated to the subnational units to initiate policy independently, and the willingness of the delegating authority to support the decentralized units in those independent decisions. For the advocates, the last phrase in the foregoing definition is the primary reason for decentralization - it enables more people to participate more effectively. (Hart, 1972, p. 605).

Our concern is with the extent of decentralization, the effects that decentralization has had, both on manpower and vocational education, and the extent to which possibilities for collaboration between vocational education and manpower programs become possible or are inhibited by various aspects of centralized systems.

It is important to point out, however, that decentralization is a part of the American political fabric. Decentralization is not a political or organization mode that is alien to or unfamiliar within the American political context. Decentralization itself can be seen as an outgrowth of American individualism. Part of the American political fabric contains the belief that containment of power and only legitimate exercise is base on common participation and consent. (Greer and Minar, 1967, p. 164). Perhaps the American support for decentralization and decentralized political institutions is based on the realization that institutional situations are influential in the values of organizations and that the outputs of the organizations are thereby influenced by the institutional situations including the structure and delegation of authority. (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 75).

The question raised by decentralization, specifically under the manpower programs, is the question of the role and scope of the authority of the federal government in this programmatic area. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 87). It is the issue of to what extent the federal government should participate in decisions affecting local program operations, the character of delivery

systems, selection of service deliverers and clientele, and related matters. It is also in another respect the question of accountability. (Sawhill, 1978, p. 6). The federal experience under decentralization with the manpower programs, as a form of special revenue sharing, has raised several issues as to the validity of this form of program delivery and federal and local accountability. Even after the enactment of CETA McPherson sees a gradual centralization of policy making in program decisions due to Congress' distrust of local control. (McPherson, 1976, p. 211). However, it may be unlikely that Congress will totally abandon the decentralized manpower system as it has been presently put in place. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 261). (Apker, 1979, p. 9). (Van Horn, 1979, p. 21). And it is possible that a shifting of various responsibilities and power may be more the case and that there may be an increase in centralization in certain areas, for example, education. (Gilbert, 1976, p. 122), and continued decentralization in other areas. (Frederickson, 1976, p. 573).

The decentralized approach to delivery of federally initiated programs at the local level is not new with the CETA program. There have been several approaches in experimentation with decentralized manpower efforts before CETA, most notably these included the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) and the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). However, the experience under the Concentrated Employment Programs and Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems was less than enthusiastically received because, in all instances, they had

certain drawbacks. The CAMPS experience was one where there was little comprehensiveness and the system generally lacked clout. (Lieske, 1976, p. 239). (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, p. 66). The CAMPS experiment was dissipated in its comprehensiveness also, due to the fact that there were eighteen different federal agencies competing and overlapping in the CAMPS structure. And there was little relationship with the school system.

> In its efforts to do something quickly to solve these serious problems some eighteen different federal agencies set up a variety of competing and overlapping programs. Most of these have had little relationship with formal school structure because (a) there was a general feeling by those in charge that the schools had had their chance and had failed; (b) the formal school structure was not attractive to many of the potential trainees; and (c) most school people were not interested. Soon there were so many programs, with different requirements, different benefits, and starting and stopping at such irregular intervals, that no one could possibly know where to send a person who needed help.
>
> The first attempt to remedy the situation on a nationwide basis was the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). This involves state and federal agencies for the first time on a large scale basis, and brought the various agencies together to tell each other what they were doing. Unfortunately, most agencies chose not to tell what they were planning for fear that some other agency would steal their plans. (Evans and Herr, 1978, pp. 271-272).

At both the federal and the local level the CAMPS experience was a loose aggregate of agencies of different status and internal differences. (Ruttenberg, 1970, p. 47).

Under the CEP program, the same lack of coordination and power was experienced. The Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) institutional training program remained outside of the CEP structure. (Mangum, 1969, pp. 89-90). And CEP generally

had little coordination or impact outside of MDTA. (Levitan and Taggart, 1974, p. 65). What is perhaps even more disturbing is that the interagency coordination linkages and advances which were achieved under CAMPS may have diminished with the implementation of the CETA program because vocational rehabilitation, welfare and vocational education have remained separate from CETA organizationally. (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 49-50).

Decentralization also raises issues with respect to funding mechanisms utilized and implications of those funding mechanisms for policies and programs. The federal government has used grants of various types to local governments and state governments to carry out the programs. These subgrants are themselves indications that the federal government depends upon and utilizes these other forms of government agencies to carry out program policies. The question that is raised by this is a question of the capacity of these governmental units to carry out such policies. CETA, for example, indicates that various levels of government can work cooperatively and that there can be, to some degree, a limited federal role in program operations. It is important, however, to reassess the federal, state, and local relationships in terms of the funding mechanisms. (Chambers and Sargent, 1979, p. 30). The present federal funding mechanisms tend to create fragmentation in policy and program operations. (Schneider and Swinton, 1979, p. 15). The grant in aid structure defines the relationship between the levels of government and defines the extent and scope of local authority within the program operation. Current assessments of the federal funding

relationship may focus on the aspect of achieving coordination of program elements through more comprehensive planning. However, other analysts are aware that comprehensive planning is not a substitute for consideration of the reconstruction of funding mechanisms, and therefore, the control of programs.

> My complaint is not with planning per se, but with planning as a substitute for more forthright reconstruction of the intergovernmental assistance system. Planning of this sort cannot work becasue the planner is the weakest of the parties, lacking the resources and support available to the functional interests. We have had enough experience over the past decade to know that planners tend to be separate but not equal, that when program planning is not accompanied by control over resources, it is a futile process.
>
> Why is this type of planning preferred? Precisely because it does not disturb the existing grant structure. When the planning is to be done by the recipient governments, it has the advantage of trying to integrate in the field that which is pulled apart in Washington. (Schick, 1975, p. 720).

In this assessment of the relationship between the various levels of government, one issue that needs to be assessed is the role being taken by state legislatures in initiating and establishing priorities under various programs, including vocational education and CETA. When the recipient government is a state, the authorization and appropriation authority of the state legislature has become more of an issue, due to increasing demand for a say in the creation and funding of programs within the state.

The question of the funding mechanisms and program priorities raises a related question of the relative share of costs and responsibilities of each of the levels of government.

(Swanson, 1978, p. 87). (University of California, 1975, pp. 13-14). To what extent should the federal government's role in supplying funds be a measure of its determination of the objectives and the outputs of various program activities? To what extent should the local government bear part of the costs for certain program activities? There is also the question of the extent of the fiscal impact of programs such as CETA on local government.

> On the average, funds available to a given jurisdiction from all three titles of CETA probably amount to about 5 percent of local government budgets (other than education) in a given year - not an insignificant resource itself. Teamed with funds from other federal or local sources, it could be sufficient to effect major social or economic goals. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 79).

The effects of large amounts of manpower moneys coming to the local level has affected program operations and has affected the general overall operation of local government. However, one significant discrepancy in this situation is that the influx of this money has not significantly impacted on institutional vocational education, therefore, not significantly impacting on the relationships and the collaboration of vocational education and manpower. (N.L.C./U.S.C.M., 1974, pp. 1-2).

The issues of decentralization raise, additionally, the issue of the capacity of the local level not only to expend funds, but to operate programs with a level of expertise and comprehensiveness necessary to achieve the objectives as established by the national level. However, it has been recognized that no matter to what extent the federal government can set priorities and objectives, programs succeed or fail at the

local level. (Mangum, 1968, pp. 79-80). (Michael, 1976, p. 605). And it is also at the local level that the effects of program proliferation show their most powerful symptoms.

After the initiation of manpower revenue sharing, programs with broad based local support succeeded. This was due in part to a fostering of autonomy and initiative at the local level. (Whetten, 1977, pp. 80-81). The point is that the local governments responded and responded within acceptable ranges to the requirements and to the mandates placed upon them. In general, decentralization as a strategy encourages experimentation and new ideas by reducing the scale of institutions and institutional operations. This would enhance one of the objectives under the manpower programs which is the generation of new and experimental ideas in program design and delivery.

We need to develop the capacity at the local level for policy management because of problems that have been generated by the local governments increasing their activities in the area of policy and program operation. (Schneider and Swinton, 1977, p. 15). (Marshall, 1976, p. 129). The record of the accomplishments has not been to date entirely satisfactory.

> Yet, under the traditional policy making approach, the record of state and local governments must cast doubt on their ability to manage ever more complex problems, and to satisfy the growing expectations facing them. We are all aware of the massive problems confronting state and local governments in many of the policy areas in which they have primary responsibility - transportation systems are disintegrating, crime rates are soaring, public schools are failing. While many of these problems may be extremely difficult to resolve, it is probably the case that a significant improvement in the quality of public services will require an

> improvement in the policy making process at the state and local levels of government. This suggests a critical need for efforts to develop policy analytic tools appropriate for state and local use. (Schneider and Swinton, 1979, p. 13).

The CETA program has been an experiment in such capacity building at the local level, and from the data that has been collected, there seems to be considerable progress in building the capacities of local units of government to manage manpower programs. (Higgs, 1975, p. 748). (Schick, 1975, p. 722). (Murphy, 1975, p. 133). The next step, perhaps, may be expanding their capacity to engage in more complex policy analysis and program collaboration and activities.

One noticeable factor in regard of capacity of local program delivery is the apparent intent of the federal government to improve the capacity of local government to deliver services but also the apparent failing of the federal government to do so.

> All of these programs share a common intent and a common failing. There intent was to improve the capacity of local governments to deliver services. Their failing was that they were fatally fragmented, even when they were supposedly unified. Without exception, these programs increased the problems of local chief executives and encourage the fragmentation of effort within local governments by fostering discreet and competing administrative structures and interests. (Scott and McDonald, 1975, p. 787).

We have noted that some of the discrepancies of the federal government to achieve cooperation and coordination and the fact that the proliferation of programs from the federal level itself may enlarge or contribute to the fragmentation of programs at the local level and the inability of local officials to achieve coordination which has not been achieved at the national level.

However, the management capacity and the growing capacity of local governments, some of which have not had much if any responsibility in the human service delivery program system, to increase their capability seems promising. General revenue sharing has not helped strengthen local decision making. (Mushkin, 1977, pp. 250-251). However, experiences under the CETA program, a special revenue sharing program, indicate that certain advances have to be made. One of the items for discussion in the future concerns the elements that are relevant to the successes of local government in achieving the capacity to manage programs and to deliver services, and what are the obstacles to these?

One of the concerns, however, is the mechanism by which the federal government attempts to achieve both service delivery and the objective of increasing capacity at the local level. General revenue sharing itself may mean an ever-growing dependence of local government on federal funds. (Benjamin, 1973, p. 192). This dependence could be detrimental to local governments functioning in those areas in which they should be functioning and in doing the job that they do best. Rubino has pointed out that state government may lack policy management expertise due to the federal determination of state agency structure, goals, and activities. (Rubino, 1975, p. 772). The extent to which the federal government seeks to achieve capacity building at the local level and the means by which such capacity building is sought may indicate that there are incompatabilities between the ends sought and the means used.

One of the crucial factors in this situation is that the various levels of governments and the various types of governments are not in and of themselves equals, not only in terms of the scope of their authority but in terms of the types of activities which legally they are able to carry out and the type of authority which they have had delegated to them by agencies that stand legally in a superior position to them.

> Municipalities are political subdivisions of the state. They are created by an act of the state legislature "....as convenient agencies for exercising such of the governmental powers of the state as may be entrusted to them.... The number, nature and duration of the powers conferred upon these (municipal) corporations, and the territory over which they shall be exercised, rests in the absolute discretion of the state....." The legislative act in turn becomes the "municipal charter."
>
> Counties, on the other hand, are more often not political subdivisions of a state. Rather they are more commonly administrative subdivisions of it. Nor have many of them ever received (and until recently ever seriously sought to acquire) that limited grant of power necessary for them to achieve a meaningful degree of self-government.
>
> The essential difference between county and municipal government, in many states, is therefore to be found in the presence, or the absence, of a grant of power from the state for purposes of local self-government as defined in, and delimited by, a municipal or county charter. (Belmonte, 1973, pp. 561-562).

Any analysis of capacity building at the local level, and thereby the success or failure of decentralization to achieve its purposes, must take into consideration the differences of the various governmental units which are operating. Under the CETA program, those agencies which can be prime sponsors are states, municipalities and counties. This mix of the variety

of local government agencies having ability to and responsibility for managing programs and generating policy has been overlooked in most analyses of manpower programs.

Nixon's new federalism was an attempt to rely upon communities, and not new programs or new federal agencies, to deliver program services in the social or human resource area. (Nathan, 1976, p. 47). There was little analysis conducted to determine the various governmental capabilities of the agencies being entrusted with the responsibility for these programs. However, after several years of decentralized manpower programs it is possible to analyze the experiences and to see the extent of which there have been positive effects for state and local relations under the aegis of these federal programs.

A few analysts have identified those areas in which they find that federal programs or policies have contributed in positive ways to the state and local relations. (Gilmer et al., 1975, p. 776). (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 72). First, the grant in aid structure provided clear-cut and well-identified roles for states in the management of various programs. Second, the states have been allowed a great degree of flexibility in their administration of programs, and by not being required to create new agencies they have not weakened existing governmental relations between the various units and institutions. Third, the federal aid program has been one familiar to and acceptable to local governments. Four, the technical assistance role of the state tends to have a beneficial effect on pulling the various levels of government

together, focusing more on substantive issues. Five, where local match provisions are part of the program, this also helps to promote better state and local relations. Six, oftentimes the various institutional arrangements such as councils and advisory groups helps to strengthen the state and local relationship. And finally, where there are no special or specific responsibilities assigned to the states federal officials often will design a special state role for certain responsibilities, thus promoting an inter-governmental cooperation on all levels of government. (Gilmer et al., 1975, p. 778).

The relationship between the various levels of government, in terms of their differentiation of functions and authority, is more of "a marble cake rather than a layer cake" relationship, where the decisions of governmental functions are made at all levels in the system. (McPherson, 1976, pp. 198-199). What are the advantages and disadvantages in such a mixture of functions and responsibilities for local control of programs? With respect to the CETA programs analysts have identified benefits of local control.

> The NCR study has focused both on the processes and the product of manpower programs. It has found that local control of programs has resulted in tighter program management, greater accountability, and more rational delivery systems. Local manpower planning, though still weak, is more meaningful than in the pre-CETA period, and grassroots participation in the planning process is greater. However the shift of program control scramble the relationships among government jurisdictions and among the local institutions that deliver manpower services. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 279).

This scrambling of the relationships requires that analysis distinguish the different levels of policy analysis and program

action. (U.S./H.E.W., 1977, p. 15). While de-categorization reflects attempts to overcome the aggregational character of separately legislated programs, the emphasis has been on the integration of policies and programs among the various levels of government and on each level of government. (Cummens, 1979, pp. 437-438). The issue that arises is the difference between state and local conditions related to policy analysis from those of the federal level.

At the local level, social and economic encouragement may be a more important factor than competition and political power. (Cohen and Farrar, 1977, p. 90). In one study of implementation of a voucher system in the local school districts, for example, the experience of the vouchering at the local school level indicated that there are implications for innovation in education as a social program that can be encouraged by decentralization but not through competition. The vouchering system achieved objectives not in terms of increasing competition between the various actors at the local level, but in fact encouraged surfacing of agenda items and objectives other than competition.

Decentralization both generates and nurtures diversity at the local level because of the pre-existing variations among the states. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 6). (U.S./H.E.W., 1977, p. 4). (Ruttenberg, 1970, p. 64). This diversity among the states, when seen from the national level, creates a situation where policy perspectives do not cancel each other out but tend to become composites without reconciliation of differences.

(David, 1977, p. 13). (Gentry, 1979, p. 37). Without procedures for reconciliation of differences, this aggregation becomes conflicting with overlaps, duplications, and omissions. One of the positive aspects of decentralization nurturing diversity at the local level is that the various manpower activities have been integrated as a part of the local government activities through the CETA program, (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 100), thereby adapting national programs and incorporating some national priorities and objectives in those of the local government's objectives and priorities.

There may be benefits to emphasizing state level coordination of program areas both for manpower programs and emphasizing those state coordination functions that exist in vocational education. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 273). (NCMP, 1975, p. 27). (Gilbert, 1976, p. 137). While this situation from state to state may not overcome the divisive characteristics of diversity, it would within in a state utilize those structures available which encourage coordination within the state.

> Some other factors that affected the structure of vocational education at the state level were (1) the organization of the total education system of the state; (2) the historical development of education and vocational education in the state; and (3) the role played by the state legislature and other political entities within the state.
>
> Although the structure for the administration of vocational education at the state level is varied, there are some commonalities among the states that are mandated by federal law. Some of these are as follows: (1) each state must designate or create a sole state agency for the administration of vocational education or for the supervision of administration by eligible recipients; (2) each state must have a full-time state

director of vocational education and a sufficient staff to perform the responsibilities as assigned by federal law; (3) each state must provide programs at the high school, postsecondary and adult levels as well as programs and services for special target groups (i.e., the disadvantaged and handicapped); and (4) each state must carry out certain functions like planning, evaluation, data collection, and the use of advisory committees. All of these commonalities imposed by federal legislation have had an impact on the structure and organization of vocational education on the state level.

> Even with these commonalities, however, no two states have exactly the same structures, scope of work, distribution of responsibilities, or organization. Given these differences, the discussion of state governmental structures for vocational education must be fairly general. (Gentry, 1979, pp. 38-39).

Even with strong state coordination of vocational education the CETA/LEA cooperation has taken place mostly at the local level with very little state activity. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 68). Perhaps this is the case because under CETA states have not been sure what are their legitimate tasks and have been reluctant and often inactive with respect to state-wide coordination of manpower programs. The policeman function also frustrates the coordination function and there are too many risks and too few benefits for the governors. (Lockard, 1976, p. 98).

> At the state level, CETA may be at a triple disadvantage. First, it is only one of the many programs and services for which the governor is responsible. Secondly, it assigns responsibilities in which the potential risks outweigh the apparent advantages of rigorous execution. Third, it is a 100% federally-funded program, requiring no monetary investment on the part of states and localities. At the state level, gubernatorial attention is much more often centered on issues involving state and local revenues - education, law enforcement, health, and highways, for instance - than upon programs in which the state and its localities have no financial stake. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 72).

It may be that the federal government lacks the commitment to the state role in policy and planning and that the tools given the states for coordination reflect this. The governor, however, has the authority to coordinate the various state agencies that provide manpower services. The governor also is responsible for providing funds to local governments and has the influence of the office available, by which to influence local control. However, there has been some reluctance on the part of governors with respect to manpower programs to take a strong, central role. At the same time states have been suffering from a lack of sophisticated policy analysis and centralized control of planning. The states themselves need stronger state policy management and need to be less eclectic in their approach to this issue. (Rubino, 1975. pp. 773-774).

This raises a question as to whether or not certain issues necessitate strong centralization and even centralization within the federal government. Local governments have a limited capacity to manage their resources effectively and have demonstrated in many instances less capacity than had been hoped for by the federal government. (Scott and MacDonald, 1975, p. 786). The federal government has come to realize that decentralization may not be simply an administrative matter, but may actually involve politically decentralizing certain functions and thereby giving up the authority over those functions at the same time.

> As you move up to the managerial and policy-setting levels, the technologies become more complex and judgemental. Therefore, it is usually harder to decentralize managerial and policy-making functions

> effectively unless the intent of the decentralization is to divest the central level of the function completely. In the case of political decentralizations, the intent often is to move policy and managerial decisions to the field. This is a legitimate objective, but it must be recognized that it is unrealistic to decentralize managerial or policy-making authority and still hope to control the receiving jurisdiction. (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 81).

It is true, too, that decentralization can itself lead to duplication especially in such areas as policy and planning. (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 61-62). (NASDVE, 1976, p. 1). There have been strong arguments for centralized planning and decentralized administration. Whether the possibility of these two can be merged is yet to be determined.

One very strong argument for centralization has been that decentralization decreases the ability to ensure measurement of the aggregate impact of the various federal programs and the utilization of federal funds. (Leviton and Taggart, 1971, p. 70). Local control of programs results in variances in priorities and expenditures and therefore results in differentiation of output. (Murphy, 1975, p. 135). The proliferation of measurement techniques and management information systems makes it difficult to determine on a national scale the impact with respect to national priorities of the expenditure of these funds. However, it must be pointed out that this inability to ensure measurement of the aggregate impact of federal funds was a criticism of categorical programs before decentralization was undertaken with CETA. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 17). Others have pointed out that it was just this lack of an overall

skill training system, presumably with centralization in a federal agency, that has given the United States a disadvantaged position with respect to Europe. (Reubens, 1978). The European edge in education, vocational education and manpower training comes from their degree of centralized decision making. The question as to whether other factors than centralization account for success in the programs and the difference between measuring different sets of national objectives must be brought into consideration when analyzing whether or not centralization or decentralization should be the way that the United States should go with respect to vocational education and manpower training programs.

B. Organizational and Structural Differences of Vocational Education and Manpower

One of the features that will be developed from the preceding discussion is that the structure of funding and administration of vocational education differs significantly from that of manpower. Besides the fact that vocational education is a much older system, manpower, having become a federal objective only since the early 1960s, has still remained a rather neophyte program in terms of developing a system of delivery. It differs from vocational education in that it involves the federal government in an experiment in decentralization which is not and has not been the case with vocational education.

There is the factor of the educational system in the United States which is that it has remained a fairly isolated institutional structure. (CED, 1965, p. 39). In this sense, it has been

isolated from the other general forms of local and state government. Several reasons have been cited for this generally isolated structure and decision making posture of education, including vocational education. Education is extremely decentralized in many respects. There is a general lack of competition and a lack of profit incentive. Education has also been noted for a lack of management expertise and a preoccupation with in-house problems. Matched with this is that education is a very separate and sizeable bureaucracy with separate professional personnel and separate tax sources.

> As might be expected when a politial institution grows dramatically in size, raises taxes, acquires property, and touches sensitive areas of individual lives and fortunes, outside influences were not entirely dormant. When opposition did sporadically occur, the educational administrators developed considerable skill in devising routines for building organizational unity and diffusing conflict. In fact, this type of folk wisdom - accepted practices for maintaining professional dominance - was elevated into ethical principles which were incorporated into the education and on-the-job socialization of educational administrators. (Mosher, 1977, p. 655).

Coupled with this politically isolated structure and separate decision making posture of education "the public schools and the education profession have their democratic roots in elitism." (Brandon, 1974, p. 1). In this respect, education has generally resented government interference, government being other governmental institutions and any dual or multiple educational track in public schools. Vocational education as part of the education system has generally resisted cooperation with other agencies as has been documented by a report from the Comptroller General's office.

> Although we observe several instances in which local officials had expanded the range of vocational offerings by using a variety of community-based facilities, in the States we visited vocational education authorities often had not made full use of existing resources. Frequently they had not explored possibilities of using either other public school facilities, federally funded manpower skill centers, military installations, proprietary schools, or employer sites to expand or strengthen vocational program offerings. Several factors accounted for underuse or nonuse:
>
> In planning programs school officials frequently have considered only those facilities under their own control.
>
> Training resources have not been inventoried to determine what was available.
>
> Costs of training have not been adequately determined so that the most cost-effective delivery system could be adopted.
>
> Delivery of training has been restricted to traditional course, time, and facility usuage patterns.
>
> Construction of new school facilities have been favored.
>
> Transportation has not been provided as a means of linking students with training available in a variety of facilities.
>
> Equipment and supplies often have not been acquired from government resources or solicited from private sources. (Comptroller General, 1974, p. 47).

There has been a solidification of professional power in education which has been due to the social division of labor and the professionalization of roles. (Cohen and Farrar, 1977, p. 92). These factors have all contributed for education generally, and for vocational education specifically, to develop a rather isolationist position.

For our purposes it would be informative to study the effects on education of its isolation and boundaries as permeated

by other policy groups. (Mosher, 1977, pp. 656-657). One such area of examination would be the effects on education of the collaboration between local educational agencies and CETA prime sponsors. It has been the case that from time to time various reformers have sought institutional change in education through pressures brought by informal societal groups. (McGowan and Cohen, 1977, p. 45). The efficacy of such an attempt, namely to achieve institutional change from outside pressure, must be analyzed in terms of its place within the strategies for collaboration between vocational education and manpower programs.

The focus on vocational education and manpower programs concentrates on the changes that are needed in each system to enable them to collaborate. It has been recognized that "the greater the similarities of mutually independent goals, the greater the interdependence and hence the greater the extent and stability of exchanges." (Reid, 1975, p. 121). For this reason there have been attempts to define methods of articulation between CETA and vocational education and to remove obstacles to collaboration. In attempting to define methods and avenues for collaboration between these two areas, obstacles which would impede this collaboration have been identified. Perhaps chief among these would be the artificial separation and division among the various levels of education itself, thus keeping vocational education outside the realm operationally of other areas of education. (Brain, 1976, pp. 56-57).

The National Commission on Manpower Policy has identified several general factors that have hindered cooperation in the states. First, there has been the lack of cooperation between non-CETA program managers and the prime sponsors and the unwillingness to cooperate in sharing plans and information. Second, many aspects of existing rules and regulations in internal procedures have impeded cooperation. Third, manpower coordination has been hindered by significant differences in program planning cycles, terminology and reports. Finally, the lack of coordinated and comprehensive labor market information both for the CETA prime sponsors and for sub-contractors has hindered the common data base from which both can operate. (NCMP, 1975, p. 37). With respect to the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs, one study of the governor's special grants has indicated a lack of cooperation between the vocational education establishment, both at the state level and at the local level. With respect to coordinating programs, researchers found:

> In many states, the interface between prime sponsors and the state voc-ed agencies is the point at which problems frequently surface. Many appear to be centered on differences in prime sponsor and voc-ed agency perceptions of Sec. 112's intent, or differences in opinion on who has the prerogative to make various key decisions affecting special grants. Some apparently have grown from inherent limitations in the ability of some states' voc-ed agencies to influence the actions and decisions of near-autonomous local institutions. Still others have come about as a result of systematic or legal restrictions on vocational education activities. These points of contention, described in more detail below, have generally served to reduce the potential effectiveness of Sec. 112 special grants, and in several states constitute the antithesis of legislative intent. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 53).

The case of the governor's special grants, including the five percent vocational education funds, is a prime example of legislative intent focused on stimulating, through the use of incentives and other mechanisms, collaboration between vocational education and CETA. However, the five percent funds have become a focal point for contention, disagreement and misunderstandings as the administration of the funds, both by the state, the prime sponsors and the vocational education agencies, has been implemented. Prime sponsors saw in many instances the five percent funds as political concessions to the vocational education community, while vocational education saw the funds as a commitment for the prime sponsors to use the vocational education system and expertise. In many instances there were differences over the use of funds, for example, the use of moneys for allowances. The situation here highlights the differences of perceptions, needs and objectives.

In many states the differences in state statues created problems for the use of the five percent funds. For example, the use of five percent only for tuition as some state statutes may require would have exhausted all of the prime sponsors' Title 1 funds for allowance payments. Another instance was the fact that state statutes limited the contracting of the state board by the state board to public education systems only. Another instance is differences of opinion as to what were considered allowable costs and ceiling on administrative costs. While the prime sponsors were, for all intents and purposes,

autonomous entities able to determine within the broad guidelines of their grant application with the Department of Labor, program priorities and expenditure of funds, their relationship with the vocational education community was that of relating to a large state bureaucracy. Vocational education was a "system" and as such as pretty much buried at the state level and within the education bureaucracy itself. The five percent funds tended in this respect, since coordination became difficult because of many institutional and legislative barriers, to take vocational education's five percent funds out of the mainstream of CETA activities. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 5).

At the same time the one leverage point that might have been able to effect at least between balance of state and through the five percent funds the leverage for coordination between vocational education and the prime sponsors was the governor. However, the governor had many restrictions and concerns about interfering with prime sponsors' activities and in many respects was distantly removed from authority over or direct operational management of the education, and specifically the vocational education, activities within the state. The reluctance of governors to act upon the authority given them within CETA largely because of other political and administrative constraints existing at the state level has itself acted as an obstacle to the utilization of the five percent funds. The one state source for coordination and activity between the two areas, manpower and vocational education, was noticeably absent in establishing

a policy direction and in stimulating coordination between the two branches. This lack of activity on the part of governors has, de facto, given consent to the separate and equal characterization of vocational education, further pulling vocational education out of the mainstream of CETA. One possible alternative to this has been the conception of creating at the state level a single system or agency that would administer all aspects of vocational education and manpower.

> If, through a combination of legislative and administrative refinements, national policy makers could promote the consolidation of responsibility for interrelated human service development programs at the state level, the combined package would not only be more visible, but would also be more likely to receive priority than would any of the elements individually. Thus while CETA alone might never generate widespread gubernatorial attention, the consolidation of CETA, Employment Service, economic development, and vocational training would constitute a "critical mass" of related activity more likely to command the attention and the personal interest of governors and other key state officials. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 74).

Having indicated that some of the organizational and structural differences between vocational education and CETA, we now turn to a more in depth analysis of the emergence of the prime sponsor as a coordinator of service delivery and in many instances, as the deliverer of services themselves. The issue further highlights the question as to the relationship between vocational educational training and the manpower system, raising questions as to the role and responsibility of each area.

C. CETA Prime Sponsors: Service Deliverers or Coordinators of Service Delivery

The enactment of CETA brought with it the creation of a new type of manpower phenomenon. Previous to CETA there had been a long history of conflicting roles of long established agencies, most of them institutions of state government, some ad hoc private and some quasi-public institutions. CETA established the chief elected official as the main decision maker on priorities for spending funds under CETA. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 76). This was a substantial shift in the policies of the federal government and their approach to delivery of manpower services. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 19). But while the chief elected official was the main decision maker, the implications of the CETA legislation were that the CETA system, as developed by this elected official to carry out the responsibilities under the act, and to expend the funds allocated by the Department of Labor, was to coordinate the services provided by other service deliverers.

CETA enacted a new set of relationships between these service deliverers by superimposing a prime sponsor, but it did not create new programs. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 270). (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 12). (McPherson, 1976, pp. 207-208). (Taggart, 1978, p. 33). (Levitan and Zickler, 1975, p. 192). It was an instance of developing a comprehensive system of checks and balances among the various levels of government while allowing for administrative flexibility. The expectation was that

the CETA prime sponsors would continue to contract for services with those service deliverers who had previously been delivering the same type of CETA services. The expectation was that the prime sponsor would weave these individual components together into a system. In the beginning, primarily prime sponsors operated in this way, using previously existing service deliverers. However, over time prime sponsors began to redefine their role and we see the emergence of prime sponsors as a new agency for service delivery.

> One of the most striking results of decentralization has been the emergence of a new agency for service delivery - the prime sponsor itself. This has come about as prime sponsors have attempted to coordinate and centralize the delivery system. Integration was accompanied by a reduction in the number of agencies controlling the basic operations and extension of the role of the local prime sponsor from administrative overseer to direct program operator. Prime sponsors cited additional reasons for moving into operations: unsatisfactory performance by existing agencies and a reluctance to choose among organizations competing for program contracts. Others have suggested that bureaucratic aggrandizement on the part of the sponsor's staff may also have been a motive. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 143).

The prime sponsors, in their attempt to develop the single stop concept in manpower service delivery, went one step further and became that one stop deliverer of services. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 144). This of course has not materialized in terms of a total takeover by the prime sponsors, but studies indicate that there has been considerable shift in the prime sponsor's role and the number of functions that prime sponsors have attempted to take over themselves. This also may be seen in a sense as a balkinization of CETA manpower system, an

example of the desire of political jurisdictions to run their own programs, a phenomenon which is not particular to CETA alone. (Lieske, 1976, p. 332). Prime sponsors have offered a variety of reasons for the need to operate these programs.

> The Labor Department staff evaluation study concluded that sponsor decisions to become directly involved in service delivery were generally related to (1) efforts to consolidate and closely control certain services, (2) the desire to more closely associate elected officials with programs viewed positively by the community, (3) the need to substitute for local agencies regarded as ineffective or inadequately sensitive to client needs, and (4) the need to establish some operating capabilities in areas where there had been little or no manpower activity prior to CETA.
>
> Researchers for ORC found that the large majority of CETA administrators viewed self-operation as a last resort. Many prime sponsors feel that their ability to effectively manage, monitor, and evaluate manpower programs might be jeopardized if they were directly involved in service delivery. Prime sponsors generally consider planning and program management to be their primary responsibilities. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 150).

It still remains, however, that the near monopoly on skill training that was held by vocational education prior to CETA has been dissipated as the prime sponsors have shifted to different types of training institutions and also to a system of individual client referral. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 156).

In this instance and in other instances with other service deliverers, prime sponsors are making training decisions formerly made by vocational education agencies. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 162). In part this has been due possibly to a desire to experiment with new forms of educational delivery and in part a desire to run programs themselves when faced with oftentimes

recalcitrant and intransigent agencies who do not have the same objectives or mode of operating that the prime sponsors have. Prime sponsors have then had to make decisions as to the trade-off advantages of contracting with established service deliverers and taking over services themselves.

It must be remembered that this is an extreme step for prime sponsors considering that few if any had had experience in human service program delivery and this step into a new area of program services was a major step for them. The advantages that prime sponsors had to forsake by failing to contract with established service deliverers was in giving up the pre-existing linkages with other agencies and programs, including funds that these service deliverers represented. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, pp. 148-149). It meant also giving up the professionalism that these agencies had developed over time and either buying that professionalism by hiring staff or developing that professionalism unstaffed. It also meant that prime sponsors would be developing related but expensive and duplicative functions overlapping those of service deliverers already in operation in their areas. The situation as it exists raises the question as to whether the CETA operation at the local level is distinct from the vocational education operation or whether it is simply a duplication. The action by the prime sponsors to take over certain functions, including vocational training, as performed by other service deliverers, raises the issue for program coordination as to the objectives and functions of each program area and the extent

to which they are consonant and the extent to which they are divergent.

D. Vocational Education and CETA: Synonymous, Distinct, or Conflicting?

For some time there have been a number of advocates for establishing training outside the present public education institutions. This has been advocated in many instances since there has been a perceived need for remedial education, which has been used to indicate the failure of the present public educational institutions to perform their responsibilities. (CED, 1972, p. 48). (McGowan and Cohen, 1977, p. 30). Most succintly it has been stated that schools have in some sense failed to serve some students. (Wurzburg, 1978, p. 47). The issue raised is whether or not the vocational education system has been deficient and whether or not these deficiencies were great enough to create a separate system of service delivery or whether this was, in fact, the issue in the creation of CETA and the mandates given the CETA system.

It has been noted that the chief Congressional criticisms of vocational education are many. First, vocational education is seen as providing irrelevant skills training for today's job market and especially for tomorrow's economy. Second, vocational education has insisted on maintaining "old categories" training. Three, vocational education is seen as being run by an encrusted, defensive, unprogressive educational establishment, unwilling to cooperate with society's other trainers for

employment. Four, dominated by rural vocational interests vocational education has shortchanged the cities. Five, vocational education, while mandated to serve the disadvantaged and special target groups, has a history of discrimination against women, minorities and the handicapped. Six, too many of the vocational education resources have been used for high school programs and not enough has been used for postsecondary efforts. Seven, there has not been a significant amount of hard statistical data for program evaluation to determine whether or not vocational education is meeting its objectives. Eight, there has been a general refusal by vocational educators to engage in statewide planning and too much time has been spent in protecting their turf. Nine, there has been a general lack of concern for out of school youth and unemployed youth. (Halperin, 1978, pp. 11-12).

Again the isolation of vocational education is cited as that reason why the vocational system has been out of touch with other institutions delivering the kinds of programs to the clientele that CETA has been designed to serve. ".....It is true that failure to provide effective vocational education programs which serve all youth in the schools has led to the development of the federally supported remedial programs operated outside the schools." (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 73). This criticism of vocational education, however, has been leveled as education in general. "Probably no other large American undertaking has been isolated from, and resistant to, the general advance of

production methods as education." (CED, 1965, p. 39). It is just this characterization of education and vocational education which has largely formed the basis for arguments of a separate remedial system of vocational training and education outside the state public educational system.

The position as stated in 1969 still has the force today in terms of the rationale for an alternative educational system.

> The argument in 1968 for vocational education control was multifaceted. It was an argument for the protection of a large government investment, for the utilization of professional expertise developed over a long period of time, and for the concept of vocational education as an integral part of the broader educational responsibility for the development of the whole man. But it was also an argument for state control of federal program dollars. In every state there is a Vocational Education Board which has long controlled the expenditure of federal vocational education funds. Generally these boards have not been responsive to the changing industrial patterns or, more particularly, to the changing educational requirements of the cities.....
>
> Opposition to relinquishing control of the institutional program to HEW was based on an unwillingness to turn it over to a system controlled by these state vocational education boards. The opposition was not based on any disagreement with the concept of the skill centers, which were, after all, jointly developed by the Manpower Administration and Vocational Education. So long as the federal government through the Department of Labor retains authority to specify who should be trained and for which jobs, the program can be made responsive to the national needs. That is the key. (Ruttenberg, 1970, pp. 19-20).

Such is the formulation of the argument for a separate manpower training program both at the federal level and at the local level. The central issue of concern at this point is the issue of correcting a deficient system or program by creating a competitior and the advisability of this as a policy position.

It is true that education and employment establishments are separate bureaucracies with a long history of separation. "The education and employment establishments are typical bureaucracies, essentially inertial. Between them is a long history of separatism, to the extent that one is considered 'public,' the other 'private.' They meet at a comparatively narrower frontier." (Wirtz, 1975, p. 64). The initiation of CETA and the designation of the local elected official as the prime sponsor has put the local government, vis-a-vis vocational education, in a unique situation. The school systems are under boards of education, most notable for their independence than for their cooperation with other community organizations. (CED, 1972, p. 53). The CETA system is in most respects a local government operation except for where the states operate balance of state under CETA. And even in many states, Balance of State sub-regions are administered by local government units. Vocational education for many purposes is a state system run at the local level through the local public agencies. In both respects they represent two different and distinct systems, each having its own type of institutional inertia. (Lieske, 1976, p. 331).

Perhaps because of these institutional and historical differences tensions between CETA prime sponsors and schools is quite noticeable. A variety of specific factors have been identified to account for the tensions and the differences between CETA prime sponsors and the local public schools, tending to drive these two institutions apart. In the implementation of the

CETA youth programs such divisine tendencies have been noted.

> The presentation describes some observations as to tensions perceived relative to past prime sponsors/ LEA collaboration. Briefly, from the educator's perspective these were:
>
> poor past history of collaboration;
>
> restrictive CETA eligibility income guidelines;
>
> lengthy and cumbersome forms;
>
> funding uncertainty;
>
> lack of emphasis on training in CETA programs;
>
> focus on CETA on economically disadvantaged youth;
>
> lack of sufficient CETA administrative funds;
>
> poor match of funding cycles between the prime sponsor fiscal year and the school year;
>
> reduction-in-force problems in public schools due to declining enrollment; and
>
> the perception or view that YEDPA contains inherent criticisms of public schools. (U.S. Department Department of Labor, 1978, pp. 11-12).

Other analysts have also noted specific conflicts between CETA and vocational education program goals and philosophies. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 149).

> Both systems seek to train those in need, but there are significant differences. Clients of CETA are generally more economically disadvantaged than vocational education clients and therefore require more supportive services. Vocational education emphasizes institutional training in a broad array of subjects over longer time periods, while the majority of prime sponsors favor shorter terms, more flexible training, with direct linkages to the local job market. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 165).

And with respect to the youth programs, differences in operational and policy postures for vocational education and

local educational agencies have been noted.

> The first year's experience, however, has highlighted some basic problems. They all trace back to the incompatibility between the prime sponsors' federally linked program year and the LEA's school year. The differences in the calendar have led to a number of problems. First, schools have difficulty hiring qualified persons they would otherwise be able to pick if the planning years were compatible.
>
> Other schools are not risking these hazards and are instead, simply adding the YEDPA load to current teaching, counseling, and administrative loads.
>
> Another problem arises from the lengthy lead-time that schools take for programming and budgeting.
>
> Schools are also encountering difficulty in coordinating class schedules for in-schoolers participating in YEDPA. Schedules for the fall semester are made up in the summer or spring, before YEDPA work and service schedules can be established. (Wurzburg, 1978, p. 49).

Other observers have noted that at best the relationship between education and specifically vocational education and the CETA prime sponsors is one of strangers and often as one of hostility. (Apker, 1979, p. 2). Others see it as a difference in strategies and outlooks and that many changes in the prime sponsors choice of program deliverers for training was perhaps more for political reasons than for programmatic reasons. In any event, there seems to be sufficient detailing of differences between vocational education and CETA to warrant consideration of the possible effects of these factors upon (1) program delivery of each system, (2) the compatibility or incompatibility of the programs as collaborative systems, and (3) the possibility that alternative or supplementary systems would be a better mode of relationship for the two systems.

The fact that vocational education, as a policy and program area, is not familiar to the prime sponsors has

contributed in large part to the fact that prime sponsors have chosen to go with other service deliverers with which they are presumably more familiar or have chosen to attempt service delivery themselves. (N.L.C./U.S.C.M., 1974, p. 14). While public vocational education is not a monolithic organization, yet the conflicts do persist between vocational education institutions and prime sponsors. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 149).

One noteable example of conflict is, as we have seen, the differences that have arisen over the use of the CETA Title I five percent funds. The fact that the legislative intent for the use of these funds is not clear (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 65) has helped to create ambiguity, conflict and discord over the expenditure of these funds.

> Field researchers have consistently noted differences between state voc-ed agency and CETA prime sponsor perceptions of Sec. 112's intent. Vocational educators tend to view the funds as proof of legislative commitment to utilization of state voc-ed facilities and accumulated expertise in the design and delivery of CETA training services. Prime sponsors, by comparison, often view Sec. 112 strictly as a national political concession to the vocational education system. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 53).

The ambiguous, conflicting character of the five percent funding helps to create confusion and has decreased the impact of CETA on vocational education. Studies conducted by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors in the Large Urban Areas indicates that in these areas the impact on vocational education of the initiation of CETA has been minimal. (N.L.C./U.S.C.M., 1974, pp. 1-2). (N.L.C./U.S.C.M., 1977, p. 7).

However, an interesting paradox arises. It has been noted that the prime sponsors are using the public school system, (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 162) but at the same time they are reducing their utilization of vocational education facilities for training. (N.L.C./U.S.C.M., 1974, p. 20). The prime sponsors have contracted more than three times the funds of Title I., as they have with the five percent funds, for training. The question remains why is the vocational education portion of public education being avoided by prime sponsors, while prime sponsors have been exploring new approaches to classroom training. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 167). Included in this emphasis are increases in individual referrals. At a time when prime sponsors are seeking to meet the needs of individual clients, when they are looking to innovative and alternative methods, and while they have a lack of expertise on the part of their own staffs to provide certain program initiatives, the question becomes quite important as to the reasons for the lack of cooperation and collaboration between vocational education and the CETA prime sponsors. This is especially true since there are funds that have been set aside as incentives to increase collaboration.

One interpretation could be that perhaps the vocational education system could not and should not be responsible for CETA-type obligations. It may be that the objectives of the vocational education establishment and the objectives of the CETA prime sponsor system are different, divergent and that

overlap is minimal. Perhaps the vocational education role in a poverty program is different than a role that it might have in accelerating productivity and growth. (Thurow, 1979, p. 334). Perhaps the discussions and analyses of the need for collaboration between vocational education and CETA have focused too much on the forms of collaboration and have focused too little on the substance of collaboration.

> There is a need to shift the focus of voc-ed attention from matters of form to matters of substance. With attention now largely centered on nonfinancial agreements, restrictions on funds, and the mechanics of having programs start on time, state sponsors and voc-ed agencies have given little attention to matters of program content, adequacy of training, quality of instruction, or linkages between training and jobs. In most states, neither the state sponsor nor the state voc-ed agency keeps track of the combined five percent and Title I CETA voc-ed effort. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 83).

The emphasis upon form as opposed to substance could be explained from the point of view that the CETA prime sponsors are quite new at the manpower game and were given a mandate in 1974 to create a program delivery system for which they had little experience and little expertise. Coupled with this was the inauguration of public service employment through Title VI near the end of 1974 and the growing funding level of public service employment which consumed almost the entire attention of prime sponsors across the country.

This focusing upon establishment of administrative systems, the establishment of data systems, the establishment of funding accountability systems placed the prime sponsors in a position

of looking to expedient forms of program delivery and giving little time to look at the substance. The principles guiding the structure of delivery systems for manpower have been those related to organization, purpose and standards. They have not developed a relation to an overarching policy frmework. (Swanson, 1979, p. 251). But if the CETA system is the development of a new form of delivery system, to what extent will the American educational system need to address itself to structural changes to meet obligations, (Apker, 1979, pp. 1-2) for example, under the mandates of the CETA youth programs?

> American education cannot fully meet its YEDPA obligations through its present structure. Change is needed. Such change must be planned and implemented in ways consistent with all basic goals of education and the educational needs of all students. YEDPA provides education with several opportunities for basic change as it seeks to meet its obligations under this Act.
>
> Opportunity 1: To plan and implement ways of utilizing the broader community in the educative process.
>
> Opportunity 2: To learn about and implement new ways of awarding academic credit. Throughout the YEDPA, repeated emphasis is placed on the need to find ways of awarding academic credit for work experience.
>
> Opportunity 3: To provide diversified educational opportunities for students within the framework of an integrated educational system.
>
> Opportunity 4: To enhance and protect freedom of career choice.
>
> Opportunity 5: To relate educational experiences to later life style activities of youth. (Hoyt, 1978, pp. 26-29).

CETA has focused on a new clientele to be served both by manpower programs and by public education. (Evans and Herr, 1978 p. 271). (U.S. Dept. of HEW, 1978, p. 48). The question which

arises, however, is the extent to which the particular needs of the new client group can be served either by vocational education or by the manpower program, or whether there are different needs that must be served by each.

For some there is little evidence that preventive measures (those provided by vocational education) will ever eliminate the need for remedial measures (those provided for example, by manpower programs).

> Some would suggest the expansion of manpower services to all those in need. Others feel that emphasis should be given to preventive rather than remedial measures. The argument is appealing, but evidence is lacking that increased expenditures on the education and training the first time around will preclude the needs of future remedial efforts. (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, p. 100).

The point to be made here is that the question of increased educational funds may not be a question of trade-off of funds between vocational education and manpower programs but that the expenditure of funds in each area is dependent upon the objectives to be achieved and the needs of the client community to be served by each program area. This puts vocational education and manpower not in a competitive relationship but puts them in a relationship where each is serving different sets of objectives which are related and complementary but which are none the less different and diverse.

But while the interests and obligations of each system may be different and diverse it is not possible that they should operate separately and autonomously. There must be an integration of remedial and vocational education programs.

> In fact, the frequent failure of schools in the past to motivate students and to prepare them occupationally has created the demand for remediation. Even with the best of occupational preparation in the schools, however, the need for remedial programs will continue.
>
> And further, though remedial programs are making significant contributions, they are still inadequate in capacity. Unfortunately, they were established piecemeal to meet current crises, with too little attention to interrelationship with other programs, existing or proposed. Duplicated services are available among some programs, and other needed services do not exist. (Evans et al., 1969, p. 57).

An example of the differences between vocational education and manpower concerns the geographic areas that are defined by the program operations. Education and manpower involve multiple and noncongruent geographic jurisdictions. Under the CETA system, labor market areas were replaced as program geographic areas with political jurisdictions. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 74). This seemingly unimportant factor has significant and far reaching implications in terms of the definition of the character of the program, based in part upon the population identified by the area served by the prime sponsor.

Organizing program deliverers and program services around client groups and professionalism encourage separation of programs. (Barton, 1977, p. 89). The separation and segregation of areas of education and training causes a segregation of students and raises problems of articulation and mobility between programs. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 311), (Wurzburg, 1978, pp. 43-44). A second concern with respect to separate and segregated programs is the extent of which duplication and

overlap of service delivery occurs. This has been one of the chief concerns for the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs. To date, however, there have been few if any satisfactory studies or analyses which have identified and measured the extent of duplication and overlap created by jurisdictional configurations. The status of the concern for this aspect of programs remains at the level of assertion.

There are consequences in terms of the programmatic mandates given to the respective programs which enhance the perception that there is indeed duplication and overlap of programmatic activities. For example, Congress and the federal administration have been pushing for more credit recognition of nontraditional training, especially with work experience under the youth programs. (Wurzburg, 1978, p. 16). There have also been criticisms, of education generally, that we need to change the present credentialing system to meet the needs of learners in terms of articulation between systems. (Hodgkinson, 1976, p. 31). The perception at base in both of these approaches is that the systems are definitely separate, that there are differences between the systems, but that the systems should in some sense interface, overlap and interlock in such a way that clients who have a diversity of needs not presumably met by any single system, can have the option of moving from one system to another.

This condition is exacerbated by the fact that there is a perpetuation of the institutional separation between academic and vocational education within education itself. (Mangum, 1969,

p. 143). This separation is perpetuated in part through federal law which has mandated separate administrative structures for academic and vocational education. There has been a lack of coordination between vocational education and education generally. There has been a lack of coordination with other education programs or deliverers of vocational education and the criticism has been that there has been a lack of coordination by vocational education with the CETA program. (Comptroller General, 1974, pp. 26-28). It has been asserted that there should be no distinction between intellectual competence (academic achievement) and manipulative skills (vocational education achievement.) (Evans et al., 1969, p. 63). One attempt to achieve a greater integration of vocational education would be the incorporation of vocational education as part of higher education or as part of education generally. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 305).

What these considerations point out is that vocational education is pulled in a dilemma between two points. (Brandon, 1974, p. 25). On the one horn of the dilemma vocational education is perceived as being outside the domain of education. On the other horn vocational education is accused of creating an elite curriculum and excluding those who need skills. Vocational education suffers the dilemma of being pulled into various camps or being pushed out of various camps. While it is possibly true that vocational education must avoid becoming elitist (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 305) and that there are many who could benefit from skill training, there are some who go even farther

and assert that education, specifically vocational education, should not be viewed as preparation for work but as a part of work. (Wirtz, 1975, p. 96). The question, however, still remains as to how these two areas are to be integrated.

The issue has been raised in terms of vocational education and manpower as supplementary or alternative systems. As we have noted before, several critics of vocational education have argued that the development of alternative education systems is justified because either vocational education has failed in its mission or because vocational education has a mission which is separate from that assigned to the manpower programs. The idea of utilizing separate and parallel systems has been tried in the United States and abroad and is an idea with some interest, especially by the U.S. Department of Labor. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 309). However, even before CETA, only a small portion of manpower funds went for vocational skill training. Vocational education and manpower have not been truly syncronized or synonymous. (Brandon, 1974, p. 9). (Walsh, 1979, pp. 230-231). (Ellis, 1973, pp. 3-6). The majority of manpower funding has gone from work-supported activities. In raising the issue of supplementary or alternative systems, the question is raised as to whether or not vocational education is a means to an end (employment) or is in itself an end in itself, or perhaps it is both.

It has been noted that vocational education's goals include more than goals of industry training and federal manpower programs.

> There are three basic objectives in any public school vocational education curriculum. Listed in chronological order of their acceptance as goals, they are: (1) meeting society's needs for workers, (2) increasing the options available to each student, and (3) serving as a motivating force to enhance all types of learning. A few vocational education programs sponsored by employers have these same three goals, but most do not. Very often they are designed only to meet the short-term needs of a single employer.
>
> Not all public human resources development programs attempt to achieve all three objectives. For example, most Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs include no general education component except for the occasional teaching of reading to students who are functionally illiterate. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 4).

The possible conception of the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs is further characterized by asserting that we need one system to deal with the "flow" problems (that is, vocational education) and another system to deal with the "pool" problems (that is, manpower programs). The Council for Economic Development, for example, argues for a separate system, since the public education has failed, citing remedial education as proof of this. (CED, 1972, p. 48). The National Advisory Council in Vocational Education, on the other hand, argues for prevention rather than remediation.

> These concerns lead us to one fundamental policy: the Federal government should invest at least as much money in reducing the flow of untrained youth as it invests in reducing the pool of unemployed, and most of the Federal investment should be concentrated on paying the additional cost of vocational and technical programs of career preparation (as compared with programs that prepare for further education) and high schools and post-secondary institutions. (NACVE, 1969, pp. 3-4).

But this characterization raises the question from the point of view of identifying apparent discrepancies in education's, or in vocational education's, ability to meet its objectives. The issue is not raised from the point of view of vocational education fulfilling a necessary role as an alternative to or as a supplement to other types of programs, for example, manpower programs.

The conceptualization which perhaps has the most positive benefit is that vocational education is an element necessary to all education. (Evans et al., 1969, p. 62). (Ginzberg, 1977, p. 24). It is a technique which has more to offer as a method to education and it also serves to offer curricula to some people which satisfy needs that they have that cannot be satisfied in other areas of education. A conceptualization which works in harmony with this and expands it further is that education and work are actually coordinate functions. (Wirtz, 1975, p. 126). They involve possibilities that cannot be achieved by the objective of one system working independently. In this way, both from the educational point of view, there is a need to integrate academic and occupational preparation (NAM, 1975, p. 11) and perhaps a need to see education as a continuum: general education, vocational education and manpower programs as ranges of the continuum with certain overlaps, not as points on the continuum or as discreet entities. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 301). In this way, vocational education would be seen as a component of a total education program. (Walsh, 1979, pp. 237-238). To a

greater or lesser degree, various individuals would engage in and spend more time with various ranges in the continuum and the flow from one range to another would be facilitated by focusing on those overlapping characteristics, and therefore, possibilities for institutional collaboration that exist between the various educational ranges on the continuum.

In order to explore the possibility of vocational education as one range of activities or techniques on an educational continuum, it would be necessary for vocational education to explore more fully than it has done to this point the goal structures that it subscribes to and for manpower, also, to examine more fully its goal structures to see those which are consonant and those which are separate. In this respect vocational education as a policy area is perhaps less definable in purpose solely in terms of on economic function. (Dahrendorf, 1975, p. 75). (Brandon, 1974, p. 38). Vocational education, as a range distinct from, although overlapping, manpower programs, cannot turn to economics primarily as a means of providing a common bond for its policy structures. (Schick, 1977, p. 262). In fact, economics perhaps cannot provide a common bond for the separate social disciplines themselves. Manpower, on the other hand, because of the trade-offs and the effects of manpower programs as part of an overall national economic policy may be more identified in its goal structure with economic principles.

What are some of the operational principles that can be used to identify vocational education? First, vocational education

is not limited to skills necessary for a particular occupation. It includes educational aspects for discovering talents, relating them to the world of work, and choosing an occupation, and to find employment. Second, there should be no distinction between intellectual competence and manipulative skills. Third, schools must assist students to bridge the gap between education and work as well as labor market institutions aiding the students in the transition from education to work. Four, some time of formal occupation preparation must be a part of every educational experience. Upgrading and remedial education opportunities are continually necessary. Finally, the objective of vocational education should be the development of the individual, not the needs of the labor market. (Evans et al., 1969, pp. 63-64). (Mangum, 1969, pp. 42-43).

The National Commission on Manpower Policy has defined four manpower policy objectives. (NCMP, 1975). First, facilitation of the employability of all persons able and willing to work. Second, strengthening of the manpower infra-structure to enhance the matching of people and jobs. Three, improving productivity in the quality of work life. Four, providing temporary jobs, income support, and other types of manpower assistance when cyclical downturns to the economy occur. In terms of the differences between vocational education and manpower training, several distinguishing features have been noted.

> One useful way to define an area is to identify what is excluded, although there may be important spill-over effects from systems that lie beyond its boundaries. For example, while the educational system prepares young people for adult work, secondary schools, colleges and universities are not primarily, and surely not solely, concerned with manpower policy. The relationship between manpower policy and vocational education and some forms of post-secondary training and education should be closer. (NCMP, 1975, p. 4).

In terms of identifying the extent to which it is possible for vocational education and manpower programs to be in actuality closer it is necessary now to turn to the elements of vocational education and manpower which have, as indicated previously, provided for disparities, discrepancies and conflicts, and to examine certain insights from organizational analyses which provide objective and managable means whereby these two education and training areas may interrelate. In doing so we will look at the aspects of vocational education and manpower programs as both political and administrative entities. This is accomplished by highlighting some of the facets and factors which identify and define them in their operations as well as to look at their general characteristics with respect to certain overall organizational factors that impinge upon the possibility of their functioning as systems that can interact and collaborate at various levels of government. To do this we characterize vocational education as primarily a public education activity, ignoring for the moment those vocational education activities which fall into the private and community-based organizations. These also are institutions and in some respect the operating

principles involved would be applicable. To avoid confusion we will focus on those activities of primarily public and governmental agencies that have responsibility for vocational education and for those which have responsibility for manpower programs, particularly under the CETA system.

CHAPTER III

COLLABORATION, COORDINATION, OR.....

A. Interorganizational Coordination Insights and Approaches

Interorganizational coordination theory is an outgrowth of general organization theory and includes the application of political, economic, administrative, management expertise which focuses upon the factors relevant for organizations to relate and those elements of successes and failure in organizations' attempts to relate to one another. Its applicability to vocational education and manpower relationships is that through inter-organizational coordination literature there is made available a variety of analyses and approaches which will help to shed light upon the various institutional characteristics and configurations, as well as to provide an understanding of the obstacles to and the possible methods for enhancing the coordinative or collaborative relationships between vocational education.

It might be relevant at this point to indicate that a variety of terms are used in the literature to describe inter-organizational or interagency coordination. The difference between the use of the word "organizational" or the use of the word "agency" is not a significant differentiation in this work. There is, however, a more important differentiation and that is between the words coordination, collaboration, and cooperation. The concept of interorganizational coordination connotes that

there is a superior agency or overarching perspective from which two subordinate functions are coordinated. Collaboration, on the other hand, and cooperation indicate that two autonomous, or semi-autonomous, functional areas choose to relate to each other in some manner. It is my belief that the most productive relationship between vocational education and manpower programs is less one of coordination, since there seems to be few agencies or organizations with the sufficient authority to require coordination and to mandate coordination of the various levels involved and of the various actors playing a role in each system. The objectives of achieving collaboration seem much more feasible. In line with the political, institutional, and social aspects of those organizations and agencies participating in vocational education training and manpower, we will use the term inter-organizational coordination theory since that is the term most often used in the literature. At a later point in this work, we will examine the merits of considering that interorganizational collaboration is a mode of relating vocational education and manpower as opposed to seeking mandatory coordination as a mode.

The University Council for Educational Administration has called for an increased collaboration of schools with other public and private agencies. (Mosher, 1977, p. 657). Under the CETA system, CETA prime sponsors have been mandated to coordinate their activities. State prime sponsors have been given the mandate to affect coordination between state and other manpower agencies within the state. But there has been relatively

little discussion in the manpower literature or in the vocational education literature as to what the collaborative or coordinative activities should include or the mechanisms most effective in achieving the collaboration desired. Most noticeably absent is a discussion of the differentiation between the various levels of government responsible for vocational education and manpower and the fact that collaboration or coordination among the various levels and between various levels takes a variety of forms and can be achieved in different ways. There has been a documentation of the lack of coordination at the federal level without much indication as to the means by which coordination can be achieved or beyond stating that coordination is an objective. (Comptroller General, 1974, p. 27).

There has been, however, somewhat extensive discussion of the need for cooperation and coordination at the local level because local division of jurisdiction enhance the need for cooperation. (Greer and Minar, 1967, p. 159). "No coordination, no power, no responsibility." The diffused and overlapping jurisdictions at the local level make the need for coordination and cooperation painfully obvious. But often integration is the most difficult at the local level because of the proliferation of programs from the national, state and local levels. Coordination at the local level also is encumbered with the requirements for achieving compatability of the process at the local level which is the means of achieving program goals and the goals themselves, which are statements of national priorities.

Interorganizational coordination is achieved in a variety of means and in a variety of contexts. Interorganizational coordination is often an explicity stated objective or method of organization, but the explicit organizational goals are oftentimes at odds with or augmented by organizational goals of an informal nature. (Simon, 1961, pp. 160-162). Interorganizational coordination itself is not immune from this formal/informal dichotomy. "Organizations tend to pursue objectives compatible with the means which they have access to and the values of their elites." (Whetten, p. 83). The objectives that they seek to achieve revolve around the means which organizations have available to them which may or may not be consonant with those objectives explicity expressed by the organization. Organizations' behavior often create distinctions between the ostensible, i.e. official, and the operational objectives. Organizations may effectively be compatible in ~~terms of their~~ official or ostensible objectives, but they may be operationally incompatible. The opposite may also be the case.

Interorganizational coooperation may take many forms. One hierarchy of interorganizational forms has been presented by Klonglan and others.

> The first three forms represent Litwak and Hylton's awareness of interdependence: (1) director awareness of the existence of another organizations, (2) director acquaintance between organizations, and (3) director interaction between organizations. The fourth item is a low level resource exchange from Finley: (4) information exchange of newsletters, reports, and releases. Forms five through seven are from Thompson and McEwen: (5) resource exchange - bargaining - of funds, materials, or personnel;

(6) overlapping board memberships - cooptation - of staff or members; and (7) joint programs - coalition - to plan and implement activities. The final item represents the "standardized action" of Litwak and Hylton: (8) written agreements to share activities between organizations. (Klonglan et al., 1976, p. 676).

As indicated by the eight identified means of coordination, some approaches tend to be more formal and others tend to be more informal. The efficacy of some of these means between national agencies, between state level agencies and between local agencies has been differentiated and we will discuss this later. However, at this point it is important to note that there may be some benefit to seeking more institutionalized forms of communication and coordination to establish interagency coordination as a definite mode of operation for agencies. One reason is that such institutionalization would help to ensure the continuation of communication and cooperation despite the frequent changes in personnel. The second reason for institutionalizing factors that assist in establishing interagency communication and cooperation is to encourage this mode regardless of competition between agencies. As competition becomes acute such communication and cooperation may decrease. Institutionalizing such coordination may assist in keeping the cooperation as an organizational objective even as competition exists. (Ogle, pp. 21-22).

Another strategy of interagency coordination that has been noted is that the decision maker has a central role in seeing that interorganizational coordination becomes a preferred strategy of the organization.

> Theoretically, the phenomenon may be viewed in terms of a scenario depicting an organizational decision-maker influencing organizational behavior under constraints imposed by the organizational and environmental contexts. The challenge to be met by theory-builders in utilizing this frame of reference is to specifically conceptualize interorganizational coqperation as the outcome of a process in which organizational decision-makers decide on cooperation as a preferred action strategy, and then ultimately achieve implementation of this strategy in organizational behavior. (Schermerhorn, p. 852).

With the identification of this and other factors relevant to implementing and achieving interorganizational coordination it is relevant that such factors for vocational education and manpower systems be identified. This raises the issue of the existence of studies and research to identify these relevant factors of coordination in order to identify what directions are more productive. (Miles, 1979, p. 109). (Reid, 1975, p. 121). (Whetten, 1977, p. 77). The National Institute of Education has initiated a vocational education study which was mandated by Congress. The study was intended to identify the forms and extent of coordination between vocational education and CETA. In so doing this study would concentrate on some of the very interorganizational coordination factors and mechanisms which the interorganizational coordination theory has been dealing, but only obliquely.

> The Congress clearly intended that the results of the study should contribute findings of fact, policy-relevant analyses, judgements and insights that will assist in legislating on vocational education in the future. To this end, it is intended that the study will deal with issues and developments that are not specifically mandated. It will, therefore (1) be attentive to changes in legislation for related programs, such as the Comprehensive Employment and

> Training Act of 1973 and the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977; (2) consider whether changes during the next four years in other domains of Federal policy, such as those concerned with national employment policy, poverty, the handicapped, social welfare, and vocational rehabilitation, for example, have implications for vocational education programs; (3) provide information on Federal expenditures on education and training through Federal departments other than Health, Education and Welfare, and Labor, in so far as they represent additional forms of the Federal investment in skill acquisition and development; and (4) report on significant developments in vocational education policy at the state level. (U.S./HEW, 1977, p. iv).

It has been indicated that an analysis of the factors related to interorganizational coordination should look at organizational structures as they contribute to or detract from the possibilities for coordination. (Ruttenberg, 1970, pp. 2-3). The organizational structure itself and the intergovernmental system with which we translate national policy into an identifiable event of change is often the point at which the analysis should begin. Some of the elements of the contextual dimensions which contribute to interorganizational coordination include (1) an organization's ability to control resources, (2) the compatibility or organizations being integrated, and (3) the point at which the initiative for coordination originates. (Whetten, 1977).

In achieving cooperation different levels of government and organizations utilize different modes of interorganizational coordination.

> The modified theory of IOR would contend that at the state level, internal communication is the only significant structural component affected by IOR. Since the major types of IOR at the state level are interpersonal awareness, acquaintance, interaction, and information exchange, it is contended essentially

that internal communication is increased by an increase in external communication among organizational units which encompass - have as a domain - relatively wide geographical areas. Furthermore, external communication is likely to increase as a result of increased internal communication in that increased internal communication will stimulate the need for information, a resource, which is not available in the organization.

At the district level the reasoning is more complex. The more relevant forms of IOR are interpersonal awareness, acquaintance, interactions, and joint programs. The distinction of district IOR is the inclusion of the relatively enduring IOR form of joint programs, and an ad hoc rationale is that this enduring aspect of joint programs is determined by a unique combination of structural characteristics: formalization, innovation, and decentralization.

The rationale for the county level - smallest geographical domain - IOR is somewhat the opposite of the district rationale. The most frequent forms of IOR are interpersonal awareness, acquaintance, interaction, and resource exchange. In contrast to joint programs, resource exchanges are seen as temporary, shortlived forms of IOR; thus, a qualitatively different set of structural determinants might be expected. Complexity and communication are seen as determinants of IOR among the county organizations, while formalization, innovation, and centralization are not. The rationale for communication is similar to that discussed above for the state level and that in both state and county levels, exchanges are involved to a relatively high extent in IOR. The distinction is in terms of the objects exchanged. At the county level, noninformational material resources are exchanged, while the resource exchanged at the state level is information. The distinguishing determinant is complexity; where geographical domains are relatively small, diversifying by increasing complexity - specific skills and training - can be expected to be felt in terms of a need for specific materials resulting in resource exchanges. (Klonglan et al., 1976, pp. 685-686).

It has been found, for example, by the National League of Cities - U.S. Conference of Mayors Study, that personal relations at the local level have yielded the most successful cooperative ventures between vocational education and manpower. (N.L.C./U.S.C.M.,

1977, p. 8). It remains, however, to analyze specific coordination experiences at the national, state, regional and local levels to determine whether or not vocational education has utilized those various means of coordination in enhancing coordination which have been identified to be most effective at the appropriate level.

It has become quite evident both to administrators, legislators and the general public that the proliferation of programs at the national and local level has resulted in confusion for both clients in terms of the services they can receive and where they can receive them and for the general public in terms of the impact of various programs and the expenditure of program funds to achieve certain social program objectives. There has been a general lack of confidence in government's ability to spend funds in efficient and effective ways. One of the most critical points of the analysis relative to the failure of government to achieve objectives is the extent to which government agencies tend to operate independently of each other. Education is certainly one of those areas where increased coordination within the educational areas and between education and other areas can be sought. Interagency coordination as a strategy with techniques available to achieve coordination could play a role in achieving the collaboration between education, and specifically, vocational education and other program areas to meet the criticisms.

> Such a new concept is urgently in need of trial and there is no better place to try it than in the fields of education and energy. No major advance in interagency coordination has been made in the last generation. If confidence in governmental administration is to be restored, no area is more ripe for improvement than interagency coordination. However, it is clear beyond doubt that such a plan can only succeed where it is under the aegis of an official directly under the president with the rank and prestige of a cabinet officer. (Miles, p. 109).

Surely given the past history of dependence upon the federal government to initiate policy directives and to implement programs through funding there has been a certain dependence upon the federal government for solutions.

A recent form of this federal dependence for direction and initiation takes the form of looking to the federal government to coordinate educational activities in the country, most notably through the creation of a federal department of education. It may be seen that a federal department of education would enhance the collaboration between vocational education and CETA by providing mechanisms for cabinet level coordination of all federal education activities which now the federal government under the Federal Interagency Coordination Committee for Education does not now provide. It is hoped that the federal government's role in directing education policy may be more focused and itself coordinated. One drawback to this approach, however, is that a federal role in education is quite unlike its roles in such areas as national defense and its potential role in such an area as energy. The question of the federal presence in education and vocational education must be met

with an analysis of the current delivery structures for education that exist at both the state and local levels. The increased presence of the federal government in education cannot be achieved without altering the relationships and the structures that current exist. And this must be traded against the negative consequences that would be generated by such a development.

Another approach to achieving coordination among educational institutions and between vocational education and manpower programs might occur on a much less grand scale. There are many agreements at the federal level for coordination between federal agencies and it is these interagency agreements and the provisions in them that could be and should be reinforced. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 272). Reinforcing these at the federal level would be a step toward affecting positive coordination at the local level, since it is often the proliferation of programs from the national level which generates many of the coordination problems at the local level. Attempts to reinforce these interagency agreements at the federal level should be coupled with attempts to devise collaborative processes which would become part of an overall strategy for a change in the education-work policy of the federal government. Although this would be only one of the critical elements of such a strategy, it would be an element necessary to achieve the overall objectives of a national education-work policy. (Wirtz, 1975, p. 14). In devising a collaborative process for agencies, federal and local policy makers would have to examine those elements which provide the bases

for positive linkages.

> The key elements required in order to build positive linkages, in order to establish useful networks, include the following:
>
> 1. An individual, a group, or an institution has to be clear about its own identity, its own uniqueness, before it can link successfully to others.
>
> 2. Diversity within homogeneous groups provides a basis for linkages with others....: From the point of view of general systems theory, and from the political sciences, comes the notion that within every system there are life-giving core groups - enclaves or individuals who, if they can prevail, will aid the system (the institution itself) in becoming more life-oriented.
>
> 3. The institution must interact with its environment. (Shaw, 1977, p. 521).

It is from analyses of the institution's own positions and policies and from an understanding of its own organizational strengths, weaknesses and capabilities and from an assessment of the environment from which it operates that successful linkages can be achieved. This is what is primarily behind the thrust for the call for a national vocational education policy and for a national manpower policy. The attempts are to define the activities which constitute the policy areas for each system.

In defining the context in which vocational and manpower policies operate, it is becoming increasingly obvious that we should look at the requirements and capabilities of these policy institutions for international coordination efforts. (ILO, 1975, pp. 28-29). These efforts would include assistance, joint research, collaborative use of facilities, information exchange, harmonization of policies and programs, and dissemination of materials. On the global front, as the communication and inter-

action of the nations become more intense and more frequent we cannot develop a national policy for vocational education or for manpower without considering the effects of and upon the international relations of labor markets, training and education and other social facilities.

One of the chief means currently being used by the federal government as a means of achieving collaboration or coordination between CETA prime sponsors and other agencies, most particularly, vocational education and the public school system, is the use of incentives. The chief incentive mechanism is that of fiscal incentives. Since this form of devising collaborative processes is the chief and almost singular approach that the federal government has used to achieve cooperation between vocational education and manpower we should look at the use of fiscal incentives in terms of its efficacy and with respect to other means of incentives. Mandatory coordination has not been very successful for coordinating programs operated by different agencies. (U.S./HEW, 1977, p. 17). For this reason it is important to look to a variety of possible collaborative processes and, with the use of incentives, at the range of possible incentive mechanisms. While there has existed some skepticism as to the possibility of coordination without the infusion of additional funds incentive mechanisms which rely on funds as the chief incenting mechanism find diminishing returns. (Bogetich and Lammers, 1979, p. 226).

The Comptroller General's report looked at the lack of catalytic effect of federal funds within the realm of vocational education.

> OE has not held States accountable for performance against criteria which emphasize the role of Federal funds as a change agent, and therefore cannot ensure that informed judgements will be made as to where and how funds should be targeted. Without continuous surveillance in this regard, there is little assurance that the leverage of Federal aid will be maximized. (Comptroller General, 1974, p. 19).

Earlier in the same report the Comptroller General noted that there had been a peaking of the leverage achieved through the use of Federal funds and that they believed that a plateau had been reached in terms of the efficacy of using fiscal incentives as a leverage or catalytic effect for achieving federal objectives. (Ibid., p. 14).

In the analysis of the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs with the incentive of the five percent vocational education funds under the governor's special grant there has been little evidence of the improvement of the relationship between the two systems as a result of the infusion of this funding mechanism at the state and local levels. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 5). (N.L.C./U.S.C.M., 1974 and 1977). There have been enumerated delays and numerous disagreements related to the negotiation of agreements covering the five percent funds which has resulted in extended delays both in the allocation of funds and delays and start-ups of programs relative to the funds. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 95). (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 66). While this was the case primarily in the first

year or two of the implementation of CETA, disagreements still persist and delays in disjointed activities are still evident.

It is evident to some analysts that money per se cannot bring about change. (Gilmer et al., 1975, p. 774). This is coupled with the observation that withdrawing incentive funds usually means a lack of continued coordination. (Reid, 1975, p. 128). (U.S./DOL., 1978, p. 25). The use of fiscal incentives has had limited effect and even more limited longevity once the funds have been withdrawn which raises issues as to whether or not the use of fiscal incentives achieves the overall objective of coordination or simply is a short-term shot in the arm which achieves a short-term coordination of activities but has little long term effect and even little or no effect on institutional change. In fact, in many instances, the policies of organizations have often been adapted only to obtain the funds with the consequent result that once the funds are no longer available, or after the funds have been assured, the policies revert or change and little impact has been achieved. (University of California, 1975, p. 2). (Comptroller General, 1974, p. 23).

If fiscal incentives are a weak form of achieving collaborative relationships, what other types of incentives are available? One of the strongest, although most difficult to manage, incentives are those which arise for institutions themselves as they participate in the collaborative process. When organizations collaborate they give up certain resources and autonomy but they also achieve a certain set of factors that would not be achieved

without collaboration. These achievements, or resource attainments achieved through collaboration, can become incentives for collaboration.

> Warren proposes that public agencies can increase their effectiveness by either increasing their efficiency, thereby channeling more of their resources into goal related activities, or by obtaining additional resources via nine interorganizational coordination activities: (1) joint data banks, (2) prompt communication of change and policies, (3) increased feedback between programs, (4) increased feedback from the community, (5) improved distribution of resources, (6) overlapping boards and staff via interagency committees, (7) increased scope of interaction between organizations, (8) joint participation in areas of common interest, and (9) a central decision-making body to resolve conflicts. (Whetten, 1977, p. 78).

The factor that is evident here is that perhaps some of the more subtle forms of coordination that have existed for vocational education and manpower programs have not been allowed the full range of opportunity to achieve results. They may be more slow in achieving their results than fiscal coordination but the results, in terms of institutional change and behavior, may be more long-term in their effects and thereby may be more desirable. Another factor of these alternative incentives to cooperation is that they appeal to the self interests of the organizations by increasing their existing resources through several mechanisms readily available to them and totally within their control. To put the matter succinctly, organizations can achieve a reduction in overhead by cooperation, thereby making cooperation more desirable for them. (Wurzburg, 1978, p. 41).

From the interorganizational coordination literature Schermerhorn has identified several of the motivating and

disincentive factors influencing interorganizational coordination. Those factors which tend to be motivating conditions influencing organizational coordination in which organizations will seek out or be receptive to interorganizational coordination are a) when organizations are faced with situations of resource scarcity or performance distress, b) "cooperation" per se takes on a positive value, and c) a powerful extra-organizational force demands this activity. (Schermerhorn, 1975). Extra-organizational force or a mandate for coordination is only one of three possible incentives motivating organizations in considering participate in interorganizational coordination. The motivating conditions are always balanced by organizations in considering the possibility of interorganizational coordination with the associated costs of interorganizational coordination. Organizations participating in IOC may involve a) unfaverable ramifications for organizational image or identity, b) a loss of decision-making autonomy, and c) costs of by requiring direct expenditure of scarce organizational resources. It is these associated costs which an organization weighs against the motivating conditions and those factors which would make interorganizational coordination an incentive for them.

Interorganizational coordination becomes more likely, Schermerhorn points out, as an element in an organization's behavioral repertory, a) to the extent organizational boundaries are open or permeable vis a vis the external environment, b) under those conditions where two or more organizations experience and

recognize some mutual need or purpose, and organizational domains are not sensitive issues, c) to the extent prevailing norms of the organization and/or its external environment supports interorganizational activity, and d) to the extent physical opportunity for interagency coordination activity exists within the organizaiton and/or its external environment. It is evident, therefore, that interorganizational coordination comes about or is thwarted as a result of a variety of factors, only one of which includes funding. There may be factors acting as incentives or disincentives to organizations which include the use of resources or the loss or gaining of prestige which effect their decision for interorganizational coordination above and beyond an internal organization's ability to use funds to leverage for coordination.

The federally mandated cooperation under the CETA youth programs almost exclusively relies upon federal funding. (Taggart, 1978, p. 32). (Wurzburg, 1978, p. 44). For instance, there are four different types of mechanisms used under the youth programs: (1) twenty-two percent required CETA/LEA agreement for expenditures, (2) in school entitlement of jobs, (3) arrangements for offering academic credit for work experience; and (4) linkages for collection and delivery of occupational information (NOICC). The other area of fiscal incentives has been the use of five percent grants where as noted little leverage has been achieved.

Part of the reason why we have been fairly ineffective in using incentives or other mechanisms for achieving collaboration is that we have basically paid little attention to the fact that we are dealing with organizations and institutions who have fairly specific characteristics. In failing to pay attention to this aspect of the collaborative context we have failed to analyze the organizational mechanisms of maintenance and boundary permeability which either prohibit, discourage or permit collaboration. We must come to understand how organizations function so that we can more efficiently and effectively impact upon those functions in ways to achieve the goal of collaboration. However, collaboration is not itself an end but a means to other ends and it is the establishment of these other ends for which collaboration is a technique or mechanism that also must be examined.

In determining how we can impact on organizational behavior, Etzioni points out that organizations are characterized by divisions of labor, power and communication responsibilities. These are often formal but even more often informal. Second, organizations are usually characterized by the presence of one or more power centers which control the concerted efforts of the organization, directing the organization towards its goals. Third, organizations are able to substitute personnel by both removing unsatisfactory persons and by assigning persons other tasks. (Etzioni, 1974, p. 3). In this sense, organizations are not monolithic or do not function in simplistic and static

fashions but are dynamic, growing and everchanging entities. It is this character which both makes collaboration difficult and possible. We have come to understand the dynamics of a variety of factors which contribute to successful collaboration.

> Three of the factors which determine the amount of structure present in an organizational linkage are: whether the relationship is mandated by law; whether the interaction is mediated by a third party, e.g., a local coordination council or a common vertical hierarchy; and the extent to which procedures are codified. Personal agreements between representatives of two organizations may greatly facilitate the flow of elements between the respective organizations, but unless these procedures are clearly specified and formally included in the job description of the boundary personnel involved in the transactions, personnel turnover will destroy the linkage. (Whetten, 1977, p. 86).

There are some basic problems to coordination based upon the dynamic characteristic of organizations and the organizational imperative for self perpetuation. If an organization poses a threat to the autonomy of another organization, the second will be reluctant to cooperate. There must be countervailing compensation for giving up autonomy. Second, a lack of domain consensus between organizations is likely to preclude cooperation. Third, conflicting requirements for integration in systems in which an organization has multiple memberships will hinder collaboration with either system. Finally, extensive internal integration may reduce a system's potential for adaptation. Thus, the contextual relationships that organizations maintain and their internal structure and dynamics determine the extent to which an organization is willing to or able to collaborate and also the extent to which various mechanisms for collaboration will or will not be effective.

According to Reid, organizations also relate to each other in a variety of ways. (Reid, 1975, pp. 119ff). Organizations are either independent of each other, which makes coordination a very low level possibility, organizations may be interdependent in their relationship, and organizations may be in conflict with each other. Ironically conflict situation, may, by manipulation of the variables be convertible into an interdependent situation. The conflicts over which organizations have disagreements concern resource inputs in which they are both in a competitive situation for resources, over exchange of resources, clients, intangibles, etc., in which organizations may be in a conflict/bargaining situation, and over output or resources, for example, goals of the organization. This is a question of the legitimacy of each organization vis-a-vis the goals and output of the other organizations.

Reid identifies basically two modes of facilitating coordination among organizations that are available to an external coordinating agency. (Reid, 1975, pp. 120-122). The agency may either facilitate interdependence or it may induce interdependence. In facilitating interdependence a coordinating agency may assist in the development of interorganizational awareness of potential interdependencies in relation to existing goals and resources and it may enable organizations to reformulate or activate existing goals, to develop new goals, to develop new ways of using resources, or to compromise in the exchange or evaluation of resources. In inducing interdependence, the external coordinating

agency may use either resources, such as the fiscal incentives which have been discussed, or through the use of power or influence. The induction of interdependence has been the mode most often chosen by the federal government in terms of achieving collaboration. The use of facilitation of interdependence has been less often used but, as has been noted, may have more beneficial and long-range effects than attempts to induce interdependence either through the manipulation of resources or by the use of power or influence.

In attempting to use coercive power, either through resources or through other means of power to achieve coordination between agencies, the federal government, itself a political entity, faces the reality that those entities which it is trying to coordinate are themselves political entities and have characteristics indicative of those entities as political. It is this consideration which we now take up with respect to political considerations affecting interagency coordination for vocational education and manpower.

B. Political Considerations Affecting Interorganizational Coordination of Vocational Education and CETA

As we have seen, it is the chief elected official who has primary responsibility under CETA for policy development and program operation. The chief elected official functions within a political jurisdiction and thereby includes CETA in the political processes on the local level, which corresponds to CETA's involvement in the political processes at the national level. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 53). (Van Horn, 1979, p. 20).

> For the first time, local elected officials were infused into the manpower delivery system. Under the pure categorical grants-in-aid system, their participation in the infrastructure was limited to the number of grants they managed. As a prime sponsor under CETA, the elected official became the focal point of the local manpower program system - responsible for performing the basic functions of local policy determination, planning, and program delivery. Moreover, the local elected official's participation in manpower programming effectively severed the vertical functional relationships between the federal funding source and the local delivery agents which existed under the categorical system. Finally, the development and expansion of the elected official's staff effectively created another layer in the bureaucracy. (McPherson, 1976, p. 208). (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 104-105).

Such a devolution of responsibility for policy development and program operation to the local level has had the consequent result of increasing the importance of the public involvement at the county level which tends to make the administrator's task easier in terms of operating programs that meet with local approval. (Shaw, 1977, p. 518). County officials, municipal officials, as well as governors, are attuned to the dynamics of the political context in which they operate and to the concerns of satisfying the constituents which they serve. The realities of this context, however, are not those of a rational policy development approach to programs.

> The democratic process is not one of defining problems, articulating goals, and designing measures for their accomplishment. Such an approach, even if it were possible, would only clarify conflicting interests beyond the possibility of compromise. The role of the politician, and particularly the legislator, is the mediation of opposing interests into imperfect but saleable packages. Dimly perceived problems are subjected to inadequate analysis, proposals are developed in an atmosphere of self-hypnotizing enthusiasm,

> traded, compromised, and reshaped to win adequate backing, festooned with impossible promises, and often revised between authorization and appropriation. The bureaucracy may again relegislate in the interpretation of congressional intent and the writing of operational guidelines. Finally, the new program is confronted with the often unexpected realities of the problem it was meant to solve, then gradually reoriented in practice or through amendment into a useful policy instrument.
>
> Considering the seeming irrationality of the process, it is not the dissonances but the harmonies between cause and cure that are impressive. (Mangum, 1969, pp. 7-8).

Officials at both the national, state and local levels are involved in the same political context in which programs are developed and operated. It is this inexact and inelegant process in which programs become possible or impossible, and it is the dynamic character of this situation to which the political official is sensitive. The educational system, on the other hand, has only recently begun becoming politicized to the extent that it operates within the same type of contexts in which the elected officials have operated. (Mosher, 1977, p. 657). Such activities as unionization and bargaining have brought the educational system into the confrontational and cooperational mode of political dynamics which the local elected officials have been dealing with for a longer period of time.

It cannot be ignored that the passage of CETA involved the issue of who gained and who lost power (McPherson, 1976, p. 205). (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 259). The operation of the manpower programs and the devolution of responsibility to the states and local governments involves the sharing of

relative shares of power. Congress had been acutely aware of their loss of power in the shift to decentralization of the various aspects of CETA. Since its passage, there have been signals of Congress's desire to retain more control. The inauguration of CETA, through its various provisions giving funds to local and state governments for operation of programs, has profoundly affected the intergovernmental infrastructure. It has always been the case that the shaping of intergovernmental relations has been a function primarily of the federal system, by providing financial assistance to states and local governments. With the inauguration of the special revenue sharing part of CETA, and with the creation of authority among local elected officials for human service program delivery, this intergovernmental infrastructure has been challenged and relationships have changed. (McPherson, 1976, p. 207).

At the local level, the arrangements between the service deliverers of the pre-CETA era and that of the present has been changed to the extent that CETA has increased the number of service deliverers.

> According to a Department of Labor study, there was a 35 percent increase in the number of service deliverers in the first year - from an estimated 1,440 under MDTA and EOA sponsorship in fiscal 1974 to 1,950 under Title I of CETA in fiscal 1975. The number of subcontractors has continued to increase substantially. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 141).

This increased participation of the political actors in a system which has been somewhat political, but which as operated at the local level has tended to bypass the local

elected official, requires that we look more carefully at the political systems at both the local and national levels and their relationship as it effects the operation of the CETA program. Primary interest is in how this affects the collaboration between CETA manpower programs given that the vocational education and education establishment operates in somewhat different a system than the local elected official does. The possibilities for collaboration, thereby, become somewhat different in each case. The fact of multiple centers of political power impacts on performance, instrumental character and possibilities for interaction. It is the character of American society for separate institutions to share power. This is true also at the national governmental level.

> Fragmentation, decentralizaiton, and lack of system are the very hallmarks of American society and politics, deeply imbedded in our institutions. Richard Neustadt has captured this notion in describing our constitutional system as "separate" institutions sharing power : the array of constitutional checks and balances between the three branches; an executive branch establishment presided over by Cabinet officials who are often political rivals of the President and who, in any event, inevitably fall under the sway of career bureaucracies they nominally head rather than under the influence of the short-timers in the Executive Office of the President; a "national party system" that is in fact little more than a collection of state and political organizations, groups that are losing whatever coherence they once had to the forces of "reform" and the "independent" voter; a tradition of implementing national policy through mediation with the state and local governments (the most recent manifestation being revenue sharing); an expanding constellation of policy-oriented regulatory agencies that are independent of the President as a legal and structural matter, independent of Congress as a practical matter, and uncontrolled

> by the judiciary except in the most extreme cases of lawlessness; a federal judiciary that has come to play not only a significant policy-making role, but a policy-implementing role as well, in areas as disparate as education, corrections, housing, health care, political party structure, and transportation; and, reflective of all of the above, a political tradition of formally delegating great chunks of political power to well-organized private groups. (Schuck, 1976, p. 75).

These factors introduce dynamic elements into the intergovernmental relations forum thereby perpetuating a variety of intergovernmental relationships. The federal system itself is "a dynamic process producing a constantly changing set of relationships". (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 78). All levels of government are involved in the performance of shared governmental activities. These relationships tend to determine the programmatic priorities as a result of the differences of constituent demands. (Gilbert, 1976, p. 126). Programmatic conflicts are based in the political basis of constituent demands and changes.

> As political conditions change through time, the influence of various constituency groups changes or new constituencies come into existence. When such shifts are recognized in national legislation in a piecemeal way, the result often is a program whose unchanged preamble or statement of purpose may seem very different from the changed language of the operative clauses. Programs that endure are periodically subjected to thoroughgoing revision in order to bring some coherence to the relationship between program goals and program operations. Comprehensive revisions of this kind always have an "up-front" intellectual and policy rationale, but they are better understood as expressions of the current balance of power between the various constituencies serviced by the program. (Anton, 1979, p. 12).

It is not unusual then to expect the goals defined by this political process tend to be unclear and the resulting legislative and programmatic mandates can be confused and conflicting. (Schneider and Swinton, 1979, pp. 14-15). Federal laws and regulations in fact embody conflicting goals and intentions. This is reflected both at the national and at the local level. (O'Keefe, 1978, p. 190). Another factor that influences the quality and character of programs is that as buffeted by the demands of constituents, policymakers tend to abandon the approaches before they are adequately tested. (Mangum, 1969, p. 140). This concern for the short term benefit of constituent demand, when even weakly buttressed by longterm demands for programmatic consistency, usually result in the kind of program development through legislative mandate that may or may not satisfy the needs for long term national policies and goals.

With such a functional dynamic of the political process by which programs are generated, the American political situation involves an element of experimentation with organizational forms. This comes from the inevitable desire perhaps to make things better and seeing that institutional change is the mechanism for correcting social ills.

> The history of American politics is full of instances of experimentation, particularly with organizational forms. Often, indeed, the nation has turned with almost mystic faith to tinkering with institutions. The framing of consitutions, federal and state, may be regarded as collective acts of societies willing to try innovation. If their products combine forms and ideas handed to them by

> tradition, many of the combinations and some of the forms were novel, even brave. Federalism, separation of powers, the presidential institution, judicial review, these are some of the relatively untested devices the nation has committed itself to in spectacular fashion. (Greer and Minar, 1967, p. 167).

With institutional experimentation such a fundamental part of the American political milieu, it is not surprising that in the development of programs such experimentation and attempts at institutional change are evident. However, the approach to institutional change as anticipated or advocated by the experts of organizational behavior, and the research findings of these experts, are usually circumscribed by the operational principles and dynamics of a democratic society. (Weiss, 1978, p. 61). (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, p. 44). The extent to which professionalism and expertise become the basis upon which policy and program decisions are made is subserviant to the demands of the constituent group.

This differentiation is seen in the distinction between the alignment of programs from the national to the local level on a functional basis. First is the alignment of programs from the national to the local level on a governmental basis. Second is the alignment on a functional basis. From the latter perspective with respect to education the relationship between a federal government and the local agencies delivering educational programs is that of professional, or functional alignment. The relationship is from one administrative agency responsible for educational programs to another education agency

responsible for administration of programs. The interacting relationship, therefore, is between administrative professionals. With the advent of CETA, the relationship of vocational training programs and manpower programs shifted the relationship under special revenue sharing from that of a functional alignment of the national to the local level to that of a governmental alignment. The relationship has been defined as interaction between an administrative agency and the chief elected official. The relationship becomes that of government to government relationship.

While there has been too little time to analyze the effects of this change in the characteristics of the relationship between the national government and the local government, it is evident from other analyses that there are distinct differences between professional approaches and political approaches to problem solving into the implementation of social policy. The varied use of a politically decentralized system to implement CETA points to the difference between the approach of using a professional expertise in making policy and program decisions to that of operating within a political context. Centralized control tends to favor the specialist and professional approach to decision making in government while decentralization favors the generalist approach. (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 79). The local elected official tends to be more of a generalist and less of a specialist.

With this issue being raised, and there being apparently no correct or incorrect answer, it becomes apparent that there

is a need to delineate the roles and relationships of the major participants in vocational education and in manpower programs. (McPherson, 1976, p. 213). Certain of the programs operate in a context requiring collaboration stemming from a professional perspective and within an institutional setting where decisions are based on professional expertise, as the chief decision criterion. Other institutions operate in the collaborative context flowing from a perspective of political trade-off and the dynamics of intergovernmental relations. It is important to identify and determine the respective roles and relationships based on the capabilities of the respective participating institutions. For example, it has been observed that part of the reason for the lack of coordination under the 5% funds has involved the fact there are too many actors in order to achieve a consensus. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 64). The types of "actors" also plays a central and crucial role.

Other factors involved in this situation include the fact that the number of actors, by moving to the political or governmental operation of manpower programs, has been expanded. State legislatures, as relevant participants, are almost always ignored in the literature, especially by policy analysts in consideration of those factors which are relevant to making and carrying out policy. (Feller, 1975, p. 780). Policy has also been created and amended by the courts and has a significant impact upon program operation. (Gilbert, 1976, p. 124). (Hodginkinson, 1976, p. 18). It is not that these factors have

not been operative to a certain degree previously. To the extent that local elected officials both at the state level and the local level become the focal point for the operation of manpower programs, political dynamics, heretofore latent in manpower programs, become activated and crucially central to decisions. It becomes obvious also that the catalysts and facilitators for cooperation will therefore differ from state to state and from level to level in ways that we have not previously experienced. (Apker, 1979, p. 4).

Public administration functions in a political and a pluralistic context: A context from which the education communities and other professional institutions may be to a certain degree isolated. In a pluralistic society and in a pluralistic context, there is no unitary definition of public interest. (Schick, 1977, pp. 260-261).

> Groups are ordered by the degree to which they are likely to be affected by a decision. Trade-offs are constructed on the basis of the net benefits and losses to the most highly impacted groups. (Ukeles, 1977, p. 227).

This factor tends to generate a multiplicity of policy analysis approaches. Manpower itself, therefore, operates within such an institutional pluralism. (Lieske, 1976, p. 327).

The fact that public agencies themselves work in separate power and political galaxies, answer to different constituencies, and interrelate within those political galaxies with different political and private institutions, (Arnold, 1974, p. 209) mitigates against such public agencies cooperating when they have

pulls and tugs that diverge with respect to the agencies with which they should and must interact. It may be that vocational education's survival may be due to political rather than professional reasons. (Grubb, 1979, p. 211). However, this is not to assert that the political context and the constituents within which vocational education operates is the same as that within which manpower operates. In fact, it may be that they operate on highly different and institutionally segregated contexts.

One example may indicate the extent to which manpower programs may be at this time more responsive to the political dynamics in education. State legislatures have become increasingly interested in the influx of federal funds into states. In a few states, state legislatures reappropriate federal funds, thereby judging again the benefits to be derived from the use of those funds and assessing the relatedness between those programs and existing state programs. In this context, program administrators of manpower programs have been asked to justify the expenditure of funds according to the categories established by the federal government, and whether or not expenditure of funds according to those categories coincides or conflicts with priorities established by the state legislatures and other state agencies. This desire to achieve a coordination within the state, regardless of national priorities and possibly in contra-distinction to national priorities, has raised the issue for manpower programs which vocational education has only tangentially faced. From the point of view of justifying large state expenditures of vocational educational money for state agency staff, and

to the extent to which state legislatures become more active in making decisions in human service delivery programs, vocational education will experience increasing scrutiny on the part of state legislatures. Vocational education thereby will be thrust more directly into the political context of decision making that is familiar to state legislatures and governors.

It appears that interagency coordination and its concerns are basically bureaucratic issues involving administrative details. To date, those active in the political process have not paid much attention to the characteristics and the dynamics of interagency coordination, beyond simply mandating that coordination should take place, which is based on a more primary objective: that of reducing the duplicative expenditure of funds and the overlap of programs. (McPherson, 1976, p. 205). If interorganizational coordination is a mechanism whereby duplication and overlap will be reduced and higher efficiency and cooperation will be achieved, what are the trade-offs of priorities and obligations and divisions of responsibilities that the respective institutions will have to take? How do these trade-offs and divisions of responsibilities relate to the political process and the constituent demands that are also impinging upon the development of policy and programs at both the national and the local levels? To what extent will the administrators have to become more familiar with the political process in order to make those engaged in political decisions aware of the possibilities that interorganizational coordination may have with respect to

achieving other objectives and the extent to which inter-organizational coordination is not desired or is incapable of achieving other primary objectives? Administrative changes are certainly needed but it is possible that they are likely to effect only marginal improvements in manpower programs. (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, p. 61). To this extent inter-organizational coordination must be seen within its organizational context and political context with respect to that which can be reasonably achieved and when it is necessary to turn to other methods for achieving such coordination.

C. The Responsibilities of Public Administration

Many recognized that there is a need to reorder the network of governmental relationships given the recent discussions and observations relative to policy analysis. Much of the debate over the issues related to systems reorganization is a debate carried on by public administrators and much less so by elected officials. (McPherson, 1976, p. 205). Perhaps it is because politicians deal constantly with change, while bureaucracies tend to be static (incorporating change to help them to keep in touch with their environment), that the elected officials find that devising systems to reorganize governmental relations is much less of concern. Elected officials dealing as the representatives of a system of compromises, checks and balances finds that very little in his or her domain is static. If a change of direction is called for, it is fully within the capacity of that system for change to take place. Bureaucracy

tends to be more legalistic and has the responsibility for carrying out legislative mandates, often reinforced by judicial decisions. The tendency is to be more static and, therefore, to be concerned with issues related to change.

Part of the distinction between public administration, as a nonpoliticial activity, and the public arena may also account for the fact that public administrators have taken little heed to and had little concern for the political considerations in the context in which public administration operates. It was Woodrow Wilson who said "administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions; although politics sets the task for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices." (Frederickson, 1976, p. 564). However, it is generally agreed that public administration at least is integrally part of the political process. (Arnold, 1974, p. 210). (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 53).

The politician deals with power and not with profits. (Arnold, 1974, p. 205). Therefore, the politician's concern for the administration of public agencies and programs concerns itself with different attitudes towards management and output than perhaps would be found in the private sector. (Weidenbaum and Rockwell, 1977, pp. 67-69). (Shaw, 1977, p. 520). This distinction between the management approach of public administration as differing from the management approach of the private sector, has been made explicit with respect to the area of planning.

The government as a planning body has certain prerogatives and freedoms that are not available to the private sector. The private sector projects anticipated outcomes and futures which it then seeks to realize through adjusting its reactions to market and other factors.

> In striking contrast, the government is sovereign, and its planning ultimately involves the use of its power to achieve results it desires. Its influence is externally oriented, extending its sway over the entire society, including redistributing the resources of that society through taxation, regulation, subsidization, and procurement. Unlike a private organization, government may not only plan, it can also command. While a business firm can set goals only for itself, government can establish goals for society as a whole. (Weidenbaum and Rockwell, 1977. p. 60).

The administration of public programs, therefore, involves a degree of power not available to the private sector. It is for this reason as we have seen that the concern of the populace for vesting too much power in any one institution or agency has led to the establishment of conflicting and competing sources of politican and governmental power. The errors in planning for government are borne by the taxpayer and the consumer through the adjustments made by the government. For this reason, the limitation of power, and therefore the limitation of the liability of the public consumer, is insured.

In carrying out the function of public administration as a public trust and answering to the demands of the various constituencies, public administration has also performed the function of balancing these political demands with the interests

of minorities. (Frederickson, 1976, p. 567). In this sense, it carries out a mission which transcends the particularized demands of any individual constituency. In this way, public administrator is responsible for managing a set of dynamics which involves the coordination of conflicting or opposing or competing constituents and also constituents who have little power in terms of competing in this process. There is a need for the public administrator to manage the involvement and the linkages of the government in the process of determining the administration of public programs.

> Increasingly the administrator finds that rather than managing resources or managing a system, he is managing relationships, facilitating exchange of information and the development of understanding between and among the diverse components which make up the community. Increasingly our public institutions are being called upon to bridge the gaps which exist between these diverse components, to forge new linkages, to construct and facilitate networks which make it possible for individuals and institutions to draw upon each other. (Shaw, 1977, p. 519).

It is this management of interests which becomes a primary focus of the public administrator's responsibility. In so doing, the public administrator reflects the balance of concerns and demands that are the basis upon which the politican makes decisions. The public administrator faces many of the same kinds of decisions and problems of integrating the goals of all citizens and groups. (Weidenbaum and Rockwell, 1977, pp. 64-65). In this respect, the consonant quality of public administration with the political process reflects the reality that operations constitute policy and operations are

not neutral.

By focusing upon the relationship between public administration and its political context, it becomes evident that the political institution must incorporate the factors of change and development as characteristics of the institutions. The institution must be able inherently to adjust to the change of context and the change of demands. It must be able to develop criteria to measure its effectiveness in such a context of change. Frederickson has given us some examples of the types of change that he anticipates will be taking place in public administration in the next few decades. (Frederickson, 1976, pp. 568ff). He discusses the areas of change in the responsiveness of organizations, the notion of rationality by which organizations operate, the management worker/management citizen relations and the structure for organizations.

First, with respect to the need for change and responsiveness and the type of change and responsiveness, he sees that we will be moving from a situation where the problem is perceived as basically out of reform or change (putting right that which is wrong) to one of seeing the problem as institutionalizing change procedures, that is, the recognition that those things put right are unlikely to stay right and that developing correctibility criteria is as important as correctness. Also there will be a move from leadership by authority to leadership by change facilitation. Second, in terms of the rationality of organizational structure and behavior he identifies that we

will move from a situation where we believe that we know what ought to be done, and where the problem is one of discovering how to do it well to moving, to a situation where we know how to do things and where the problem is one of discovering how to determine what ought to be done. Planning will cease to be a crisis technique, and planning will be acting. Public administration will move from setting sensible goals and then institutionalizing to achieve them, to seeking to developing commitment to sensible action in order to achieve sensible overall objectives.

Third, with respect to the relations between management and workers and citizens, a situation which directly affects vocational education and training, Frederickson identifies a move from authority occurring from the top and moving down through the organization to a situation of authority coming from the group. It will also be a case of a change in attitude of the job as subsistence to the job being a satisfactory experience. Along with this will be a change in the characterization of the regimented work environment to that of the democratic work environment. Public administration will have to move from a conceptualization that conflict should be avoided to the awareness that conflict is good and should be accommodated and used. In such a situation, we will have to adapt our present view that consensus is necessary and that confrontation may be tolerated as long as it is transient (that confrontation may be productive of catastrophe if allowed to extend beyond marginal questions),

to a view that confrontation is necessary and consensus is tolerable as long as a great premium is not placed upon it. In this position, consensus may be productive of error if allowed to extend beyond the original conditions which produces it. Finally, Frederickson indicates changes in the structure of administration. He believes that we will change from centralization, which helps the manager make an effective and right decision, to decentralization where the task of the manager is to make sure that good decisions get made in the bowels of the organization and to be certain that they are not blocked. In this respect, we will move from an emphasis on institutional hierarchy to an emphasis on small decentralized hierarchies within large terminal projects.

Considering this sample of projections for the character of public administration, it becomes quite evident that there will be an increased emphasis on re-educating the public administrator. Such changes as Frederickson projects for public administration, however, are not limited to this sphere of work. The whole work environment itself will be undergoing such changes. However, for our purposes, it is enough to indicate that change in the characterizations of the various relationships in public administration point to the ever increasing awareness of the political context in which public administration operates.

In order to facilitate the developments that Frederickson has outlined, we will need more management studies of administrative

problems on the various levels of government and the trade-offs on such issues as centralization as compared with decentralization. Such a need has been identified in the area of manpower programs.

> More information is needed on administrative relationships between sponsors and subunits in counties, consortia, and balance of states. The Department of Labor should initiate studies of administrative problems such as the effects of administrative layers on processes, divided accountability, and the trade-offs between centralized and decentralized contracting and supervision of operations. Problems of fragmented administration and the effects of using planning organizations to administer programs in balance of states also need further exploration. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 264).

The key to successful interorganization of various agencies and institutions operating collaboratively in the public administration context is in matching charactertistics of each unique context with the appropriate level of integration. (Whetten, 1977, p. 77). (Schermerhorn, 1975, p. 850). It has been pointed out, in this respect, that the inauguration of CETA has created the need for higher order of public management and changed the public management environment by placing emphasis on political decision maker for central programs. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, pp. 185-186).

This change effects not only the local level but also the state level and the federal level, because it raises the issue of the relative roles and responsibilities, delegation and devolution of authority, accountability, and related matters. In this respect, public administration must face the question of its

relationship to the private sector in terms of improving the relationship of the values and operations of public administration with respect to those of the private sector.

Public administration, in carrying out manpower and employment and training programs, is required to impact upon the private sector. (NCMP, 1976, p. 61). (U.S./D.O.L., 1978, p. 61). Many of the changes that must take place in employment programs will have to take place in the private sector, and the impetus for this will come from the public sector where much of the training of the workers for the future takes place. In order to have a satisfied worker, for example, we need to have satisfying work.

> If we are to enhance payoffs between education and employment futures it is essential to devote more time and effort to establishing a social system which is capable of absorbing workers and providing workers with conditions which will take advantage of the skills and motivation which these people bring into the work market. (Gottlieb, 1977, p. 40).

The emphasis of vocational trainers on reducing the dropout rate will have to be achieved through improved transitions. (Kirst, 1979, p. 62). The transitions will be ever increasingly emphasizing the quality of work that the worker will be performing. While most skill training may take place on the job, (Thurow, 1979, pp. 324-325) industry training has been quite limited and limiting (McGowan and Cohen, 1977, p. 36) and, therefore, the vocational community will have to assess the quality of skill training in its relevance to their providing training and preparation for work, and in re-training people for skills in new technologies.

Vocational education and manpower programs will also have to deal with the issue of limited industry involvement in both vocational educational programs and manpower programs. This limited involvement has been due to (1) the fact that industry has been disillusioned with vocational education and manpower programs, (2) the isolation of educators, (3) some union provisions, (4) lack of mechanisms for communication and cooperation. (NAM, 1975, pp. 9-10) (Cameron, 1979, pp. 116-118). Vocational educators and manpower administrators will have to be looking at the types of businesses and industry operations that are most often served by vocational education and manpower to better understand the nature of those industrial and business groups with which they must form collaborative relationships. This also includes collaboration with labor unions.

We must assess the extent to which vocational education can have a positive impact on those responsible for the design of the work setting, those responsible for increasing work opportunities, and those responsible for absorption and integration of the work force, namely the private sector where four out of five jobs are created. (OECD, 1964). In this respect, vocational education must assess what measures are being used to relate to the needs of industry at the local level through vocation education and manpower programs. Ultimately it is business and labor that have the responsibility to provide opportunities for work. (Michael, 1976, pp. 605-606). It is they who must redesign work settings and procedures to take

advantage of the skills and abilities and expectations of those entering the work force. (Gottlieb, 1977, p. 48). However, it is the responsibility of vocational education and manpower agencies to assess the extent to which such collaborative linkages to facilitate this development have not taken place, and the extent to which such collaborative linkages are possible.

There will be the continuation of a decrease of in-house training by industry and a greater use of outside agencies for training. (Amara, 1978, p. 12). For most industries, it is not cost-effective for them to do their own training, and the large industries that do their own training perform basically industry related skill training. There is still a large responsibility in this area for vocational training. Vocational education has not been isolated from the various forms of skill training that relate to on-the-job work. Vocational education utilizes training on the job, in school, and in other institutional settings, and in this respect should be ready to provide the kind of well-rounded training and skill experience that employers find valuable in workers. (Swanson, 1978, p. 88). One possibility that has been suggested is that consortia of employers who cannot provide training indivudally could provide and purchase training from education and manpower agencies. (Becker et al., 1965). There is obviously a need to assist industry with such training and it is up to vocational education to determine the means by which such training can be provided with the greatest facility and flexibility for industry, but also

providing the best skill training that an individual needs. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 116) (Kirst, 1979, p. 64).

As publically administered programs, vocational education and manpower have a responsibility to develop collaborative linkages between their respective institutional contexts, and with the private sector. To this end, the observation on the particular characteristics of the public administration context, and the research that can highlight the dynamics of inter-organizational cooperation, provide guidelines for positive strategic developments. The feasibility of national or nation-wide policy thrusts, in achieving the collaboration sought, derives support or opposition from the foregoing discussion of the public policy context.

CHAPTER IV

TOWARDS A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY AGENDA

A. A National or Nation-wide Vocational Education Policy

Our discussion has focused on the variety of factors affecting vocational education and manpower programs in terms of their functioning as administrative systems. It has also focused on the contexts in which they operate, including demographic and technological factors. We have seen that vocational education and manpower are not monolithic systems but involve several levels of governmental institutions and a variety of actors and groups impinging upon each other and deciding policy. For these reasons it is justified to ask whether vocational education requires a national policy, or perhaps a nation-wide policy.

The distinction between the two center around the distinction between a policy that would be national, that is a policy uniformly derived and uniformly applicable to all vocational educational programs in the United States, and a nation-wide system which would include basic principles but which would be developed at the regional and local level with differentiations appropriate to the various contexts and actors relevant for implementation of policies. Currently, there has been a call for a national vocational education policy. The reasons given for having a national vocational education policy would apply equally well to reasons for having a nation-wide policy. The

reasons presented are first, the scope of the responsibilities a vocational education establishment has never been precisely defined; second, vocational education is vulnerable to attack because there is no articulated policy against which its effectiveness can be measured; third, there is a need to strengthen local control and adaptability with a clear and comprehensive policy which defines goals precisely.. (Feldman, 1976, pp. 5-8). For these reasons alone a nation-wide vocational education policy should be developed. Such a policy could be generated at the national level but could not be developed at the national level only. Policy developments at the local and state levels have taken a step forward in the last decade, and the capabilities of both the state and local levels to engage in policy research and policy analysis have increased along side their authority and responsibility for managing additional human resource programs, most specifically manpower programs.

With respect to vocational education, the current situation may be one of existing policy centers throughout the country, which is not unacceptable except for the fact that there appears to be little coordination of policy development among these centers.

> Perhaps the trouble is that there is a national public policy, or a constellation of public policies, toward vocational education. It consists in all the actions taken through public policy-making procedures--legislative, executive, administrative, and judicial--on all three levels of government, involving the use of public resources, affecting the provision, consumption, promotion, and regulation of a public service referenced in public documents as vocational education. In short, national policy toward vocational

> education is what a highly decentralized, publicly maintained and operated enterprise identified, with considerable ambiguity, as vocational education in fact does on a day to day basis.
>
> This conception of what a national policy may be in fact appears, however, to be less than satisfactory to those who expect that policies in operation should display features of clarity and economy of goal structure, as well as coherence and internal consistency in the means stipulated for fulfilling stated goals. (David, 1977, p. 10).

It is for the very reasons that some expect policies to display certain features of clarity and economy of goal structure as well as coherence and internal consistency that the analysis as indicated by this paper should be accomplished. It is not that the constellation of public policies, either generated at the local level or defined in the day-to-day operation, should cease to exist but that we must come to better understand the various factors by which policy is defined and the role of the actors at the various levels in defining and creating policy. We can then come to better understand the mechanisms involved in policy development.

It is not the case that we should opt for a loose system without criteria for evaluation of performance. Specifications of national vocational education goals should be particular enough for measurement. (Lindman, 1976, pp. 121-122) (University of California, 1975, pp. 13-14) (Walsh, 1979, p. 231). For example, vocational education can be measured on (1) its ability to create the skills demanded by employers, and (2) on the necessity of acquiring those skills not in academic but in

vocational education environments. (Thurow, 1979, p. 336). But for the development of a nationwide vocational education policy and for the realistic measurement of the effectiveness of that policy, we cannot ignore differentiations and distinctions that exist and opt for an overly-simplified model of what a nation-wide or a national vocational education policy should look like.

In defining vocational education policy for an entire nation, it would be helpful to do this in a context of defining also a nation-wide manpower policy recognizing that certain elements of manpower policy would have more centralized characteristics than perhaps vocational education would have. But what would a national manpower policy look like?

> Some delineation of what is meant by a national manpower policy framework is in order. The concept of a national manpower policy has been discussed by many, but it has not been well defined as to what it would be or how it would be structured and implemented. Conceptually and operationally, it has many illusive dimensions that preclude sharp demarcation and exposition, but the following major elements can be identified:
>
> A fairly explicit set of principles and goals.
>
> Specific objectives, with standards and time tables.
>
> A series of program and operational measures.
>
> A range of coordinated delivery systems, with accountable management structures.
>
> An infrastructure of manpower policy making institutions tied into the economic policy institutions.
>
> Other support institutions for labor market information and data, as well as a related research effort.
>
> Performance standards for both policy and program assessment, with an evaluation and control system. (NCMP, 1976, pp. 13-14).

Such a framework for a national manpower policy does not preclude the possibility of formulating a nation-wide framework for manpower policy. A framework would include some of the very considerations for local policy making and the devolution of federal responsibilities to the local levels, recognizing that the diverse and pluralistic context in which policy is made in both formal and informal ways.

Another consideration, taken from the context of national economic planning, points to the limitations such a national planning or policy attempt may have.

> Thus, "American-style" national economic planning would not be planning at all and could not fulfill the objectives of planning. It could provide no coherent social goals. It could not dispel our intractable ignorance about the social organism. The more comprehensive its reach would become, the less sure would be its grasp. And its rationality would quickly dissolve in the yeasty medium of politics.
>
> If national economic planning would accomplish no good, however, it is also likely to do little harm, if only because the dominant, and predominantly hostile, political reality to which it must speedily adapt will deny it any real influence. Yet for all of that, national economic planning in some form appears inevitable in America. Its natural enemy, big business, has lost its hard edge of opposition, sensing perhaps that planning can be easily co-opted. (Schuck, 1976, pp. 77-78).

With the possibility that national economic planning may be a chimera for which little effort should be expended, a question is raised as to whether manpower and vocational education planning and policy development should support attempts to make a national, single and coherent policy. (Kirst, 1979, p. 53) (U.S./HEW, 1977, p. 14). Planning and policy making for

vocational education do not occur at the federal level, and vocational education is "a national program only in the sense that it is a collection of state programs in which there is a federal interest." (Swanson, 1978, p. 87). A federal interest, however, does not constitute a national policy and we have to ask more carefully the extent of which the search for a national policy as opposed to a nation-wide policy is a realistic objective.

We must then ask what a nation-wide pluralistic vocational educational policy would look like. Such a policy might, apart from national economic programs to stimulate manpower demand, specify specialized programs to encourage local and regional development of employment opportunities. (OECD, 1964, p. 16). A step in the direction of such local development opportunities might be Kruger's blueprint for a comprehensive vocational education and manpower delivery system. Kruger specifies ten elements in such a system: first, a need to consolidate programs; second, mandated groups of workers to be served; third, a meaningful and manageable role for federal, state, and local government agencies and non-profit agencies in planning and delivery of services; fourth, a more pronounced role for the state, possibly with the governor as the state manpower agent or the mandating of a state manpower agency; fifth, new institutional arrangements to foster and improve the federal, state, and local government relations; sixth, clarification of the role of public service employment; seventh, improvement of

the functioning of the labor market; eighth, improvement of the delivery of manpower services mandating accountability, establishing a due process system in the application of rights, and more emphasis on staff training including interagency training; ninth, an adequate level of an advanced funding; tenth, establishment of a national institute for manpower policy. (Kruger, 1972, p. 20). Kruger's blueprint is possible, while it may omit some elements that we have discussed. It focuses on several that are quite important including the role of the state and improvement of manpower services and a meaningful and manageable role for each of the levels of government agencies and for non-profit agencies. It is a step in the direction of including those groups that realistically have a part in developing vocational education and manpower policy.

One of the most important factors that will have to be an element of such a blueprint are mechanisms for opening the boundaries of various institutions to permeability from other institutions which have a share in and affect the development of their own policies and programs. Such an attempt will not be met with favor from most organizations, which currently are in competition with each other for funds. It may even be necessary to amend our concept of organizational behavior and institutional existence.

> It shall be necessary for public administration to develop what might be called "structural dynamics." In structural dynamics it will be necessary to have an arsenal of organizational models, with any one model or combination of models ready for use when needed. Only in this way can organizations change

> as rapidly as will likely be necessary. So while the effective public administrator will need to understand and work effectively with people, that administrator will also need to know how to organize those people to effective patterns of interaction. It is those structures that we have ignored, and it is my best guess that we are likely to see a much fuller array of structural alternatives being developed in the future. (Frederickson, 1976, p. 573).

The rationale for such a flexible and multivaried approach to models of organization would be that such definition of the policy context would be more realistic in terms of the factors involved in development of policy. It has become more evident that policies and the mix of programs should be variable. The structures for developing policy and implementing policy also must be mixed and variable. While it is true that the nature of manpower and labor market policies and the mix of programs should be variable with (1) the nature of unemployment, (2) the levels of unemployment at the time, and (3) with the mix of individuals seeking work, (NACVE, 1977, p. 2) it is also true that the organizational and institutional structures and mechanisms must themselves be variable with respect not only to these factors but with respect to the whole range of factors that we have been discussing.

It is not likely at this time that such a notion will have wide-based popular support, and there is a great deal of analysis that must be done in terms of adjusting this notion with the notion of policy harmonization of various policy arenas in the larger context of policy development. However, I believe that the results, if such an approach were utilized, would be far

more beneficial and fruitful than to take the current approach of static organizations with semi-fixed and autonomous boundaries, each trying to approach the other from an isolated world view. What this situation is evidence of is the dilemma that exists in policy making of the tensions between precision and consensus. (David, 1977, p. 14). On the one hand, there is the drive for precision and parsimony. On the other is the political drive for consensus, ambiguity, and decentralization.

The ambiguity of policy and policy focus facilitates consensus at the same time that it appears to confound precision. However, we may have to develop different notions of precision or notions of precision that are more accurate to the situation at hand. The question at this point is whether the techniques and insights for interorganizational coordination would provide a tool for policy harmonization efforts or whether this is simply an administrative consideration. We have looked at the findings of interagency coordination theorists with respect to public administration at large and with respect to vocational education manpower programs in particular. It is not clear at this point whether the insights would provide opportunities for achieving the kind of consensus mode of pluralistic vocational education policy in a nation-wide effort, or whether another approach to interagency coordination would be effectively utilized as an administrative mechanism for achieving implementational coordination, after policy harmonization had been achieved.

B. Issues of Policy Harmonization for Vocational Education

Vocational education is defined by a web of social and economic policy domains. (David, 1977, p. 17). This dependence of vocational education on other policy areas increases the need to understand the activities of those other policy areas. It also creates a climate in which there is an increased need for policy harmonization between the areas, as policy analysis has become more sophisticated over the last several years and as the acceleration of activities within the various policy areas has generated more attention to policy considerations, focusing on long range rather than short range approaches to program design. The need to coordinate the activity in areas such as economics, social welfare, education, skill training, and so on have become more evident.

It is no longer possible to settle for ad hoc policy development where funding priorities and mechanisms, determining program goals, are implemented in a piece-meal fashion, or implemented without regard to the effects that they have on other programs. There is a difference, however, between coordinated policy development and centralized policy decision making. On all levels of government, and in both the private and the public sectors, policy analysis and policy making takes place. The problems that have developed are because there are few mechanisms for coordinating these activities, such that decisions and concerns and considerations in one area are known and taken into account in other areas, and that the objectives

of each area, while perhaps not totally coordinated and without conflict, are at least known and taken into consideration in setting objectives in other policy areas. There are several tendencies that shape public policy in the United States, and it is these tendencies which will continue to shape the policy in the United States' third century.

> Ten such tendencies are: Environmental constraint, the modern mixed economy, the changing international order, postindustrial society, changing political values and ideaologies, modern mass communications, urban society, the growing density and changing balance of federalism, the modern administrative state, and the changing character of public policy. Popular sovereignty, the people's ability to control government, is a useful rubric under which to consider democratic conditions for shaping public policy. The party system is critical in effectuating popular sovereignty. Other concerns are the role of interest groups, political and civic participation, and elections. Requirements of popular sovereignty culminate constitutionally in policy shaping by responsible officials: Congress and the President. Our ways of shaping policy are as subject to constructive change through public understanding as through legislative actions or constitutional amendments. (Gilbert, 1976, p. 116).

The one tendency, which has been the most pervasive consideration of this paper, has been the changing character of public policy, which Henry David identifies as perhaps the most important sphere for the formulation of vocational education policy. (David, 1977, p. 17). There are several factors with respect to the changing character of public policy that affect the development of vocational education policy as it relates to its own objectives and as it relates to the harmonization with other policy areas. The more public policy there is the more it shapes while it is being shaped. (Gilbert, 1976, p. 123). Public policy generation

creates the climate in which more public policy is generated because of the preponderance of public policy. The generation of public policy also generates new expectations and demands which therefore create political overlaps and overloads. The generation of public policy exacerbates conflicts over the technological determination of public policy. This reflects the conflict between precision and consensus. Finally, public policy is defined by organizational precedents and constraints, which affect the generation of public policy and the kinds of policy which are generated.

To seek policy harmonization of the various policy areas in their generation of policy does not mean that the concept of harmonization eliminates the reality of, or the need for, conflict. The Constitution of the United States recognizes the reality of and the need for conflict and the need for mechanisms for conflict resolution. (Weiner and Wildavsky, 1978, pp. 10-11). It is not by the elimination of conflict that policy is made, but it is by the control of conflict and the amelioration of conflicting claims that harmonization's effects in program development and the selection of objectives is achieved. Another factor that shapes policy is that, in a pluralistic society, policy emerges. (Mangum, 1969, pp. ix-x). It is, therefore, not made in a coherent sense. (Ibid., p. 11). When two institutions or policy areas share common goals or goal structures, the consequents of the shared goals is the increased possibility of conflict over program outputs and

resource utilization. But the more important objective is to achieve conflict resolution. (Reid, 1975, p. 124). The challenge for a democratic society is to achieve conflict resolution without the need for a super-coordinating agency, or power, demanding coordination but through the development of collaborative mechanisms whereby the autonomous or semi-autonomous institutions, each controlling resources, can coordinate their activities and harmonize their objectives and policy goal structures.

Vocational education then should consider well what policy areas it is in competition with, because policy harmonization attempts to heighten the differences and the conflicts between such areas. One of the problems that emerges is that each policy area is more likely to be measured differently, each having different or conflicting objectives. The concerns for allocating resources, for choosing objectives between the conflicting policy areas, and the measures by which effectiveness will be determined cause some difficulty. It is awkward to determine the relative impact of such competing programs and to resolve issues of trade-offs. (Schiller, 1978, p. 109). But as we have seen, it is just these and similar issues that will be the central focus for public administration. Public administration will increasingly be more concerned with issues external to individual policy areas, such as boundary problems. (Frederickson, 1976, p. 571).

A related factor confounding the smooth harmonization of policy areas is the existence of alternative conceptions for each policy area. (Lerwick, 1979, p. iii). Given alternative conceptions, conflicts within a policy area over objectives, boundaries, resources, and outputs will make harmonization more difficult with other policy areas for whom some of the same resources, boundaries, and objectives may be in contention. In this respect, policy perspectives do not cancel each other out. but tend to become composite without reconciliation. (David, 1977, p. 13). This creates a situation of policy by aggregation and inherent conflicts are generated and compounded over time. The coordination of the various pieces of policy development becomes more difficult and continued policy hegemony becomes more and more detrimental to harmonization. (Heclo, 1975, pp. 404-405).

It must be warned, however, that there are negative consequences of over-emphasizing the adversarial quality of policy thinking. (Lynn, 1978, p. 16). The result could be a lack of the common set of relationships agreed to as the focus of the discussion. A lack of consensus also develops as to what is being discussed. For example, there is a lack in vocational education on (1) agreement on how the problems being addressed should be defined, (2) how situations should be represented, and (3) on the range of available options. (David, 1977, p. 13). Such consequences of conflict and diversity pull against harmonization. However, they are elements of the very

fabric of policy making and point again to the need for mechanisms to achieve consensus and mechanisms for collaboration. These tensions arise from a very real fact of the nature of policy making and that the power to influence policy is fragmented and adversarial. It has been indicated that the essence of federalism is overlap and redundancy. Martin Landau has indicated

> What appears is a truly messy stystem--one that is anathema to our prevailing conceptions of a viable organization. There is no unity of command and there are no unequivocal lines of authority. Domains overlap, jurisdictions are confused, and accountability is dispersed. And for each citizen, there is, at least, two of everything....Virtually every aspect, every feature, every agency, and every structure of government was duplicated and still redundancy was not exhausted. (Weiner and Wildavsky, 1978, p. 17).

Weiner and Wildavsky point out that the crucial point not acknowledged by planners is that this system was intended. It is planning with a different aim, however. It is the generation of society's objectives and the means to achieving those objectives through careful structuring of social interaction and choice. (Winer and Wildovsky, 1978, p. 17). The emphasis on mechanisms to achieve consensus do not focus on the synoptic view of the expert but places the emphasis on the development of communication linkages to maintain diversity within interdependency. (Shaw, 1977, p. 520).

Perhaps the competition experienced among programs is not a negative factor and duplication should be allowed because it serves some other objective. (Whetten, 1977, p. 81). However, such possibilities should not occur sotto voce, but should be the focus of the discussion. Such considerations, while not

resolving all issues, should take into consideration the fact that the conflict as an objective may have a positive value for policy determination. Policy determination requires normative concepts of trade-offs and values and in such there is a danger in insisting upon too much rationality.

> There are dangers, however, in insisting upon too much rationality in determining priorities. Large-scale changes are probably discouraged by such an approach. Opponents of change can always demand more experimentation and a more "measured" pace of expansion. (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, p. 59).

This recognizes that there may never be a best choice among alternatives or even a finite number of alternatives from which to choose. As conceptions of various policy areas proliferate, as policy areas overlap and involve each other, this "messy system", contrary to being characterized as an undesirable situation, may be viewed as a possibility for achieving the very linkages which we have been seeking. In the area of program implementation, we are not too clear as to what specific objectives a program should seek or how program activities might produce desired result. (Morehouse, 1972, p. 873). With such uncertainty because of the nature of the beast with which we are dealing, we should look at policy analysis and policy development not as a scientific endeavor but as an endeavor of creative social process. To this end, we must reorient ourselves in terms of the kinds of analysis that are carried on under policy development. We need research which examines the effects of different patterns of delivery of program services in such a way we can

understand a variety of options and possibilities as well as understand the concerns and considerations that were behind implementation of various patterns. (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 268-269). (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 140). We should examine vocational education and manpower under comprehensive, mixed, and categorical systems, we should examine them under centralized and decentralized systems, and we should examine the delivery models involving a wide spectrum of services. What are some of the policy analysis research and data needs considerations that policy analysis for vocational education should consider? We now turn to this.

C. Issues of Policy Analysis Research and Data Needs

The aims of policy research are first, to achieve relevance to the concerns of decision makers; second, to recognize that there are no ultimate solutions; third, to exhibit a concern for variables which are controllable; fourth, to achieve credibility for the research and the researchers, and finally, to consider the intended audience and the format for implementation. (Bushnell, 1975, pp. 4-5). Within these aims of policy research we must ask what the focus for research and development should be with respect to organizational change as it affects vocational education. What are the avenues that should be explored and what are the factors that should be considered in determining the character of organizational change or whether the concern should be for the improvement of the quality of the present organization or structure rather than to change it? (Venn, 1975,

p. 20). Beckman has indicated 12 analyses that the policy analysis should undertake relative to developing policy that is effective in implementing this policy. These analyses include: (1) underlying assumptions and their implications, (2) information gaps, (3) internal consistencies, (4) conflicts with other goals, policies, and programs, (5) political consequences, (6) impacts on society, the economy, and the environment, etc., (7) problems of administrative implementation, (8) institutional aspects, (9) problems of coordinating interdisciplinary impact, (10) hypothetical alternatives, with disqualifying reasons for those ruled out, (11) realistic alternatives, with pros and cons of each, (12) evaluation, oversight and follow-up requirements and procedures. (Beckman, 1977, p. 223). Policy analysis must therefore consider the objectives, the alternatives, the costs, the models, and the criteria. (Burt, 1974, p. 8).

One facet which this discussion has focused upon is the analysis of the performance in the organizational structure of vocational education as it relates to manpower power. (Mead, 1979, p. 27). Organizational analysis of vocational education as an institution, and particularly in the context in which it operates, should be expanded. Organizational analysis has developed techniques for looking at such characteristics.

In general, organizational analysis has broadened its concerns to include:

1. both formal and informal elements of the organization and their articulation;
2. the scope of informal groups and the relation between such groups inside and outside the organization;

3. both lower and higher ranks;
4. both social and material rewards and their effects on each other;
5. the interaction between the organization and its environment;
6. both work and non-work organizations.

(Etzioni, 1974, p. 49).

We have also concentrated on the fact that interorganizational coordination may differ between hierarchal levels and between systems. (Klonglan et al., 1976, p. 677). It is relevant to consider that there are alternative patterns of delivery and the assessment of these and the impact upon interagency coordination and policy harmonization should be assessed. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 269).

Another factor which has been little analyzed with respect to vocational education is analysis which resources the various actors will use to gather support to achieve their objectives. The types of resources which are available are material, symbolic, physical, positional, information, and skill. (Meltsner, 1972, p. 862). The various actors employ these resources in seeking to gain support for positions and objectives. We need to understand which resources are most applicable in which context and how effective various resources are to achieving different goals.

With the proliferation of research and demonstration and the generation of studies, we must also be careful to consider the effects of research on information as it affects governmental operations. (Henry, 1974, p. 190). The increased reliance on information tends to favor professionals. Bureaucracies almost inevitably tend to distort information and there are

geometric effects of information as utilized by bureaucracies. Studies are not neutral and the effect of studies are not neutral. As we call for more investigation of the various elements of policy analysis, of the resources used in program implementation, and the analysis of the elements of program success or failure we cannot ignore the impacts that the generation of such information will itself have on policy development and policy making. The effects may be detrimental or positive but without due consideration of these factors, we will ignore one of the most dynamic aspects of policy making today.

We must also be aware that the overrationalizing of policy making tends to ignore the fact that new policy thrusts are based more on ideology than they are on analysis. (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, p. 46). (Venn, 1975, p. 3). This is in part due to the fact that policy makers cannot comprehend the whole fabric of society and with the enormous amount of information available and much of it seeming irrelevant to the concerns of policy makers, the tendency is to seek to act on the basis of that which the actor in the policy arena knows best. The seeming interrelatedness of our society and the fact that effects in one policy arena have effects in the other may give the illusion that the fabric of society as a whole which any one policy maker or group of policy makers can comprehend, but there is indistinctiveness in boundaries of the universe of discourse. (Siegel, 1965, pp. 269-270). There is the indefiniteness and incomplete quantifiability of this world. There are

limitations of human knowledge. There are factors that interfere with the assignment of alternative uses of resources. There are unknown consequences of implementing certain policy stances. These are beyond and perhaps will always be beyond the range of human understanding to grasp. It is for this reason the changes, and particularly vocational education changes, have grown from societal changes rather than from research. (Venn, 1975, p. 6). There are many reasons for the lack of impact of vocational education research. First, there is a lack of dissemination of results, and second, a failure to interpret the results in operational terms. (Evans et al., 1969, pp. 94-95). But perhaps the more overriding reason for the lack of impact is that research as yet has not been identified in its place in the arsenal of the policy maker for determining how policy should be developed and how to choose between policy options and conceptualizations.

Policy analysis must also take into account that people learn and can change behavior. (Roberts, 1978, p. 33). Emphasis on quantifiability and precision can never match the world of reality in which policy analysis operates because people react to policy decisions. Economic, social welfare, national defense, education, and so on. In their reactions people themselves become vectors in the policy analysis arena which must be taken into account at a later date by policy analysts. Since these reactions are difficult if not impossible to determine, the attempt to policy analysis which seeks the scientific model will never be

precise enough to achieve the objectives that scientific analysis requires. It is for this reason that I have suggested that policy analysis operate in terms of models which have a pluralistic and political direction. One example that indicates the problems that a policy analyst must deal with, in terms of people's changing behavior, concerns the perceptions of standards of living and what is acceptable in the work environment. As the workers shift from higher aspirations to great expectations, there is an increasing dissatisfaction with underemployment. (Gottlieb, 1977, p. 43). This problem which concerns manpower experts and vocational education alike may have little control value with respect to developing policies because, as opportunities increase in terms of the increasing quality of the work life, aspirations and expectations may also increase to keep pace, and dissatisfaction may not abate.

As we have noted, there are some fundamental differences between policy research conducted as a science and politics.

> Politics is quite different from science: The intent is to find one purpose, or course of action, acceptable to individuals espousing diverse purposes, values, and courses of action. Politics is value expressive; facts are subordinate to and sustaining of values, and only contribute to the delineation of an issue. The politican seeks to maximize the satisfaction of his interests; he must be bold, persistent, opportunistic, and capable of mobilizing and sustaining belief and commitment.
>
> It is extremely difficult for an individual to retain his credibility in these two very different areas. The scientist who is too action-oriented loses his credibility in the same way that the politician who is too theory-oriented loses his. But the basic problem is not the ability or inability of an individual

> to wear two hats, but rather the incompatibility of science and politics: One trades in facts and the other in values. (Rein and White, 1977, pp. 135-136).

The result of the confusion of the objectives of science and the objectives of politics which may not be as totally incompatible as might seem has been in many cases the misuse of educational research for advocacy purposes. (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, pp. 42-43). There are, however, many reasons for the factors contributing to the misuses of education for advocacy purposes and the undermining through changes in policy. First, research tends to focus on the most controversial issues which may be unpopular for reasons not related to the program's merit; second, program evaluations are flexible and reflect the changing fortunes of the program study; third, studies that contradict prevailing policies are often ignored while those in agreement are publicized; fourth, separate programs have an inertia sustained by the vested interests and established obligations to constituents and resists unfavorable changes in policy; fifth, the success of a program does not insure its expansion. The approach may be assigned elsewhere under different administration and authority; sixth, results of experimental efforts can be misused in the support of desired policies through, for example, distorting the significance of results; finally, when legislation is designed to implement the reform suggested by evaluation, there can be no certainty that the desired improvements will result.

Bureaucracies, for example, have their input and control in the implementation of policy. This is not to suggest that it is inevitable that research will be misused for any advocacy purpose, but that such a possibility exists and the researchers and analysts must take into account the possible context in which the research may be disseminated and the fact that research must undergo the criterion of consensus.

It has been noted that policy makers in the more established policy areas tend to be more concerned with striking bargains than with innovation. (Lynn, 1978, p. 18). This tendency towards institutionalization of policy positions mitigates in favor of the bureaucratization of policy as opposed to the tugs and strains of the political context which, while consensus is difficult to achieve and the trade-offs might be less than conceptually elegant, tends to favor change. Running the findings of research and the recommendations and policy initiatives and research through the organization necessary to achieve the implementation tends to mute the impact of research. (Shaefer, 1974, p. 7). (Weiss, 1978, pp. 47-48). Organizations operate individualistically rather than within a broad mission and are, by and large, internally directed. (Venn, 1975, pp. 2-3). This tends to shape the nature of the implementation of policy away from harmonization and coordination, for the essence of social experimentation is often ignored in the place of political considerations. (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, p. 32). It is just this factor which the policy analyst must consider

carefully in order to determine the reasons why research and research findings are either distorted or ignored in the context in which such research should have the most impact.

Policy research aids in the consideration of goals, means, funding, and administration. (Weiss, 1978, pp. 63-64). While the policy makers, politicans, and the public may wish to ignore these factors or while the considerations of the smoke-filled rooms may mitigate against a rational or a precise answer to social problems, it is often to the findings of social research and the testimony of experts that the politicians and the policy makers turn. Often times, they are looking simply for a legitimization of a position which they have already formulated. But often times, when they do not receive the information which they are looking for and receive information contrary to their cherished beliefs, they have to deal with this conflict. Policy analysts realize that they have an important function in making, remaking, and unmaking of policy.

To this extent, policy direction should be very carefully chosen and the questions posed by policy and evaluation research should be carefully formulated. It is important to determine the best questions to be asked about the efficiency and effectiveness of vocational education. Such questions might include (a) in what types of education do society and the individual students get the best return on their time and money?; (b) what is the interaction among student ability, social class, and motivation, as they affect the costs and effectiveness of various educational

programs?; (c) how much time is required for the graduates of a vocational education program to adapt to the techniques of the contemporary productive enterprise? (Evans and Herr, 1978, pp. 95-98). We have little or no data on the relative effectiveness of public and private schools and no systematic methods exist for the collecting information on the output of the various occupational training programs. One approach to correct this deficiency would be to strengthen the Bureau of the Census survey of high school graduates to obtain data on labor force experiences of those who do not go on to college. (Freeman, 1976). We can also examine the benefits to individuals who have taken vocational education. Swanson, 1978, pp. 88-89). Such data must be the focus for determining the efficiency and effectiveness of vocational education: (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 237-238). We must carefully form the questions because the answers we get may be confused or confounding and may present a picture that is not only unrecognizable by the audience in the policy making arena but may also confuse the discussion by raising irrelevant and unclear issues.

We need the same kind of efficiency and effectiveness measures for manpower programs. We need to determine which programs and for which groups, under which economic conditions, are efficient. But this is difficult to determine precisely.

> Essentially, the issue of relative effectiveness boils down to the question of which manpower program models work best for specific target groups under given economic conditions. As might be expected, information on this issue is scarce. First of all,

> individual studies of specific programs have generally yielded uncertain estimates of average program effects. Second, the various manpower programs have been implemented at different times, and therefore confronted differing economic situations. (Schiller, 1978, p. 117).

The confusion of the collection of data, and the lack of consistency in data collection should not stop the policy analyst from seeking to collect data on a more systematic basis. There are currently efforts underway, for example, through the VEDS system, which may form a more accurate and adequate basis for the collection of data on vocational education. The manpower system also must increase its capability for the collection of data without placing unreasonable burdens on those who gather the data and operate the programs at the same time. Factors which we need more information on are the characteristics of internal labor markets with respect to career ladders and previous vocational training. We also need to determine the value and need for vocational education programs in penal institutions. We should know what programs and what services have what effects on various students, (David, 1977, p. 18) and to know when to stress skill acquisition. (Ginzberg, 1977, p. 24).

One problem confronting the development of vocational education policy has been that vocational education tends to reject policy research because it distrusts it. (Shaefer, 1974, pp. 8-9). (Mosher, 1977, p. 656). An approach which might assist in making vocational education research relevant to the vocational educator would be studies of the various aspects of

work itself. Among these aspects are (1) praxiology (the science of efficient action), (2) work values and work ethics of individuals in a society, (3) job satisfaction and work design, (4) effects of education and opportunities for work, (5) effects of governmental fiscal planning on work. (Evans and Herr, 1978, p. 320). It is in looking at the area of work and the relationship between the vocational training and work that research can have a profound impact. The assessment of the sequence of education and other experience in the lives of individuals primarily with respect to work and work-related activities has an important focal point for research as it impinges upon both vocational education and manpower training. (Wirtz, 1975, p. 164). The relationship between these two policy areas can be facilitated by research which aims at the common and collaborative areas between these programs and the area of work is just one such area.

D. Policy Issues for Consideration

1. Dilemmas of Comprehensive Social Policy and Planning

The objective of achieving a comprehensive plan or policy structure for any given policy area, be it vocational education or manpower programs, runs into several conflicts in attempting to present a consistent, uniform, and completely comprehensive approach to setting objectives, defining the universe of discourse, and implementing program activities. Within the realm of policy analysis alone, it is difficult to achieve comprehension to any great degree so that a comprehensive policy position can be developed. Part of this is due to the fact that policy

analysis is not itself a single or comprehensive system.

> Policy analysis is neither a single method nor a a collection of methods and techniques. Because policy analyses derive their character largely from the problems they address, they may seem to bear little resemblance to each other. Also, the specific tools or analytical techniques may differ from study to study, because the problems addressed and the questions asked about various policies and programs are different. What then is policy analysis?
>
> Policy analysis is a practical philosophy on how to assist a decision maker with complex problems of choice under conditions of uncertainty. (Burt, 1974, p. 1).

With policy analysis having the objective of being a practical philosophy assisting decision makers in making choices in conditions of uncertainty, policy analysis becomes itself as diverse as the practical situations of uncertainty with which it is faced and even more complex with the assistance and the decision makers in each given context. This is not, as we have seen, a drawback to policy analysis but can be conceived as its strongpoint.

Policy analysis as with social planning may be the stronger for having diversity and an objective of consensus. The converse characterization as presented by Alan Altshuler presents a rather grim picture for both social planning and social policy which takes on a rather undemocratic character.

> Those who contend that comprehensive planning should play a large role in the future evolution of societies must argue that the common interests of society's members are their most important interests and constitute a large proportion of all their interests. They must assert that conflicts of interests in society are illusory, that they are about minor matters, or that they can be foreseen and resolved in advance by just arbiters (planners) who understand the total interests of all parties. (Schuck, 1976, pp. 67-68).

It is not the case, however, that conflicts in society are illusory or that matters to various constituent groups are minor, especially to those groups. We have also experienced, with attempts at achieving a great society, that problems cannot be foreseen to a great degree or with any great degree of precision, and that it is even more difficult to resolve in advance by anyone the interests of all parties. It is hardly possible for a social planner or a policy analyst to understand the total interests of all parties just as it is impossible for professionals or laypeople alike to comprehend the total fabric of any situation let alone of our society. It is not in rankling against this situation and striving for more comprehensive and complex knowledge that we will overcome the inherent apparent liabilities of this situation. Certainly, we must strive for greater clarity and for more information. But the resolution of decision making does not reside in having a corner on truth.

We are presently experiencing a situation where our own political institutions have been overloaded. They have been so burdened with various demands and responsibilities that have exceeded their ability to deal with the trade-offs of social policy and tend to deal in simplistic solutions. Political institutions such as government have gained an inordinate amount of power. However, this power is gained at a loss.

> In practice, this increased power is gained only at some cost, and the new technology presents society with new choices. Quite often the trade-offs are obscure or unrecognized.....Even when the nature of the trade-off is appreciated, political institutions may be inadequate to resolve the resulting

conflict of interests. This is what is meant by "overload" of political institutions.

> The naive solution to this problem is simply to increase the amount of power enjoyed by one of the decision-making institutions in the system, so that the President or the Cabinet can enforce the particular trade-off chosen. Since government in a democratic system does not and should not have such power in normal circumstances, the authorities are forced to make circumstances appear abnormal--by inventing crises and impending catastrophes to justify an extension of their power. (Weiner and Wildavsky, 1978, p. 11).

It is just this increase of the power of institutions including government which should be avoided. It is the role of government that we must reassess. We must be able to develop these methods of assessment so that we can evaluate programs with differing objectives, strategies and methods. The possibility of the emergence of the service state, a concept of government which is that it is not all powerful or manipulative, would be a state based on balance instead of dichotomies, a snythesis of options, and a government which resides in all institutions and has a variety of natures. (Dimock, 1972, p. 876). The measure of the performance of this state would be measured by the degree to which it makes creativity possible. Uniformity and unanimity would be secondary objectives. Creation of new and viable solutions would be primary objectives. For this conception to not seem Ivory Tower, it will be imperative to develop practical issues for consideration in the implementation of policy under such a conceptualization. It is possible that vocational education and manpower policy can be developed in such a context in which there is not a win-lose situation, but

in which both aspects of program delivery and both aspects of policy conceptualization can augment each other in ways that reinforce and support the other.

2. National Priorities and Local Priorities

Another area of consideration is the need to resolve the apparent conflicts between national priorities and local priorities. One step in rectifying the situation would be to address the apparent conflicting, confused and overlapping legislative mandates. (NCMP, 1975, pp. 26-27). Part of this conflict and overlap comes as a result of the very committee structure through which the Congress develops legislation. There may need to be more coordination between the various committees and houses of Congress in terms of generating legislation to help reduce the conflicts and overlaps. There is also the jurisdiction of numerous departments, each having responsibilities similar to or related to those of other departments. It is also the case that opportunities for coordination have not been fully exploited by all parties at all government levels. Approaching these three areas in terms of the legislative mandates for vocational education and manpower programs could eliminate areas of apparent conflict, which actually are not conflicting, and indicate those areas for which potential conflicts and actual conflicts exist. Without such an analysis of the generation of legislative mandates, resolutions of conflicts does not appear possible

One aspect of the legislative system is the generation of categorical programs to solve independent and isolated problems.

Some of the problems identified with the categorical systems were;

(1) A lack of any cohesive, unified approach for the development of priorities and goals
(2) A lack of flexibility for tailoring programs and services to meet local needs and conditions
(3) A lack of coordination in program operation--resulting in inefficient management, fragmented delivery systems, overlapping services, and conflicting policies and regulations
(4) A lack of local input in decisions affecting program priorities and policies
(5) An inability to adequately assess the overall effectiveness or impact of federally funded manpower efforts, (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 17).

The proliferation of categorical programs reinforces a positive aspect of intergovernmental relations but in a negative way. One of the major issues in the manpower programs and raised by the manpower programs is the issue of intergovernmental relations and the relative shares of power. (McPherson, 1976, p. 205). The situation in the American political structure of relative shares of power plays a positive role but the proliferation of constituencies and the proliferation of political entities to operate programs through the categorical system creates conflicts in ways which may be counterproductive.

To define this situation more precisely, we must distinguish between administrative decentralization and political decentralization. Each form of decentralization has its own characteristics.

> The current activity in the federal government encompasses at least two definitions of decentralization--political decentralization and administrative decentralization. These two meanings are not always clear. For example, proposals for decentralization embodied in revenue sharing schemes call for "political decentralization." Authority is exercised by territorially based units with general powers. Much discretion is left with the receiving unit. States,

provinces, counties, and municipal corporations are examples. Proposals for general and special revenue sharing suggests the transfer of resources and power to these governments.

> A system of political decentralization emphasizes the need for general purpose officers living in a specific area to coordinate governmental activities there because, it is argued, they are in closer touch with residents and can modify programs to meet area priorities. (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 73).

The important factor here is that manpower programs may be best administered in this fashion given the type of objectives for which manpower programs have been designed since the 1960's, including not only skill training and work experience, but also employment. Another approach to decentralization is the administrative approach.

> Administrative decentralization occurs when a politically independent unit delegates some of its powers to subordinate levels within its organization. These delegations may be revised or retracted at the will of the delegating authority. Recent efforts to decentralize the federal bureaucracy are essentially an "administrative decentralization." Functions performed by the federal government are being transferred from the central office in Washington to regional offices. The regional offices still reflect the functional and department structure of the central offices, but are expected to exercise increased "final authority" in the execution of programs. (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 74).

Vocational education as a decentralized program shares many characteristics with administrative decentralization while the entities carrying out the vocational education in public education functions at the local level are not organizationally part of the federal bureaucracy. The relationship between the federal bureaucracy and the local educational agency is more

of a professional delegation of authority from one level of a professional organization to another, (Hart, 1972, p. 605) or from one level of an administrative organization to another, as opposed to political delegation of authority with broad based powers. The delegation of administrative decentralization occurs more along the lines of specific programmatic functions, as delegated within certain parameters and as opposed to broad based political delegations. This distinction and the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs, which may be affected by the differences in delegation and devolution of authority from the federal level, must be examined more carefully.

It is better recognized that state and local governments are very important in the management of non-defense programs. (Schneider and Swinton, 1979, p. 12). (Shaw, 1977, p. 518). But this management responsibility and the important role that local and state governments play has not been examined fully. The harmonization of two policy areas must take into consideration the historical experiences of each area in terms of its scope of responsibility within the various levels of government. The state governments and local governments have been increasing their numbers of employees and have been increasing their scope of their responsibilities in the past several years. The capacity has been building as the number of employees and the expertise of the employees has been increasing. An assessment of the level of local and state capability to deal with certain

programs, whether they have dealt with them in the past or not, must be assessed in terms of the appropriate devolution of responsibility to these levels of government for appropriate programs in policy areas. Policy considerations appropriately should be made at the lowest level practical for sufficient manageability. (Burt, 1974, p. 16). This has not been considered to any great degree. If the relationship between the federal government and state and local governments has been one of unhappy and guarded relinquishment of power, policy considerations will not be made at the local level or the level practical for sufficient manageability, but will be made at the level where sufficient political power exists. It is likely that no political entity will give up power willingly: however, the span of control of the federal government is so great as to make its manageability ineffective in a variety of areas.

It may be that the policies in implementing practices of the federal government should be couched in terms of principles rather than in terms of detailed specifications. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 6). (Barton, 1977, p. 78). The goals should be specific enough to specify funding and to allow for local differences. (Lindman, 1976, pp. 121-122). They should be specific enough to be measurable; however, the move to decentralize, to the extent that the decision making and the priority setting at the local level becomes a responsibility of those levels, is a step in the right direction. It has been, for example, the European experience for such an approach

as this follows in which details are left to the local organizations. (Reubens, 1976, p. 59). We may need to study the European experience in terms of their organizational success in dealing with various problems and objectives with this approach. The problem arises in making such decisions as to the devolution of authority as to who will be responsible for what and to whom, as the federal experience with CETA has demonstrated.

> The institutional issue that concerned the Committee was the relationships among the federal, state, and local levels of government in the administration of CETA. The heart of the issue is the locus of decision making and accountability: Who decides among alternative places, programs, and people? Inherent in this set of relationships is the question of whether congruence can be achieved between national policies and local prime sponsor practices. The decentralization of manpower programs has also affected the networks of institutions that traditionally have provided training and employment programs. The unsettled relationship between the Employment Service and prime sponsors is particularly troublesome. The question is whether CETA has indeeed created a better organized system for administering manpower programs, one of the objectives that led to manpower reform. Another issue is whether the CETA programs are being used for local political purposes rather than for improving employability or creating jobs. (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 241-242).

In any event, the situation will ultimately be a matter of trade-offs between programs of national significance and programs with specifically local outputs. The authority to carry out programs rests at the local level. The funds and the scope necessary to achieve impact on programs transcending local or state boundaries and programs with national significance must be met at the federal level. This partnership between the levels of government can do much to improve the operations

of programs and the meeting of objectives which has gone on for many years. The existence of conflict or diversions of local goals and national goals indicates the requirement for points and mechanisms of resolutions of differences.

3. Organizations and Systems

The National Commission for Manpower Policy has called for institutional changes which are required in American society to assure that young people have a less difficult transition from school to work. The Commission then goes on to ask what is needed, and how we measure institutional change. (NCMP, 1975). This problem affects fundamentally the possibility of most of the issues that we have been discussing, policy harmonization, decentralization, achievement of consensus, nationwide policy development, and others. The extent to which organizations and systems, institutions and actors operate and respond, perceive and communicate affect the extent to which the objectives that will be developed by vocational education and manpower policy analysts and makers will be achievable.

It was, for example, an expectation that the U.S. Department of Labor would, through the institution of manpower programs, affect changes in the educational and vocational education system.

> The case for giving the chief responsibility for the program to the Department of Labor rested not only on the argument that Labor was better equipped to handle the program but also in the belief, in doing so, effective pressure could be brought to bear on the vocational education system to bring about much needed and far-reaching institutional

> changes. By giving the Department of Labor authority to determine what jobs people should be trained for, as well as the responsibility for selection of the people to be trained, it was hoped that the vocational education system would be forced to shake off its outdated approach to the major employment problems facing the nation and would begin to make the adjustments that existing social and economic situations demanded. (Ruttenberg, 1970, p. 18).

The question that this point of view raises is whether or not it is appropriate for one federal agency to be given the responsibility to fundamentally change the institutional arrangements and actions of agencies and actors who extend far beyond the pale of the federal bureaucracy and who traditionally and historically have related to an entirely separate federal agency and bureaucracy. The question on the one hand is whether such an approach is feasible. On the other hand, the question is whether such an approach is reasonable. The issue that is raised is the extent to which programs can be used to achieve institutional change. To get a better grasp of the situation, we need to examine organizational and structural changes in vocational education that have related to changing legislative mandates to determine whether or not the use of programs themselves can be used to achieve institutional change. (Gentry, 1979, p. 46). The research findings may indicate that government structures may not be able to carry out such mandates. (Ibid., p. 48). It is the current situation that the youth programs under CETA were fashioned as a tool for institutional change. (Wurzburg, 1978, p. 44). Analysis of the results of these program operations and the impact that they may have on institutional change should

be examined very carefully without distorting generalizations.

Another issue that has been raised in terms of institutional change with the enactment of CETA is whether or not, by creating a decentralized comprehensive system in which organizations are required to coordinate their activities with other agencies in a system administered by a local elected official, is whether there is a greater necessity for the organization to maintain the integrity of its own system rather than being combined into a system which is comprehensive and supercedes the objectives of the individual agency. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 146). It is probably not possible for any comprehensive system to coherently and without exclusion incorporate all objectives of all cooperating agencies. Perhaps we must look at the notion of comprehensiveness in the manpower delivery system, and in this respect, look at the contribution by vocational education and the extent to which vocational education can participate in the system. There is a lack of organizational parity between vocational education and CETA both at the state and local levels and at the national level. (Autry and Dement, 1977, p. 50). It is also the case that one group's conception of unity is another group's conception of dispersion of power. (Schick, 1975, p. 718). The differences between outlook and objectives, between mechanics and practices, have far greater meaning than simply different ways of doing the same thing. When these two approaches to training are combined into a single organizational and comprehensive system, we must look at the extent to which we have created for one or the other a procrustean bed.

It is also the case that we must look very carefully at whether we can afford competing systems. (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 237-238). We must analyze the cost of each system and compare the relative outputs, assessing the outputs relative to the overall objectives. (Ibid., 1978, pp. 252-253). This requires a great deal of analysis, far more than we have been able to achieve to date. It may be that there is questionable efficiency of a comprehensive system. A system outlined by Ruttenberg calls for strong federal direction and for the state's authority and resources for social economic welfare to be turned to serve national goals. (Ruttenberg, 1970, pp. 99-101). These two facets of a comprehensive manpower system raise questions with respect to experiences which we have recently had in terms of local governments setting their own priorities and the questionable importance of national priorities. We must constantly be aware of the dangers of centralized control and the avoidance of checks and balances on government through the political process. (Weidenbaum and Rockwell, 1977, pp. 71-72). What have been the effects of the shift from a function to function relationship between the national and local level to a government to government relationship? In what sense has this made the achievement of national priorities and local priorities more possible? What are the trade-offs between the two approaches? The implications for present power balances and institutional relationships are extensive.

> The ideal relationship would be government-to-government rather than function-to-function and substantial federal assistance would be earmarked for augmentation of policy management capabilities of the recipient governments.
>
> A shift from a functional to a government-based structure would have major implications for the federal as well as for the recipient governments. In political terms it would impel a flow of power at all levels from line agencies to central executives. But in view of the weakened status of the presidency, there is considerable doubt as to whether Congress would be a willing partner in this shift of power.
>
> There also would be a shift in power from functional interests to those with strong access to city hall or the state house. This would mean a devestiture of power from once disadvantaged groups which, in the 1960's under the aegis of the "war on poverty," were given their own administrative structures and grant programs. The poor and minorities would be threatened with a same loss of power as they have experienced as a consequence of revenue sharing. (Schick, 1975, p. 721).

It is not to say that a function-to-function or a government-to-government approach is good or bad. (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, pp. 141-142). The question is the character the programs operated and the effects on intergovernmental and interorganizational collaboration that are effected by a program effort, for example, vocational education which is administered through one type of relationship and manpower which is administered through another type of relationship. What are the implications for vocational education and manpower program objectives as related to the access of various groups to decision making structures and the capacity for such structures to interact?

Finally, organizations must have the characteristic of change and development inherent in their structure. They must

be able to move and change with the demands and the objectives of the populace. Unfortunately, vocational education has not been characterized by flexibility. (Comptroller General, 1974, p. 58). Perhaps, however, this is due to certain administrative and legislative mandates at both the national and the local levels. The possibilities for expanding flexibility of vocational education and the objectives to be achieved by expanding this flexibility can be investigated. An institution is a learning organism, (Shaw, 1977, pp. 518-519) and vocational education is a learning organism. The extent to which vocational education has learned to develop in certain ways must be explored in terms of developing capacities for growing in new ways as identified by policy makers in a variety of areas. It is because policies and objectives must change and grow with the needs of the times. The institutions themselves which operate and carry out policy must also be changing and developing. We also need newer conceptions of management to deal with the collaboration of the pluralistically based system of manpower and vocational education programs. (Cummens, 1979, pp. 450-451). The development of public administration and public management must meet the challenge to develop such structures and such processes for collaboration between diverse but mutually dependent policy areas.

4. Assessment of Goal Structures

The assessment of the goal structure for vocational education is complicated because (1) the scope and volume of social and

economic policies impinging upon vocational education and (2) the growth and scale of vocational education enterprise itself. (David, 1977, p. 11). The assessment has been complicated by the fact that to a great degree there has been a goal displacement by the federal government through the actions of its own bureaucracies. (Scott and MacDonald, 1975, p. 788). Such goal displacement has occurred because of federal goal assumptions as to the understanding of how state and local governments operate and by deciding what is best. The federal government also has required locals to compensate for errors or omissions of federal operations and to take the necessary steps to correct these when the problems have existed at the federal levels and should be corrected at the federal level. This has occurred to the extent that the local program operations are encumbered by taking the responsibility for correcting the errors of federal policy. Local policy and priorities have been set aside and priorities, as defined by the local level, have had to take second place to achieving the objectives through the demands of the federal bureacracies that come with the requirements for the funding.

With the decentralization and decategorization of manpower problems under CETA, local governments were pressed into the service of the federal legislative mandates to take the responsibility for the operation of these programs. Decentralization and decategorization themselves became objectives or ends. We have lost sight of the fact that these institutional arrangements are means to other ends, (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 26)

and having lost sight of this, we have lost sight of the fact that local governments have objectives for which decentralization and decategorization may be ends, not as ends to achieving national priorities but ends to achieving the priorities of local level constituents.

With decentralization and decategorization under CETA, the issues of policy formulation and decision making have been raised and stand out more clearly than perhaps they did before.

> Several policy issues are evident in the CETA program and, in one form or another, touch its major problems: the relationship between national policy and local practice, multiple objectives, ambiguous legislation, the balance among program components, and the place of public service employment in the overall design of manpower programs.
>
> One of the most pervasive issues is the degree to which local priorities and practices are consistent with national objectives. The issue is apparent in the structural as well as in the countercyclical components of CETA. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 12).

These and other policy issues raised through the implementation of CETA point to the need for intergrating other manpower policies and areas with manpower. (Levitan and Zickler, 1975, p. 194). (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, p. 23). In raising these issues, the question of the fundamental principles underlying various policy and program thrusts is of primary concern.

> To be effective, a policy must be based upon an underlying belief or assumption. Principles are basic truths, laws, or assumptions which determine the intrinsic nature or behavior of vocational education. Principles serve as the basis for policy and are inextricably bound to the economy, the labor force, and the social structure. The majority of the principles that guide vocational education today were first delineated during the period 1906 through

1917, and they have been periodically reinterpreted to reflect changes in society, business, industry, and education. Principles that were first expressed as beliefs or theories, have since 1917 been verified and are now considered as standards or basic truths. (University of California, 1975, p. 14). (Refer to Appendix A).

While it may not be that everyone would agree that there are basic and unchanging principles of vocational education, what can be agreed upon is that the principles accepted as those basic to vocational education first delineated as early as 1917 have changed and been reinterpreted periodically to reflect changes in society and business. But it is to these basic beliefs and assumptions which underly policy that we must turn in so far as we are able to understand the reasons for specific policies. But as times change and the assumptions change so must the policies change. There are many trends facing vocational education. These trends will influence the policy development through the influence on the attitudes and assumptions of policy analysts and policy makers.

Some of the trends that have been expressed as facing vocational education are, first, American education is currently reassessing its goals and is seeking to emphasize occupational skills for all students. As vocational education moves more and more into the mainstream of education, it will be challenged in ways that are new. Second, there is a growing interest to include coping skills relative to bureaucratic and organizational forms and to also include interpersonal human relation skills. The emphasis on such skills for workers to adjust to the changing

world of work will place demands on vocational education in terms of the kinds of skill offerings which they make. Third, there is increased concern for developing decision making skills as part of basic academic skills. (Evans and Herr, 1978, pp. 314-315). As these and other trends affect vocational education, goals and the assumptions underlying those goals will be called into analysis. Vocational educators and other policy analysts must examine the extent to which these and other trends are relevant to the development of future vocational education policy.

5. Funding Mechanisms and Program Policies

As we have noted earlier, operations constitute policy, and funding constitues operations. The extent to which certain funding mechanisms are utilized in a large way determines not only the nature of the program but of the ultimate outcome itself. The features of the vocational education system point out the relevance of funding for the operation of that system.

> Assessments of the distribution of vocational education funds are complicated by the need to recognize and accommodate three major features of the vocational education system: (1) decision-making authority concerning the level and distribution of vocational education is spread among three levels of government (federal, state, and local); (2) vocational education funds support and are allocated among a wide range of skill-developing curricula; (3) vocational education programs can be provided by a variety of public and private organizations. Issues concerning the distribution and impact of vocational education funds have been raised in each of these areas, and the interdependences of the various decisions are quite clear. (Chambers and Sargen, 1979, p. 23).

From another point of view accounting practices often have determined program policies and problems for example the

anti-comingling requirement determines not only the extent to which the bookkeeping systems of program operators but also the way in which various clients are treated and the other institutional structures which are possible and impossible given certain accounting practices become of primary importance. (Apker, 1979, p. 3). This factor has often been overlooked as a key factor in determining not only the quality of programs but in determining the quality in the type of the output. Funding priorities and mechanisms determine programmatic goals. (McPherson, 1976, p. 199).

With the extent of which financial considerations determine programmatic considerations, a variant of this facet of federal programs is the application of the market model to public policy. The extent to which competition is seen as a model for service delivery, one advocates using a market model or an economic market place model to determine the structure of program delivery and the determination of program objectives. It should be readily seen, however, that a market model is inapplicable to government operation since they constitute control in ways differing from market control. (Weidenbaum and Rockwell, 1977, pp. 60-61). We need methods for measuring the quality of programs that are relevant to the social programs developed and operated by public administration. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 267).

With respect to the mechanisms for funding programs, the question has been raised to whether it is efficient to let program appropriations fluctuate for economic reasons rather

than for policy and program reasons. (Evans and Herr, 1978, pp. 17-18; p. 52). The trade-offs between programs and the decisions by which program operation is determined have often been made on the basis of wildly fluctuating unemployment or some national crisis for which skills of a certain type are in high demand. We have only recently begun to ask ourselves whether some of the fluctuations are themselves a result of not having taken steps early enough with respect to education and training, and specifically skill training, that would have, if not eliminated, at least softened the blow of certain economic and labor market problems. For vocational education the issue becomes particularly acute. Vocational education is more expensive in terms of operating dollars, and it is difficult to staff and maintain on an up to date basis. (Ginzberg, 1977, p. 25). Fluctuations of funding given the fluctuations of labor market concerns places an extreme burden.

> Today, the questions being asked are: How do you stockpile the capital equipment of school systems? How do you get the money to pay school teachers or do we fire them? Should we stop training new teachers? If we stop for the time being, what effect will a rapidly aging teacher force have for the education of our children?
>
> Look at the elementary school age population. It will certainly be down to about 22.5 million by 1985 but will quickly rise to about 27 million by 1990 if women have only about 2.1 children. And if I am right, rather than the Census Bureau, there will be 6-7 million more only five years later. The year 1990 is a fascinating one. High school and middle school populations will be declining and elementary school populations will be increasing. (Goldberg, 1978, p. 9).

The same types of fluctuations of school age children have in the recent past caused wildly fluctuating enrollments and

demands upon school systems. Willard Wirtz would like to see educational funds keyed to economic conditions, for example, business cycles. (Wirtz, 1975, p. 58). A question must be raised as to whether or not educational funds and the objectives of education are so closely tied to objectives of business, that is, whether the fluctuations in the business cycle should be the determinating factors, or whether we should have a broader range.

The experiences of foreign countries with more institutionalized employment policies and programs indicates some positive factors that we should consider with respect to the institutionalization of these programs to soften the vagueries of fluctuations and funding.

In identifying the countries whose unemployment programs seem outstanding, the following characteristics appear significant:

a. Programs are prepared in prosperous periods and go into effect promptly as economic indicators show declines.

b. General monetary and fiscal measures are well integrated with specific unemployment measures.

c. Within the specific unemployment measures, special programs for youth occupy a position which reflects the social priority attached to this segment of the population.

d. A sufficient variety of measures and large enough programs are provided to cover the needs of a diverse unemployed population.

e. Provisions for reducing or closing down of programs are set as a response to changes in the economy and programs are not ended simply for financial reasons.

f. A set of basic programs for training, mobility, income maintenance and other measures is kept permanently

in place with cyclical variations in the utilization.
(Reubens, 1976, pp. 59-60).

The main feature here is the emphasis of having inplace programs to meet economic conditions. (Levitan and Taggart, 1971, pp. 76-77). Vocational education is not exempt from these considerations as it influences and is influenced by economic conditions and the demand for workers with specific skills. Both demographic changes and technological changes effect vocational education, some to greater or lesser degree, some more quickly than others. However, the extent to which programs are funded for reasons which consider longer range effects would help to mitigate the hardships which have been faced on the one hand, with the overabundance of funding that may be experienced on the other.

Notwithstanding the problems with the categorical approach to the organizational or institutional response to the needs for training, Robert McPherson argues that the categorical approach to funding is the only realistic and politically feasible way for the federal government to operate, being incapable of comprehending the whole fabric of society. (McPherson, 1976). It is, therefore, forced to categorical and piece-meal approaches. This solution, however, must be looked at more carefully, especially with respect to the fact that funding mechanisms determine program policies to a large degree. If the federal government is incapable of comprehending the whole fabric of society, perhaps an approach other than the categorical approach

would rectify this situation rather than compounding the miseries through implementation of the categorical approach.

6. Education and Training Needs and Economic Necessities

What was the message from the federal government by the creation of the 1960's remedial programs? Vocational education, and education itself, has asked this question. There may be a multiplicity of reasons involved in the creation of these remedial programs, but what must be assessed is whether or not this necessarily requires the creation of an alternative or competing system to vocational education. (Venn, 1975, p. 23). The relationship between remedial programs and vocational education programs may be one of complimentarity as opposed to a relationship of competition or alternatives.

With vocational education undergoing a reassessment of its own goal structure, in part as a result of the reaction to the creation of remedial programs, we must look at the methods of assessing this goal structure and to determine what is appropriate. The question has been raised as to whether or not vocational education goal structure is overloaded. It may be that by including poverty goals and goals to accelerate economic productivity, vocational education's goal structure has been inappropriately overloaded. Vocational education has little control over these areas though it contributes to a large degree to them. The extent to which its goal structure should include objectives over which it has little control raises serious questions. It appears that the greatest cause for commonality

of vocational education's goals lies in Vocational Education Amendments and related legislation, that is vocational education's federal mandates. (Bushnell, 1975, p. 2). The extent to which vocational education's goals and goal structure should take its cue primarily or even totally from federal legislation is an issue that needs re-examination. For example, in 1968 vocational education amendments added occupational areas and the disadvantaged to the goal structure of vocational education. (Ibid., p. 24). This and other activities should be re-examined.

> Reinterpretation of principles has occurred six times during this century--in 1917, 1936, 1946, 1963, 1968 and 1972--as reflected in national legislation. Two of these years, 1963 and 1968, represent abrupt shifts in interpretation and implementation of the principles of vocational education. In 1963, the legislation provided opportunities to the unemployed and underprivileged for the development of technical skills so that they could obtain specific jobs; whereas, in 1968, the legislative intent was to encourage the improvement of the individual's well being. (University of California, 1975, p. 42).

Vocational education is not a dimension of education or of economic policy alone. (Evans et al, 1969, p. 16; p. 75). As we have indicated previously, it is defined by and located in a web of social and economic policies. (David, 1977, p. 17). (NCMP, 1976, p. 18). As a policy area of its own, however, it needs to define itself as distinct from federal mandates alone or as distinct from educational or other policy definitions alone. This is not an easy task to do. We must extricate vocational education from the confusion of employability with employment. (Ginzberg, 1977, p. 24).

Added to these problems are conflicting views of vocational training. (Mirengoff, 1978, pp. 128-129). What constitutes effective training? Views are confused because of bureaucratic concerns and inertia. There is a mixture of short range and long range objectives. What vocational training is and should be is a question that needs untangling.

At the same time there is a need to define manpower programs not in terms of demographic or socioeconomic characteristics, but in terms of labor market structures. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 125). (NCMP, 1976, p. 18). (McPherson, 1976, p. 213). (Snedeker and Snedeker, 1978, pp. 281-282). The extent to which both vocational education and manpower define their areas of expertise and responsibility is the extent to which the turf battles and problems of overlap and duplication may become more easily managed. Manpower needs to provide for interventions into the labor market process and not simply to augment skills of supply. Manpower needs to deal with complimentary strategies for supply and demand. The question is raised, however, whether such a posture is appropriate for vocational education. The challenge to vocational education has been adequately, if succintly, stated.

> I turn now to an obvious, but still essential, point to be made in connection with the invention of fresh strategic approaches to public policies for vocational education. It will not occur unless there is a compelling disposition to undertake four tasks. One is a disinterest examination of the admittedly overloaded goal structure commonly associated with vocational education. That is too familiar to you to require delineation by me. The second task, which

flows from the first, is a reconsideration of the expanded number of functions that vocational education is expected to perform. The third is an appraisal of the larger social and economic policy context within which the federal, state, and local public policies for vocational education are located and with which they are assumed to interact with some positive consequences. The fourth task is inquiry into the state of the available knowledge and information that is functionally useful for policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation. (David, 1977, pp. 11-12).

APPENDIX A

Principles of Vocational Education

1. Vocational Education is needed to meet the increasing demand for trained craftsmen and technicians.

2. Vocational schools should aim to give as much technical education and practical experience as possible.

3. No vocational school or program can turn out a finished craftsman or technician, but it can furnish the material out of which a finished craftsman can be made.

4. Vocational education is needed to increase wage-earning power.

5. Vocational education teachers should, in addition to academic training, have current work experience and expertise in each field in which they are engaged to teach.

6. Much of vocational instruction must necessarily be individual rather than group in order to adapt it to the varied abilities and experiences of the student.

7. In addition to teaching vocational students skills and teaching them to think, it is vitally necessary to aid in the development of their moral character.

8. Vocational education is required to conserve and develop our national resources.

9. Vocational education is a wise business investment.

10. A skilled worker is an asset to the locality, the state, and the nation, and all should cooperate in paying the cost.

11. Vocational guidance implies provision for enabling youth (1) to discover themselves vocationally, (2) to receive vocational counseling, and (3) to be placed vocationally.

12. Higher standards of living are a direct result of vocational education.

13. Vocational education has for its purpose the acquiring of a body of useable knowledge relating to industrial conditions, processes, organization, and administration; the gaining of skills; and of mental, aesthetic, and ethical

training through the acquisition and use of the knowledge indicated.

14. We need not only higher skill in 1975 than we needed in 1917 or in 1968, but we need more of it in proportion to population, and we will need it in the future in a constantly increasing ratio both in numbers and in efficiency.

15. Trade training alone will not make good teachers.

16. Vocational education does not in the slightest interfere with the cultural training, the character building, and the development of things noble and beautiful in life which was the aim of the old education.

17. It is generally conceded by educators who are interested in vocational education that the industrial school "per se" does not and cannot result in turning out full fledged skilled mechanics ready to take up a trade.

18. Vocational education must maintain a fair and proper apportionment of the supply of labor power to the demand for labor power.

19. The pseudo-experience, such as is gained by ordinary students in school and college classrooms, will not replace actual practical experience.

20. The ordinary type of pedagogical training given to prospective teachers will not serve to adequately prepare them for successful service in vocational schools and programs.

21. Students in vocational education should have the opportunity to enter and exit vocational programs as their specific needs dictate.

22. Vocational students should receive theoretical and practical training necessary for procuring gainful employment.

23. Vocational education should seek to satisfy and to integrate the social, intellectual, cultural, and occupational needs of the students.

24. A curriculum should be of direct value to society in relation to economic stability, supply and demand of the labor force, lower level unemployment, efficiency of the labor force, and other societal needs.

25. Curriculum should be of direct value to the individual worker in relation to competence, economics, and satisfaction.

26. Vocational curriculum must reflect the changing function of the school as well as the shifting scope and emphasis of education.

27. Curriculum should include the development of motivation, persistence, drive, and the other factors which relate to achievement in the world of work.

28. Vocational education should aim its instruction toward meeting the requirements of entry occupations.

29. Vocational education should be evaluated on the basis of its success in providing training for lasting economic returns in increased production and wage earning power.

30. Vocational education should be evaluated on the basis of its success in preparing students to enter the world of work.

31. A Vocational Education program should be evaluated on the basis of its ability to meet the demand for trained workmen.

32. Vocational education should be evaluated on the basis of its success in decreasing the incidence of student drop out from public school education.

33. Vocational education should be evaluated on the basis of its success in decreasing manpower waste.

34. Vocational education should be evaluated on the basis of its success in combining general education and technical training.

35. Vocational education should be evaluated on the basis of its demonstrating the competencies necessary to achieve the skills required to meet the immediate rural and urban job markets.

36. Vocational education should be evaluated in the light of its being an end in itself as well as a means useable for achieving further ends.

Report on Policy-Making for Vocational Education, University of California (1976). pp. 42-45.

CONCLUSION

The legislative and programmatic thrusts of the past two decades in vocational education and manpower have indicated that there have been certain assumptions implicit in policy and program developments. The first of these assumptions is that the coordination of vocational education and manpower training programs will produce qualitatively and quantitatively more and better results. A second assumption is that both programs share a significant segment of the population to be served. Third, it is maintained that institutional barriers negatively affect their individual outcomes and the total outcome. Fourth, it has been asserted that the problems identified in employment and training, for example, the production of younger workers not well prepared with skills and functional world of work attitudes, can be reduced by combined and comprehensive effort. Finally, and most fundamentally, the existence of such problems ascribed to the fact that there is a perceived breakdown of systems, policy development, delivery systems, accountability, political, educational, and other systems. It has not been the attempt of this work to determine whether or not these assumptions are correct, but to raise interest in subjecting them to a closer scrutiny. It may be that hidden within these assumptions are basic fundamental distortions of the context in which vocational education and manpower policy and programs function. The distortions occur as a result of ignoring certain elemental characteristics of the American political and social process.

As derived from the previous analysis, three possible alternatives arise with respect to developing the future relationship for vocational education and manpower. First, it remains to be determined whether or not it is desirable to develop new systems or mechanisms to correct the employment and training deficiencies. This option was embraced with the initiation of the CETA program, itself an attempt to establish a new group of actors within the employment and training arena. This was an addition to those actors that already existed under pre-CETA program operations, both in employment and training and in vocational education. The second alternative is the expansion of the capabilities of the existing systems and mechanisms. This has been a continuing argument on the part of vocational educators, with respect to the expertise the established systems can call upon to lead the national effort to correct employment and unemployment deficiencies. The third alternative is a reorganization of the responsibilities among the groups and institutions that are currently involved, including the possibility of developing or encouraging a limited number of new actors. These alternatives raise the issue of the present performance of the individual institutions and groups, as well as the objectives of each and the extent to which they mutually interrelate, complement or confound, and the degree to which they take cognizance of each other.

We further recognize that the context in which public policies are developed, and the programs flowing from those policies as implemented, is a complex encironment involving many explicit and implicit functioning entities.

> The environment within which U.S. manpower policy operates must be kept in perspective. In the first place, manpower decisions are made by individuals, families, schools, employers, and unions, in that order, with public policy playing a minor role. Secondly, for most people at most times and in most places, the labor market works reasonably well without policy intervention. (Mangum, 1969, p. 8)

The same is the case with vocational education. The extent to which vocational education contributes to the function of the labor market, it is also limited in terms of the impact that it has.

These limiting factors are not to deny the necessity for developing more sophisticated approaches to policy development, but should be taken into consideration in determining the extent to which policy development through institutional change can itself be an answer to the problems. In this respect, we may ask whether or not the creation of the CETA system may not have been unwise. With the creation of the CETA prime sponsors, new political jurisdictions were created in the form of state and local elected officials and their administrative staffs, taking responsibility for an area of policy development and program operation for which they had had little or no previous experience. Within the employment and training arena, an additional political and institutional entity has been interjected into the process.

While CETA has been characterized as a means to successfully transfer manpower program administration to states and local governments, this may not be entirely the case. Whereas the federal government may have given lip service to the transfer of power, in reality it may be that states and local governments

have sought to use CETA as a means of shifting the balance of power in the employment and training area from the national level to the local level. The extent to which prime sponsors have been able to develop a degree of autonomy and achieve a certain amount of programmatic success may be seen as an indication of the health of local governments and their ability to carry out the responsibilities that have been delineated for them within the manpower legislation. If this is true, then the possibility for collaboration between vocational education and manpower programs at the state and local levels, the levels at which program delivery becomes a reality, is far more possible than may have been anticipated. The strength with which local political and social institutions are able to determine local needs, and to fit these into the context of national policy objectives, is the extent to which mutually supportive institutional structures and processes may be developed or enhanced, and detracting structures or policies may be minimized or eliminated.

What has been gained in the United States by the creation of this institutional situation of manpower programs administered by agencies politically and historically separate from the educational systems, both at the national and at the local levels? What has been gained by the creation of a structure seperate from the vocational education policy and program delivery structure? The gains can only be seen in terms of the expectations that were held for CETA by the national policy decision makers.

> One was that the jumble of categorical programs would be transformed into an orderly array of program activities in each community, a system with clearly designated entry points, each of which would have access to all services that the system provides. The second expectation was that under the eye of the local sponsor, delivery agencies would be obliged to become more efficient and effective - or be replaced. Discernible progress has been made in the former goal; the extent of improvement in the latter is not clear and needs further study. (Mirengoff, 1978, p. 137)

Thus, the two major objectives for institutional change embodied in CETA were the systematization of program delivery and the strengthening of local accountability. Both of these objectives, if they have been achieved at all, have been achieved because of the determination of local officials, both in vocational education and employment and training, to make these goals a reality. However, undermining these attempts have been the experiences throughout the nation with federal programs, decategorization and decentralization. As has been noted earlier, the CETA program did not in reality totally decategorize the employment and training program arena. This decategorization has been eroded by the addition of new programs and by the expansion and overshadowing effect of other categorical programs, such as public service employment.

With respect to decentralization, there has been more success in this area, primarily in terms of the initiative taken by states and local governments to control the unemployment situation within their respective jurisdictions. But what has been the pride, both in terms of a nationally coherent approach to unemployment and in terms of coordinating the various agencies, at the local level?

The emphasis placed on the local prime sponsors ability to achieve a coordination of agencies not under his or her jurisdiction has led to the isolation of the prime sponsors operations from those such as vocational education, which are intrinsically valuable to the target population that the prime sponsor should be serving. The generation of duplicate systems, with personnel who may or may not have the expertise necessary to deal with the education and training needs of the target population, leads to a confusion and an extension of the overlap and duplicative efforts found before CETA.

However, the push for decentralization is a very necessary part of the American social policy scene.

> The idea of decentralization in government has a broad appeal in the United States. Partisans of the left and right of the political spectrum support decentralization. Americans have an enduring suspicion of strong, centralized government dating from before the American Revolution.
>
> Implicit in this American preference for decentralization is a recognition that institutional structure will influence the values emphasized by the organization. Decentralized systems promote participation, access, and responsiveness; centralized systems favor efficiency, professionalism, and the use of advanced or expensive technologies. The trade-offs between these values, however, are often overlooked. (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 75)

It is the nature of the trade-offs between centralization and decentralization which has failed to achieve much prominence in the analysis of the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs. In this respect, the analysis should achieve a greater degree of focus because of the central role

that it plays in the ability of the various areas of policy development to achieve a degree of collaboration. The role of government in this process raises further questions.

> The interminable debate in the U.S. public policy has been between those who viewed government as the major threat to freedom and those who found it an effective tool for enlarging their own range of choice. The debaters, conservative and liberal, have swapped their affirmative of "government as tool" usually won in the end. Only as the proclivity for strong governments to become involved in world power struggles and of bureaucrats to add restraints to programs designed to enlarge and distribute choice have been forcefully redomstrated have the advocates of individual liberty begun to question the route they have taken for more than one hundred years. But this nagging fear is only beginning to surface. Though there have been lapses and aberrations, the nation's domestic policies can be reasonably analyzed as a continuing dual effort to expand the supply of opportunity and assure access to it. (Mangum, 1969, p. 2)

It may be that the simplistic approach of a comprehensive employment system is unable to fill either need adequately. We have not analyzed the institutional considerations in choosing a system for which comprehension becomes either a meaningless and hollow phrase or an attempt to deny the very participatory provesses which have been an endemic part of the American political scene.

The U.S. experience has been one of experimentation with institutional forms. The institutions themselves and the social context in which institutions function must be seen as dynamic, changing and ever-expanding their interrelationships. In this respect, conflict will be a natural, inherent and necessary mode for policy development and program implementation. Conflict, far from being a destructive force, is part of the check and

a simple manner from the top down. The development of policy is multi-purpose and is generated from many points. Professor David has stated the situation most succinctly.

> But whatever may be said about the laws of social change, it still remains true that to engage in policy making is to assert that man has the power to fix its direction, affect its rate, and control its consequences. And it is also true,...that there is no singular or uniform view of "things as they are." This, of course, is one of the marks of a free and democratic society. Moreover, a plurality of readings of "things as they are" may seem to complicate the business of policy making unmercifully, but it is a necessary condition for maintaining that society. (David, 1977, p. 15.

The comprehensiveness, if it be such, for interagency coordination should be that of encompassing divergent objectives and views; coordination moreover takes on the character of cooperation or collaboration. We must avoid the limitations of simplistic views of synoptic approaches or of absolutism. The attempt to model interagency coordination upon the planning model so prevalent in the past decade would be to erroneously conceive the nature of interagency collaboration and to underestimate the strength and necessity of the plurality and divergence of the various operative parts of the policy making fabric. Planning, argues Friedrick von Hayele, is an inadequate and totally inappropriate model to determine the character of interagency coordination.

> The dispute between modern planners and their proponents is...not a dispute on whether we ought to employ foresight in systematic thinking in planning our common affairs. It is a dispute about what is the best way of doing so. The question is whether for this purpose it is

> better that the holder of coercive power should confine himself in general to creating conditions under which the knowledge and initiative of individuals are within the best scope so that they can plan most successfully; or whether a rational utilization of our resources requires central direction and organization of all our activities according to some consciously constructed "blueprint." (Weidenbaum and Rockwood, 1977, p. 72)

Such a conception of planning is totally inappropriate an understanding of the nature of interagency collaboration.

Interagency collaboration must be more responsive to the diversity of changes and challenges both in terms of objective setting and in terms of policy analysis. Interagency relationships, or whatever the term to describe the process of facilitating collaboration between autonomous or semi-autonomous policy making and implementing bodies, must be creative rather than reactive because of the participatory character. It must be readily seen that we lack a superior agency to endorce policies, for example, as would be necessary in taking a strict coordination approach to interagency relationships. Therefore, we must develop a model of collaboration which involves multiple-centers of initiation. Within the CETA system and the policy generated by analysts focusing on the employment and training program, there seems to be an inherent agreement that a network of delivery systems, as opposed to a comprehensive delivery system administered by a superagency, is the underlying reality which must be expressed for such programs to be effective and successful.

Which factors, therefore, must be analyzed to understand the present and potential relationships between vocational education and manpower? First, the institutional structures and behavior

of vocational education and manpower as governmental functions and as private functions must be studied, to determine the similarities and dissimilarities and functional types and structural characteristics. Second, actual historical relationships and development between vocational education and manpower must be more closely scrutinized and laid bare to determine the extent of ambiguous and confused legislative initiatives and mandates as they have effected the relationships. Third, we must determine the characteristic of the relationship of these two policy areas, for example, whether the domains of vocational education and manpower are distinct or common in order to understand the overlapping of the policy areas and the conflicts generated by policy stances.

Fourth, each policy area must be seen as a structure for the allocation of resources and the establishment of relative priorities. In a more general context, this might include stances relative to youth and older workers or, in another context, individual well-being or the condition of the national economy (Ruttenberg, 1970, p. 1) Both manpower and vocational education literature state the primacy of both individual well-being and the overall health of the economy as being the utmost importance. The extent to which the development of the individual or the functioning of the economy is given primacy or emphasis within each system determines the extent to which those institutional systems are able to relate. (Ruttenbert, 1970, p. 99). Fifth, there must be additional research of the results to date and research on the

balance of institutions upon each other to assure access to minorities of all types which make up the fabric of our society. A distinction must be made between an emphasis on changes in institutional dynamics and conflict which borders upon anarchy.

The kinds of changes and dynamics inherent in the American system are such that anarchy would become impossible, but diversity and plurality are seen as relevant and necessary forces. In many respects, this is not achieved by any centralized organization or direction.

> The churches and chambers of commerce, the Rotarians, the parent-teachers associations, etc., are not conscious that they discharge quasi-governmental functions; nor is the individual member aware of the fact that he takes part in spontaneous community government. Yet these associations, which are unique to the United States, do govern. They set community standards, discharge community functions, mold public opinion, and force or prevent community action. (Drucher, 1942, p. 172)

It is through a better understanding of the dynamics of this "community function" and the need to understand the interactive mode at all levles of government and with respect to the diverse actors and groups at each level, that demands the attention of vocational education and manpower policy analysis.

In order to understand the ideal, and in order to assess and take charge of the reality of interagency collaboration we must set out to grasp the dynamics of the situations in which policy is made and in which policy implementation is carried out. In the United States there is an emergent development of policy, which is not developed in a deductive fashion or implemented in

data needed to determine the effects of the interrelatedness of various policy areas on vocational education and also for manpower. (Refer to appendix B for a more detailed discussion of this point.) We require data on demographic trends, appropriate technology, training procedures and contexts, quality controls, the role and effects of planning, and the procedures for setting and implementing goals. Finally, there must be a greater attempt to explicity demonstrate how all of the above affects the character of policy development for vocational education and manpower in their mutual and individual aspects.

Vocational education and manpower may be analyzed with respect to the extent to which they are distinct, interrelated, supplementary or alternative systems. (Wirtz, 1975, p. 46) Attention should be directed to those elements which would help to clarify the relationship between vocational education and manpower as policy-generating systems and institutional structures designed to allocate resources and achieve specific social policy objectives. It is necessary, in terms of policy harmonization or interagency coordination, to ask what will be gained and what will be lost by each policy area, in seeking to achieve harmonization or integration of institutional structures through collaboration. And finally, we must be more cognizant of carefully evaluating whether the criticisms of each institutional strucutre are valid. It is inappropriate to judge the outcomes of one set of policy directives in light of objectives that have been established by a dinergent set of policy objectives.

A final issue with respect to the relationship between vocational education and manpower is the determination of those incentives which are feasible and meaningful to both vocational education and manpower in order to achieve collaborative relationships. The most obvious incentive, which is explicit in the employment and training and vocational education literature, is the fiscal incentive. The question must be raised as to how effective this is in achieving specific outcomes and how lasting the effects will be of such fiscal incentives. Policy analysts should investigate other types of incentives in terms of achieving different effects and achieving other longer lasting outcomes. We must look at other types of incentives which are either implicit or explicit in terms of achieving specific outcomes.

One type of alternative incentive would be the incentive of program symbiosis and the achievement of greater outcome through collaboration. Incentives of this type would focus on a different set of outcomes than those to be achieved by fiscal incentives. Such objectives provide incentive for collaboration between vocational education and employment and training programs in the extent to which these objectives may be more easily or readily attainable collaboratively than either would be able to achieve individually.

An additional incentive to collaboration would be the recognition that different factors operate at different levels of government and with respect to different groups of actors, and that incentives to collaboration are themselves operating within different spheres and on different hierarchies of need and achievement. National incentives, therefore, may not be operative at the local level.

The leverage achievable at the local level through collaboration creates a unique position for local agencies and institutions. Manpower programs have demonstrated such opportunities for the leverage of collaboration at the local level. The outcomes, therefore, will differ from one locality to another.

> Six variables tend to be critical under the manpower programs: (1) the ability and availability of program administrators and project leadership at the community level; (2) the political climate and the degree of support from vested-interest groups; (3) the quality of the clientele which is served; (4) the adequacy of supportive services which are offered; (5) the economic circumstances in which the program or project operates; and (6) the timing and preparation for the mounting of the efforts. All of these factors can vary widely among projects, between the areas where they are applied, and over time. Unless these variations are carefully considered, the information provided by measurement and evaluation can be misapplied; and even if these factors are given the fullest attention, a wide margin of uncertainty must prevail. (Levitan and Taggert, 1971, p. 7)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amara, Roy. "The U.S. in the Decade Ahead: An Inventory of Resources." A paper delivered before the National Convention of the American Vocational Association, in Dallas, Texas, December 4, 1978.

Anderson, Bernard E. "Youth Employment Problems in the Inner City." In the Report of the Congressional Budget Office Conference on The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What Are the Options? Congress of the United States: Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 14, 1976.

Anton, Thomas J. "On Implementing the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976." In The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study, Vocational Education Study Publication: No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Apker, Wesley. "Policy Issues in Interrelating Vocational Education and CETA." An address before the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, April 26, 1979.

Autry, George B. and Dement, Edward F. The Utilization and Effectiveness of CETA Title I Special Grants to Governors. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: MDC, Inc., April 1977. Submitted to ORD/ETA, United States Department of Labor.

Arnold, Peri E. "Reorganization and Politics: A Reflection on the Adequacy of Administrative Theory." Public Administration Review 34 (May/June 1974): 205-211.

Barnes, William. "Target Groups." In CETA: An Analysis of the Issues. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23, May 1978. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Barton, Paul H. "Youth Transition to Work: The Problem and Federal Policy Setting." Testimony before the U.S. Congress. Youth Unemployment: Hearings Before the Joint Economic Committee. Congress of the United States, Ninety-Fourth Congress, Second Session, September 9, 1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Becker, Joseph M., Haber, William, and Levitan, Sar A. Programs to Aid the Unemployed in the 1960's. New York: Upjohn Institute, January, 1965.

Beckman, Norman. "Policy Analysis in Government: Alternatives to 'Muddling Through.'" Public Administration Review 37 (May/June 1977): 221-222.

Beckman, Norman. "Policy Analysis of the Congress." Public Administration Review 37 (May/June 1977): 237-244.

Bell, Carolyn Shaw. "Manpower Policies and the National Economy." Directions for a National Manpower Policy. A special report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 14, December 1976, Washington, D.C.

Belmonte, Robert A. "State and County Relationships: An Imperfection in the Fabric of American Federalism." Public Administration Review 33 (November/December 1973).

Benjamin, Gerald. "The Process of Change in Federal/Local Relations." Public Administration Review 33 (March/April 1973): 188-193.

Bogetich, Thomas M., and Lammers, Norma Phillips. "The Effects of National Policy on Vocational Education Evaluation." In The Planning Papers for Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication: No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Brain, George. "Principles and Policies for Vocational Education." In Report on Policy-Making for Vocational Education. University of California at Berkeley, Division of Vocational Education. Berkeley, California: University of California, June 1976.

Brandon, George L. An Appraisal of Manpower Training Programs Established by Congress in the 1960's. Project Baseline Supplemental Report. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, August 1974.

Bresnick, David. "Should Public Administrators Care About Educational Policy?" Public Administration Review 34 (July/August 1974): 404-407.

Brickell, Henry M. A Framework for Developing Alternative Scenarios for Vocational Education Research and Development. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, August 1975.

Burt, Marvin R. Policy Analysis. Washington, D.C.: Information Resources Press, 1974.

Bushnell, David S. "Policy Alternatives in the Evaluation of Vocational Education." Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, August 1975.

Cameron, Juan. "How CETA Came to be a Four-Letter Word." Fortune (April 9, 1979): 112-120.

Chambers, Jay G., and Sargen, Susan. "Distribution and allocation of Funding for Vocational Education." In The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication: No. 1., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Goverment Printing Office, April 1979.

Cohen, David K., and Farrar, Eleanor. "Power to the Parents?--The Story of Education Vouchers." The Public Interest 48 (Summer 1977): 72-97.

Coleman, James S. "The School To Work Transition." In the Report of the Congressional Budget Office Conference on The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What are the Options? Congress of the United States: Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 14, 1976.

Committee for Economic Development. Raising Low Incomes Through Improved Education: A Statement on National Policy. New York: Committee for Economic Development, September 1965.

Committee for Economic Development. Training and Jobs for the Urban Poor: A Statement on National Policy. New York: Committee for Economic Development, July 1970.

Comptroller General of the United States. What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? Report to the Congress. Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office, 1974, MWD-75-31.

Cummens, John A. "Interagency Coordination and Manpower Programs at the State Level." Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration 1:4 (May 1979): 431-452.

Dahrendorf, Rolf. The New Liberty: Survival and Justice in a Changing World. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

David, Henry. "On Thinking About Vocational Education Policy." In The Future of Vocational Education, edited by Albert J. Pautter, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.

Dimock, Marshall E. "The Creative State: Emergence of the Service State." Public Administration Review 32:6 (November/December 1972): 875-880.

Ellis, Mary L. "Federal Manpower Programs." Unpublished paper. Washington, D.C.: Technical Education Research Centers, 1973.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Evans, Rupert N., and Herr, Edwin L. Foundations of Vocational Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1978.

Evans, Rupert N.; Mangum, Garth L.; and Pragan, Otto. Education for Employment: The Background and Potential of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan-Wayne State University, 1969.

Feldman, Marvin J. "Toward a National Policy for Vocational Education." Paper presented before the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, Houston, Texas, December 5, 1976.

Feller, Irwin. "Issues in the Design of Federal Programs to Improve the Policy Management Capabilities of State Legislatures." Public Administration Review 35 (December 1975): 780-785.

Fielstra, Clarence. "Policy-Making Strategies for Vocational Education: Interim Evaluation Report." In Report on Policy-Making for Vocational Education. University of California at Berkeley, Division of Vocational Education. Berkeley, California: University of California, June 1976.

Frederickson, H. George. "Public Administration in the 1970's: Developments and Directions." Public Administration Review 36 (September/October 1976): 564-576.

Freeman, Richard B. "Teenage Unemployment: Can Reallocating Educational Resources Help?" In the Report of the Congressional Budget Office Conference on The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What are the Options? Congress of the United States, Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 14, 1976.

Gentry, Don K. "Federal and State Governance of Vocational Education: Its Relations to Compliance with Federal Rules and Regulations." In The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication: No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Gilbert, Charles E. "The Shaping of Public Policy." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 426 (July 1976): 116-151.

Gilmer, Jay, Guest, James W., and Kirchner, Charles. "The Impact of Federal Programs and Policies on State/Local Relations." Public Administration Review 35 (December 1975): 774-779.

Ginzberg, Eli. "The Place of Skill Acquisition in a National Manpower Policy." In The Future of Vocational Education, edited by Albert J. Paulter, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.

Ginzberg, Eli. "The Professionalization of the U.S. Labor Force." Scientific American 240: 3 (March 1979): 48-53.

Goldberg, David. "The Future Population of the United States: Some Speculations." A paper delivered before the National Convention of the American Vocational Association, Dallas, Texas, December 4, 1978.

Gottlieb, David. "Vocational Educational Futures: Some Sociological Dimensions and Considerations." In The Future of Vocational Education, edited by Albert J. Paulter, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.

Greer, Scott, and Minar, David W. "The Political Side of Urban Development and Redevelopment." Reprinted in Urban Renewal: People, Politics, and Planning, edited by Jewel Bellush and Murray Hausknecht. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967.

Grubb, W. Norton. "The Phoenix of Vocational Education: Implications for Evaluation." In The Planning Papers for The Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication: No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Halperin, Samuel. Emerging Educational Policy Issues in the Federal City: A Report from Washington, Occasional Paper No. 42. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, April 1978.

Hart, David K. "Theories of Government Related to Decentralization and Citizen Participation." Public Administration Review 32:5 (September/October 1972).

Hartle, Terry W. "Public Policy and Higher Education." Public Administration Review 37 (March/April 1977): 196-201.

Heclo, Hugh. "Frontiers of Social Policy in Europe and America." Policy Sciences 6 (1975): 403-421.

Henry, Nicholas. "Knowledge Management: A New Concern for Public Administration." Public Administration Review 34 (May/June 1974): 189-196.

Henry, Nicholas. "Paradigms of Public Administration." Public Administration Review 35 (July/August 1975): 378-386.

Higgs, Louis D. "Mapping the Federal Assistance Effort: The Pieces of a Puzzle, But Where's the Picture?" Public Administration Review 35 (December 1975): 743-748.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. A Research Agenda for the National Institute of Education. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, August 1976.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. "YEDPA: Obligations and Opportunities for American Education." In the Report on Joint DHEW/DOL Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. U.S. Department of Labor. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

International Labour Organization. Convention and Recommendation Concerning Vocational Guidance and Vocational Training in the Development of Human Resources. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office, June 1975.

Killingsworth, Charles C. "Manpower Policy for Balanced Economic Growth." In Directions for a National Manpower Policy. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1976.

Kirst, Michael W. "Research Issues for Vocational Education: Compliance and Enforcement of Federal Laws." In The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication: No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Klonglan, Gerald E.; Warren, Richard D.; Winkelpleck, Judy M.; and Paulson, Steven K. "Interorganizational Measurement in the Social Services Sector: Differences by Hierarchical Level." Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (December 1976): 675-687.

Kruger, Daniel H. "Statement," before the Select Committee on Labor, House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. Congress. Unpublished paper. Michigan State University, School of Labor and Industrial Relations, February 23, 1972.

Lee, Arthur M., and Sartin, Robert. Learning a Living Across the Nation. Project Baseline, First National Report, Volume I. Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University, 1972.

Lerwick, Lowell P. Alternative Concepts of Vocational Education. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, January 1979.

Levitan, Sar A. "An Economist's (Solicited and Surprisingly) Cheerful Message to Vocational Educators." In The Future of Vocational Education, edited by Albert J. Paulter, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.

Levitan, Sar A. "Coping with Teenage Unemployment." In the Report of the Congressional Budget Office Conference on The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What are the Options? Congress of the United States, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 14, 1976.

Levitan, Sar A., and Taggart, Robert, III. Social Experimentation and Manpower Policy: The Rhetoric and the Reality. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins Press, 1971.

Levitan, Sar A., and Zickler, Joyce K. "Block Grants for Manpower Programs." Public Administration Review 35 (March/April 1975): 191-195.

Levitt, Theodore. "Management and the 'Post-Industrial' Society." The Public Interest 44 (Summer 1976): 69-103.

Lieske, Joel A. "In Quest of the Manpower Grail: Politics, Planning and Pluralism." Public Administration Review 36 (May/June 1976): 327-333.

Lindman, Erick L. "Financing Vocational Education in Public Schools" In Report on Policy-Making for Vocational Education. University of California at Berkeley, Division of Vocational Education, Berkeley, California: University of California, June 1976.

Lockard, Duane. "The Strong Governorship: Status and Problems." Public Administration Review 36 (January/February 1976): 90-98.

Lowi, Theodore J. "Four Systems of Policy, Politics, and Choice." Public Administration Review 32:4 (July/August 1972): 298-310.

Lynn, Laurence E., Jr. "Introduction." In Knowledge and Policy: The Uncertain Connection. Study Project on Social Research and Development, Volume 5. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

Lynn, Laurence E., Jr. "The Question of Relevance." In Knowledge and Policy: The Uncertain Connection. Study Project on Social Research and Development, Volume 5. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

Mangum, Garth. "Evaluating Federal Manpower Programs." Paper delivered to Industrial Relations Research Association, December 28, 1967. Reprinted in Employment and Training Legislation - 1968: Background Information. Congress of the United States, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1968.

Mangum, Garth. The Emergence of Manpower Policy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Marshall, F. Ray. "The Interface of Public Policies and Economic Development." In Directions for a National Manpower Policy. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 17, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December, 1976.

McGowan, Eleanor Farris, and Cohen, David K. "'Career Education' -- Reforming School Through Work." The Public Interest 46 (Winter 1977): 28-47.

McPherson, Robert. "CETA - The Basic Assumptions and Future Prospects." In Directions for a National Manpower Policy. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1976.

Mead, Lawrence M. "Institutional Analysis for State and Local Government." Public Administration Review 39:1 (January/February 1979): 26-30.

Meltsner, Arnold J. "Political Feasibility and Policy Analysis." Public Administration Review 32:6 (November/December 1972): 859-867.

Meltzer, Allan H., and Richard, Scott F. "Why Government Grows (and Grows) in a Democracy." The Public Interest 52 (Summer 1978): 111-118.

Michael, Robert H. "The Future Direction of Income Transfer Programs." Public Administration Review 36 (September/October 1976): 603-607.

Miles, Rufus E., Jr. "A Cabinet Department of Education: An Unwise Campaign Promise or a Sound Idea?" Public Administration Review 39:2 (March/April 1979): 103-110.

Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester. CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

Morehouse, Thomas A. "Program Evaluation: Social Research Versus Public Policy." Public Administration Review 32:6 (November/December 1972): 868-874.

Mosher, Edith K. "Educational Administration: An Ambiguous Profession." Public Administration Review 37 (November/December 1977): 651-658.

Murphy, John C. "General Revenue Sharing's Impact on County Government." Public Administration Review 35 (March/April 1975): 131-135.

Murray, Michael A. "Comparing Public and Private Management: An Exploratory Essay." Public Administration Review 35 (July/August 1975): 364-371.

Mushkin, Selma. "Policy Analysis in State and Community." Public Administration Review 37 (May/June 1977): 245-253.

Nathan, Richard P. "The 'Administrative Presidency.'" The Public Interest 44 (Summer 1976): 40-54.

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Second Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, November 15, 1969.

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. "The Challenge to Vocational Education in the Economic Crisis: Policy Statement." Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, January 17, 1975.

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. "Youth Unemployment: The Need for a Comprehensive Approach." Report by the Council, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., March 1977.

National Association of Manufacturers. "Secondary Vocational Education." NAM National Association of Manufacturers Public Policy Report. National Association of Manufacturers, New York, 1975.

National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education. "Position Statement on a National Manpower Policy." May 11, 1967.

National Commission for Manpower Policy. An Assessment of CETA. Report No. 7. Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1978.

National Commission for Manpower Policy. Directions for a National Manpower Policy: A Collection of Policy Papers Prepared for Three Regional Conferences. Special Report No. 14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1976.

National Commission for Manpower Policy. The Quest for a National Manpower Policy Framework. Special Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1976.

National Commission for Manpower Policy. Toward a National Manpower Policy. First Annual Report to the President and the Congress. Report No. 3, October 1975.

National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors. The Impact of CETA on Institutional Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Urban Services, NLC/USCM, December 1974.

National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors. The Impact of CETA on Institutional Vocational Education. Case Studies and Final Report. Prepared by Robert Anderson and Rosa D. Rozansky. Washington, D.C.: Office of Urban Services, NLC/USCM, March 1977.

Nelson, Richard R. "The Allocation of Research and Development Resources: Some Problems of Public Policy." In Economics of Research and Development, edited by Richard A. Tybout. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1965.

Newton, Robert D. "Administrative Federalism." Public Administration Review 38:3 (May/June 1978): 252-255.

Norwood, Janet A. "The Demographic and Employment Perspective for the Future of Vocational Education." In The Future of Vocational Education, edited by Albert J. Paulter, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.

Ogle, Richard A. "Institutional Factors to Encourage Interagency Cooperation in the Management of National Resources." Public Administration Review 32:1 (January/February 1972): 17-23.

O'Keefe, Patrick. "Program Information Systems." In CETA: An Analysis of the Issues. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1978.

O'Keefe, Patrick; Ainsworth Robert; and Crawford, Everett. "Overview of the Program." In CETA: An Analysis of the Issues. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1978.

Ollerenshaw, Kathleen. Manpower Planning: The Threat or Spur to Education. London, England: British Association for Commercial and Industrial Education, February 1972.

Olson, Kenneth C. "The States, Governors, and Policy Management: Changing the Equilibrium of the Federal System." Public Administration Review 35 (December 1975): 764-770.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. Manpower Policy and Programmes in the United States, Review of Manpower and Social Policies, 2. Paris, France, February, 1964.

Paulter, Albert J., Jr., editor. The Future of Vocational Education: Papers from the Bicentennial Conference on Vocational Education. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, October 10-13, 1976.

Porter, David O., and Olsen, Eugene A. "Some Critical Issues in Government Centralization and Decentralization." Public Administration Review 36 (January/February 1976): 72-84.

Reid, William J. "Inter-organizational Coordination in Social Welfare: A Theoretical Approach to Analysis and Intervention." In Readings in Community Organization Practice, edited by Kramer and Specht. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Rein, Martin, and White, Sheldon H. "Can Policy Research Help Policy?" The Public Interest 49 (Fall 1977): 119-.

Report on Policy-Making for Vocational Education. University of California at Berkeley, Division of Vocational Education. Berkeley, California: University of California, 1976.

Reubens, Beatrice. "Foreign Experience." In the Report of the Congressional Budget Office Conference on The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What are the Options? Congress of the United States, Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 14, 1976.

Reubens, Beatrice. Presentation at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, October 11, 1978.

Reuther, Walter P. "The Human Goals of Manpower Policy." In Manpower Tomorrow. New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1967.

Roberts, Paul Craig. "The Breakdown of the Keynesian Model." The Public Interest 52 (Summer 1978): 20-33.

Robson, R. Thayne. "Administering Federal Manpower Programs." Paper delivered to Industrial Relations Research Association, December 28, 1967. Reprinted in Employment and Training Legislation - 1968: Background Information. Congress of the United States, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1968.

RuBino, Richard G. "State Policy Management: A Question of the Will to Act." Public Administration Review 35 (December 1975): 771-774.

Ruttenberg, Stanley, and Gutchess, Jocelyn. Manpower Challenge of the 1970s: Institutions and Social Change. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1970.

Sawhill, Isabel V. "Introduction and Summary." In CETA: An Analysis of the Issues. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1978.

Schermerhorn, John, R., Jr. "Determinants of Interorganizational Cooperation." Academy of Management Journal 18:4 (December 1975): 846-856.

Schick, Allen. "Beyond Analysis." Public Administration Review 37 (May/June 1977): 258-263.

Schnick, Allen. "The Intergovernmental Thicket: The Questions Still Better than the Answers." Public Administration Review 35 (December 1975): 717-722.

Schiller, Bradley. "Program Outcomes." In CETA: An Analysis of the Issues. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1978.

Schneider, Mark, and Swinton, David. "Policy Analysis in State and Local Government." Public Administration Review 39:1 (January/February 1979): 12-16.

Schuck, Peter H. "'National Economic Planning': A Slogan Without Substance." The Public Interest 45 (Fall 1976): 63-78.

Scott, Paul, and MacDonald, Robert J. "Local Policy Management Needs: The Federal Response." Public Administration Review 35 (December 1975): 786-794.

Shaefer, Carl J. "Policy Research and National and State Evaluation Studies of Vocational-Technical Education." Unpublished paper, 1974.

Shaw, Malcolm E. "Education is not a Place: Connecting Learning and Living." Public Administration Review 33 (November/December 1977): 516-522.

Siegel, Irving H. "Appropriate Government and Private Research Roles in a Mixed Economy." In Economics of Research and Development, edited by Richard A. Tybout. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1965.

Simon, Herbert. Administrative Behavior, Second edition. New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Smith, Bruce L., R. "The Non-Governmental Policy Analysis Organization." Public Administration Review 37 (May/June 1977): 253-258.

Smith, Ralph. "The Teenage Unemployment Problem: How Much Will Macro Policies Matter?" In Report of Congressional Budget Office Conference on The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What Are the Options? Congress of the United States, Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 14, 1976.

Snedeker, Bonnie B., and Snedeker, David M. CETA: Decentralization on Trial. Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Company, 1978.

Spring, William J. "Youth Unemployment, Bridge Jobs and National Policy." In Directions for a National Manpower Policy. A Special Report of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 14. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1976.

Stern, Barry E. Toward a Federal Policy on Education and Work. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1977.

Swanson, Gordon I. "The Role of Vocational Education in the Nation's Employment and Training Programs." In The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication, No. 1., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Swanson, Gordon I. "Vocational Education: Fact and Fantasy." Phi Delta Kappan (October 1978): 87-90.

Taggart, Robert. "Promoting Cooperation Among the Education and Training Communities Under YEDPA." In the Report on Joint DHEW/DOL Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. U.S. Department of Labor. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Thompson, Victor. Modern Organizations. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Thurow, Lester C. "Vocational Education as a Strategy for Eliminating Poverty." In The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Publication, No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Ukeles, Jacob B. "Policy Analysis: Myth or Reality?" Public Administration Review 37 (May/June 1977): 223-228.

University of California, Division of Vocational Education. Policy-Making for Vocational Education. Los Angeles: University of California, November 1975.

U.S. Congress, Report of the Congressional Budget Office Conference on The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What Are the Options? Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 14, 1976.

U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee. Youth Unemployment: Hearings Before the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Ninety-Fourth Congress, Second Session, September 9, 1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Employment and Training Legislation - 1968: Background Information. Superintendent of Documents. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1968.

U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Notes and Working Papers Concerning the Administration of Programs Authorized Under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Committee Print, 90th Congress, Second Session. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. A Plan for the Study of Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 30, 1977.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs. Impacts of YEDPA on Education/CETA Relationships at the Local Level: Five Case Studies. Office of Youth Programs Special Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August, 1978.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs. Report on Joint DHEW/DOL Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Van Horn, Carl E. "Evaluating the New Federalism: National Goals and Local Imperatives." Public Administration Review 39:1 (January/February 1979): 17-22.

Venn, Grant. "An Analysis of Vocational Education Research and Development Policies from Three Perspectives." Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, July 7, 1975.

Walsh, John. "Vocational Education: Education or Short-Run Training Program?" In The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study. Vocational Education Study Publication, No. 1. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1979.

Weidenbaum, Murray, and Rockwood, Linda. "Corporate Planning versus Government Planning." The Public Interest 46. (Winter 1977): 59-72.

Weiner, Sanford, and Wildavsky, Aaron. "The Prophylactic Presidency." Public Interest 52 (Summer 1978): 3-19.

Weiss, Carol H. "Improving the Linkage Between Social Research and Public Policy." In Knowledge and Policy: The Uncertain Connection. Study Project on Social Research and Development, Volume 5. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

Whetten, David A. "Toward a Contingency Model for Designing Interorganizational Service Delivery Systems." Organization and Administrative Sciences 8:1 (Spring 1977): 77-96.

Wirtz, Willard. "Education for What?" In The Future of Vocational Education, edited by Albert J. Paulter, Jr. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1977.

Wirtz, Willard. The Boundless Resource. A Prospectus for an Education-Work Policy. Washington, D.C.: The New Republic Book Company, Inc., 1975.

Wurzburg, Gregory. "Improving Job Opportunities for Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act." Second Report to the U.S. Department of Labor, ETA/ Office of Youth Program. From the Youth Evaluation Committee of the National Council on Employment Policy, August 1, 1978.