PRECONDITIONS TO INTERORGANIZATIONAL COLLABORATION AMONG STAKEHOLDER ORGANIZATIONS THAT CARE ABOUT PROSTITUTED WOMEN

By

Gayla Jewell

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

2004

ABSTRACT
PRECONDITIONS TO INTERORGANIZATIONAL COLLABORATION AMONG STAKEHOLDER ORGANIZATIONS THAT CARE ABOUT PROSTITUTED WOMEN

By

Gayla Jewell

The formation of collaborative efforts among organizations is a significant strategy used to cope with uncertainty in the corporate world. Collaborative efforts among stakeholders organizations committed to social problem solving are, too, a well-established occurrence. Collaborative endeavors tend to follow a pattern from preconditions through process to outcome. It is the precondition phase of this pattern that is the focus of this research project. Five theoretical elements of the precondition phase were derived from the theories of Gray and Wood, Resource Dependency Theory, Political Theory, Relationship Capital Theory, and Civil Society Theory and were utilized to develop a structured interview. Preconditions to interorganizational collaboration were investigated by comparing responses of stakeholder organizations that did and did not participate in Prostituted Women's Support Network, an 18 month collaborative endeavor in a mid-size, Midwest city. While statistical findings were non-significant, comparisons by percentages and qualitative analysis of the stakeholder organizations' responses provided useful information about preconditions to interorganizational collaboration in this genre.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One

Project Focus

The formation of collaborative efforts among organizations is a significant strategy used to "cope with the turbulence and complexity of their environments" in the corporate and business world (Gray & Wood, 1991, p. 3). Collaborative efforts among agencies for social problem solving are, too, a well-established occurrence (Logsdon, 1991, Edwards & Stern, 1998, Lopez, 1999, Hamalaine, Kettunen, & Ehtamo, 2001, Perlstadt, Jackson-Elmoore, Freddolino, & Reed, 1999). Requests from funders and the need to maximize funding dollars for ever-growing social needs are often motivators to explore "cross-institutional collaboration as a tool to meet existing and new challenges" (Nissan & Burlingame, undated, p 1, Personal Communication C, 2003).

One example of an interorganizational collaborative endeavor is the "Prostituted Women's Support Network" (PWSN) (pseudonym). Initiated with support funds from a local foundation in 2001, the 18-month project focused on facilitating a collective learning process designed to enable community organizations to more effectively address both the needs of prostituted women and girls and the issues surrounding prostitution. Within a year after the funded PWSN ended, a number of original members initiated an effort to bring together past PWSN members and other stakeholder organizations to determine the possibility of a new Prostituted Women's Support Network, it's mission, and potential projects.

Collaborative endeavors tend to follow a pattern from preconditions through process to outcome (Gray & Wood 1991, Austin, 2000, Winer & Ray 2000, Mattessich, Murray-Elose, & Monsey 2001). It is the precondition phase of this pattern that is the focus of this research project. Preconditions are those factors that cause organizations to participate in some form of collaboration (Gray & Wood, 1991) This research offers an analysis of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration by comparing interview responses of stakeholder organizations who did and did not participate in the original PWSN. Elements derived from the theories of Gray and Wood, Resource Dependency Theory, Political Theory, Relationship Capital Theory, and Civil Society Theory are utilized to develop a structured interview that focuses on preconditions to interorganizational collaboration. Representatives of stakeholder organizations that care about prostituted women (PW) and related interest groups in a mid-size, Midwest city were interviewed (hereto referred to as the "City"). Analysis of the interview responses provided useful information about the precondition phase of interorganizational collaboration in this genre.

Problem Statement

The phenomenon of prostituted women (PW) is such a complex social, cultural, economic, psychological, racial, and gender power issue that no single approach can effectively conceptualize it or be a basis for planning comprehensive problem-solving response. Many challenges surround the efforts of western society to deal with the phenomenon of prostitution. In the United States, generally speaking, prostitution is a criminal act subject to fines, incarceration

and/or enforced rehabilitation efforts. A diverse system of agencies and interest groups – the stakeholder organizations[1] - has developed to respond to this issue with activities that range from public policy mandates to religious and secular interventions. The missions of each stakeholder organization, the environment in which they operate, and their history of interactions drive responses to the phenomenon of PW as well as interests to work independently or collaboratively.

The Prostituted Women's Support Network (PWSN) is one example of an interorganizational collaborative established to deal with the complex issue of prostitution. The original PWSN was initiated with support funds from a local foundation in late spring, 2001, as part of a long-term initiative to gain better understanding of women and girls in the city who are marginalized. The 18-month project focused on facilitating a collective learning process designed to enable community organizations to more effectively address both the individual *needs* of prostituted women and girls and the *issues* surrounding prostitution. The stated goal of the group was to help women and girls involved in street prostitution in the city make positive choices for their lives. The PWSN strategy was to "focus on raising awareness of the issues surrounding prostitution through a community learning process; to provide a forum for a broad spectrum of community members to meet regularly, learn about and discuss the issues surrounding prostitution, and explore ways of addressing them" (outcome publication of the project). During an eighteen-month period, the group convened thirteen times. More than thirty-five local stakeholder organizations participated

with a core of 20-30 present at most meetings (outcome publication of the project). Outcomes of the original PWSN included:

- education of the group members
- encouragement of communication among members
- and a one-day conference about prostitution in the city offered to the general public and various professionals.

Two groups formed the backbone of this research; *participating* stakeholder organizations of the PWSN, as well as stakeholder organizations that did *not* participate in the original PWSN. The purpose of the research is to compare those stakeholder organizations that participated in the original PWSN with those who did not to investigate the following question:

> Do the stakeholder organizations that participated in the original Prostituted Women's Support Network demonstrate more elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than those that did not?

Overview

The following chapters describe the process by which this research occurred. First, a literature review of the phenomenon of prostitution is presented followed by a discussion of prostitution in the City. Next, theories relevant to interorganizational collaboration are reviewed. Based on this information, a theoretical framework is developed. Research methodology is described and

findings presented with discussion. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are offered.

Chapter Two

Why Collaborate?

Since the 1970s and continuing to the present, funders have strongly encouraged or mandated that agencies collaborate to be eligible to receive monies (Mattessich, et al,, 2001, Personal Communication C, 2003). This has transpired as more non-profits compete for increasingly limited local, state and federal resources. Rationale for this trend is that interorganizational collaboration brings together complementary capabilities to accomplish more than that that can be done individually. By joining together in creative ways, issues that lie beyond the scope of a single agency can be dealt with more effectively (Austin, 2000, Gray & Wood, 1991, Mattessich, et al,, 2001, Winer & Ray, 2000). Information sharing among stakeholder organizations can enhance understanding of the issue by learning the desired and intended actions of others (Wood & Gray, 1991) and, thereby, can foster an enriched appreciation of the identified social problem or issue from a broader perspective. Effective collaboration of stakeholder organizations' capacities can result in more efficient use of limited resources and decrease individual stakeholder expenses by sharing overhead (Austin, 2000, Edwards & Stern, 1998, Mattessich, et al,, 2001).

In circumstances such as those described in this research endeavor, an ultimate benefit of collaboration could be improved accessibility and effectiveness of services, especially for targeted individuals and groups who have complex problems. Organizations that work together (not independently) tend to perform a more comprehensive analysis of issues and possible strategies for interventions.

The quality of outcomes often increases when a problem is addressed by an interorganizational collaboration (Gray 1989). While interorganizational collaboration is not always appropriate or effective, it is a strategic method for many situations (Austin, 2000).

Research Focus

This research is focused on the elements (factors in Gray and Wood terms, 1991) of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration among stakeholder organizations that did or did not participate in the Prostituted Women's Support Network. Preconditions to interorganizational collaboration have to do with those factors that cause organizations to participate in a collaborative (Gray and Wood, 1991).

The PWSN met for 18 months during 2001 and 2002 with a support grant from a local foundation. When the funding support ended, so did the PWSN. In mid 2003, preliminary efforts were underway to start a second support network. This researcher explored the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration by using a structured interview with some open-ended items to collect data from original PWSN participant stakeholder organizations and non-participant stakeholder organizations.

The term "stakeholder organization" refers to agencies and interest groups that are concerned about prostituted women. Agencies are those that provide health, social, or legal intervention services for prostituted women (PW), e.g., a

clinic agency that focuses on women's health, a substance abuse treatment agency, a mental health service agency, and the probation office within the local police department. Interest groups do not provide intervention services, but do want something done about the social problem of PW, e.g., a neighborhood association or a local media-watch group.

Interview questions cover topic areas such as: What is/are stakeholder organizations' perception(s) of interdependence with other agencies? and What is the common or shared understanding about the problem at hand?

The phenomenon of prostitution has existed since ancient times in various forms. What is of interest here is how prostitution is perceived and, in the genre of stakeholder organizations coming together in a collaborative effort, responded to in the city of interest. A literature review of prostitution is presented here, followed by a brief history of response to the issue of prostitution in the City, and a description of the current picture of prostitution. Once this past and present picture is completed, literature on interorganizational collaboration is reviewed and a theoretical framework for investigation of preconditions is proposed.

Chapter Three

The Global Phenomenon of Prostituted Women

Prostitution has been a subject of fascination and condemnation over the course of human history. That descriptions of it reach back into antiquity lends a kind of credibility to the title: "the world's oldest profession". Yet, this appellation denies any historical-political context of prostitution and does not consider influencing social-cultural constructs of normative sexual practices and gender-power relations as well as differences in economic organization over time and across geographies (Zatz, 1997). It is the social evaluation and legal determination of a society that give prostitution a special status (Bullough & Bullough, 1987, xiii).

For the purpose of this study, prostitution is regarded as a social problem because, generally in the USA, the sale of sex is mandated as illegal, the activity is often associated with other criminal behaviors, e.g., substance abuse, theft, and violence, and because of the anecdotal evidence and research results that comment on the psychological damage and health problems caused by involvement in "the work" (Barry 1979, bell 1987, Davidson, 1998, King 1990, Overall 1992, Potterat, et al 1990, Rhoede, et al 1994, Richardson 1987, Rosenberg, 1988, Scambler 1999, O'Leary & Howard, 2001). Prostitution is defined as a social-sexual phenomenon that involves the exchange of money or something of value, including drugs or shelter or other survival needs for sexual activity. Sexual activity includes vaginal sex, anal sex, oral sex, and manipulation of another person's genitals for purposes of sexual arousal. Many girls and

women are involved in prostitution activity although they may not self-identify as prostituted women (O'Leary & Howard, 2001, p. 6, Davidson, 1998).

Because the majority of adult prostitution is perpetuated on women, this study is limited to adult, female prostitution. Male prostitution and child prostitution, while equally vital in importance of social concerns, are left for other research efforts. Adult, female prostitution technically begins at age 17 to 18 years, the age of adult majority status. Nonetheless, as the stated definition of prostitution suggests, it really makes no difference whether the boundary for childhood is drawn at 18 years, 14 years, or even 10 years of age. People become prostituted, at any age due to economic, political, personal, and social circumstances in which they live that make it either the best or only means of subsisting, or they are forced into prostitution by a third party (Davidson 1998). A great number of prostituted children continue into the market as adults. In reality, child prostitution cannot be separated from the more general phenomenon of prostitution

Prostitution is a social-sexual phenomenon in which one person or group purchases and exercises control over another (Davidson, 1998). This is different from the purchase and use of a material good. When services of a prostituted woman are contracted, there is no mutuality of consideration. The purpose of the prostituted act is to ensure that one person becomes the objectified enactment of another's desire. Prostitution is a social phenomenon that allows certain powers

of command over one person's body to be exercised by another (Davidson 1998, p. 9). The services of a prostituted woman cannot be available unless she is present (Barry, 1979, Pateman, 1985), i.e., her service cannot be separated from her body.

This conception of prostitution holds implications on two levels: 1) the exchange level at which psychological and physical health damage are caused by "the work" and 2) the social-sexual phenomenon level - because prostitution is primarily purchased by men, it is an outcome of the imbalance of gender-power relations. Many girls and women enter prostitution due to constrained or limited ranges of choices in their lives and/or under coercive circumstances.

Historical Perspectives

Tannahill (1980) posits that the profession of harlot carried no stigma in Sumerian or Babylonian times. During those times, temple priestesses offered prostitution services as a method to experience spiritual closeness with the divine. Later, in justification and maintenance of their monotheistic ideology of private property, family structure, and lines of inheritance, Judaism and, later, Christianity, stripped the temple priestess of her divine duty and designated her immoral. Temple priestess prostitution was regarded as a threat to family integrity and created questions of patriarchal rights to inheritance.

In the United States today, prostitution is mandated a criminal activity, except for a few counties in the state of Nevada. Fines, jail time and probation

are sanctions levied against lewd behavior, solicitation and sex for the exchange of money.

Entry Into Prostitution

Accounting for how many women become involved in prostitution is difficult partly due to the invisibility of much of the work and partly due to inconsistent definitions about just what comprises prostitution. The nineteen-year-long study by Potterat, et al (1990) about prevalence and career longevity of 1,022 prostituted women in Colorado Springs, CO, resulted in an estimated rate of 23 prostitutes per 100,000 population. These researchers report these findings as reasonably consistent with FBI data (p. 241). O'Leary & Howard (2001) report that in 1999, while the Chicago Police Department made a total of 5,651 arrests of women for prostitution-related offenses, "...our total estimate is at least 16,000 women and girls involved in prostitution activities in the Chicago metropolitan area during any given year, and most likely substantially greater (p. 30). (U.S. Census Bureau estimates the year 2000 population of Chicago at 2,896,016.) Alexander (1987) gives a more generous statistic stating that "at any one time, there are approximately one million women who work as prostitutes in this country [USA], and as many as ten to fifteen percent of all women have done so at some time in their lives" (p. 258). A career longevity estimate, the accuracy of which was questioned by the authors, themselves, was 4.8 years (Potterat, et al, 1990, 241).

Why women enter prostitution and/or that which contributes to their vulnerability to being prostituted is a complex issue. The impact of poverty can lead to women engage in "survival sex". If a woman possesses limited education and low-level employment skills, she may turn to prostitution for money, shelter, food or drugs to dull the pain of existence. Poverty induced homelessness, violence, child sexual abuse and substance abuse are significant contributing factors to entry into prostitution (Goswami, 2002, Phoenix, 1999, Schoot & Goswami, 2001, Farley & Barkan, 1998, Farley & Kelly, 2000, Simons & Whitbeck, 1991, James & Meyerding, 1977, O'Leary & Howard, 2001). From the macro perspective "...entry into prostitution is conditioned by and predicated upon a particular set of social relations rather than being a specific expression of [the] individual" (Davidson, 1998, p.5). That is, due to societal inequities in gender-power relations, women are more likely to have lower paying jobs than men and, thereby, be more vulnerable to unemployment and poverty, more subject to domestic and partner violence, and less likely to have available intervention services geared toward the treatment of women or women with children, e.g., substance abuse treatment programs.

Health Issues

Literature about health issues for prostituted women (PW) tends to focus exclusively on sexually transmitted infections – particularly for the purchasers of prostitution. Historic examples are the Contagious Disease Acts of 1864, 1866 and 1869 enacted by the British Empire to safeguard military troops. These acts mandated arrest, quarantine and punishment of prostitutes (Richardson, 1987)

while the men were simply treated for infections. "Sanitary policing" of wayward women is particularly noted during times of war – presented as issues of threat toward national security (Brandt, 1985). Regardless of times of war or peace, the PW is seen as the "infector", not as an "infectee" (Farley & Kelly, 2000).

Brock (1979), King (1990), Rhoede, Donoghoe, Hunter, & Stimson (1994), Scambler, Penswani, Renton, & Scambler (1990), and a US Center for Disease Control cumulative study (1987) all found data to support that HIV infection among women in prostitution is directly related to substance abuse, particularly crack cocaine and intravenous drug abuse. Surprisingly, some of this research suggests that prostituted women (PW) who are not substance abusers have lower HIV rates than found on most university campuses. Therefore, HIV and AIDS among PW could be more related to substance abuse lifestyles than to sexual behaviors.

The unbalanced focus on HIV and sexually transmitted infections concerning the health of women in prostitution serves to undermine attention to overall health issues and lack of access to health care for PW (Richardson, 1987, King, 1990, Scambler, Peswani, Renton, & Scambler, 1990). Health problems arise from more than the actual act of prostitution. Health problems associated with poverty, homelessness and substance abuse are exacerbated by repeated exposure to extremes of cold, snow, rain, and heat as well as physical and sexual assaults. The few research reports about multiple health needs of PW

describe increased risk of abnormal pap smears, cervical dysplasia and cancer, chronic hepatitis, unplanned pregnancies, sore throats, flu, and repeated suicide attempts (Farley & Kelly, 2000, O'Leary & Howard, 2001).

Violence "on the job" and in personal relationships seems to be an inherent experience for prostituted women. In a survey of 235 women incarcerated for prostitution offenses, Goswami (2002) found that sixty to seventy percent of the women had been isolated by a partner (kept from others), hit or beaten, and ridiculed or shamed, thirty-two percent had been attacked by a weapon, and twenty-six percent raped and/or sexually assaulted. This is in stark contrast to the reports by the U.S. Department of Justice (2000) that twenty-five percent of women in the U.S. are sexually or physically assaulted by a partner and eighteen percent raped. Women who were homeless and prostituted report significantly more experiences of violence (Goswami, 2002). Such a history of violence contributes to the high level of emotional and mental health problems. Many prostituted women do not receive care for these health issues. In Goswami's survey (2002), women stated that lack of money, lack of insurance, and unavailability of services were major reasons why they were unable to access care for their emotional and mental health needs.

Prostitution: Right or Wrong?

Arguments about the "rightness and wrongness" of prostitution abound. Conceptualizations of prostitution range from that of a simple sexual-economic exchange or consensual contract as Chapkis (1997), Jenness, (1993), and Bell

(1987) claim, to an opportunity for personal empowerment and dominance over men (Chapkis, 1997), to the epitome of the "female condition as a class condition" (Barry, 1995, 9) of subordination and oppression of women's human rights (Overall, 1992). Prostitution is considered:

- racist because women of color are represented in disproportionate numbers in women who "walk the street" (Arrington, 1987, Delacoste & Alexander, 1987, Dworkin, 1989, Barry, 1995);
- classist because poverty and/or the need for money is a major reason given for entry into the work by the women themselves (Pheterson, 1989, Overall, 1992, Chapkis, 1997);
- and sexist because it emanates from the social construction of women, i.e., a class condition of subordination and exploitation Overall, 1992, (Barry 1995, Davidson, 1998, Farley & Kelly 2000).

The stigma of the label of deviance on the woman in prostitution can lead to disrespect for the woman and unequal power relations as evidenced through police harassment and lack of adequate health care and other services to assist women to leave the trade (Barry, 1995, Chapkis, 1997, Delacoste & Alexander, 1987, Dworkin, 1989, O'Leary & Howard, 2001). The majority of published literature reviewed emphasizes the wrongness of and damage caused by prostitution. Nonetheless, several publications speak to the power and self-confidence some women feel through their prostitution activities (Bell, 1987, Chapkis, 1997, Jenness, 1993).

Prostitution: The Complex Phenomenon

This complicated and interrelated accumulation of factors suggests that the course that leads to prostitution is quite complex ranging from the micro social to the macro-social, e.g., individual rebellious behavior to substance abuse to sexual and physical victimization to poverty and gender-power-economic inequity issues. The phenomenon of prostitution involves multiple levels of oppression: gender, class, race, etc. Additionally, prostituted women do not constitute a single, unified, social group (Barry, 1979, Delacoste & Alexander, 1987, Davidson, 1998, Dworkin, 1989, O'Leary & Howard, 2001). Therefore, it is difficult to identify a single cause and, thereby, suggest a straightforward intervention. Broad-based intervention efforts are purported to be the best approach to complex social problems (Edwards & Stern 1998, Fleisher 1991, Gray 1989, Gray & Wood 1991, Hulse-Killacky & Killacky 1991, Logsdon 1991, Lopez 1999, Perlstadt, et al 1998, Edwards & Stern, 1998, Harmalaine, Kettunen, & Ehtamo, 2001, VanAlstyne, 1997). Meaningful strategies to impact the social problem of prostitution require community-wide, comprehensive programming.

While potential social problem-solving strategies and the descriptions of the phenomenon of prostitution emerge from general conceptions and frameworks, local community response must be grounded in the social-economic-cultural environment specific to the area. This research project occurred in the United States in a midsize, Midwest City. As the reader will see, while City leaders have historically and currently regarded prostitution as a social

problem and service agencies have implemented various problem-solving strategies, the phenomenon of prostitution persists.

Local Background About Prostituted Women in a Mid-size, Midwest City

Historical Perspectives

Historical documentation about prostitution in the City is rather scant. After a lengthy search, the Chief Historian of the city's public library found a few documents of interest. Around 1885, an autobiography was published by a woman named Georgie Young entitled "A Magdalen's Life". This book chronicles the author's difficult childhood, loss of home, and movement into a life of prostitution. Newspaper files from the same era in time reveal articles about the author and a home for wayward girls she established.

In 1911 a "Report of the Investigations of the Vice Committee of Forty-One" was published by the City. The Vice Committee sent an undercover, heterosexual couple to known Rooming Houses, "Third Class Hotels", "Houses of Ill-Fame", and Roadhouses to investigate the availability of prostitution in this City. As a result of the summary report by the Committee, a recommendation was made to create a "Morals Efficiency Commission" to enforce proposed ordinances to close the buildings and businesses of ill repute. No recorded comment about any social programming to assist the women in prostitution in redirecting their lifestyles was found. In addition, no historical follow-up to this Committee and the recommendations was found. Clearly, despite the expressed

desire of the city leaders, the phenomenon of prostitution persisted and persists today.

This City and the Issue of Prostitution

Population Demographics

According to the US Census 2000, total population of the City is approximately 200,000. Over 62% of the total population claims to be white, about 20% Black, and about 2% or less are Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, some other race, and two or more races. Twenty-two percent claims at least one ancestor who was from a conservative, religious, northern European country. Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin represent less than 13% of the City population. Note that Hispanic/Latino is not considered a race in the 2000 US Census but a demarcation of the place of origin. Persons of this origin may be of any race (www.fedstats/gov/gf/states/26/2634000.html).

A great majority of city residents were born in the USA and in the state. Almost 90% of the population was born in the USA. More interesting is that, of the total population, almost three quarters were born in the state. About 10% were foreign born. Over 80% of the homes are English-speaking only. Thirty percent of the Hispanic community is non-English speaking (Personal Communication C, 2003).

Community Characteristics

The 2000 US Census statistics bear out the local, cultural perception that within this city organized religion is quite prevalent. Over 68% report attending worship services one to two times a week. Catholicism is the most reported religion with about 27% of the population claiming attendance. A large, conservative, religious, protestant community tied to a specific group claims about 18% of the total City population attending church. The percentage of non-Christian attendance is insignificant. These demographics are somewhat evident in the make-up of the City Commission. Five of seven City Commissioners are Catholic. However, no member of the aforementioned conservative, religious, protestant community has been a City Commissioner for over 12 years (Personal Communication E, 2003).

If, as suggested in the research literature, poverty and child abuse are risk factors for female entry into prostitution, then, this city holds such a risk. The difference in median income for women and men in 1999 (the most recent year the estimate is available from the US Census) was about $13,000.00 (median for men is approximately $41,000.00 and for women is approximately $28,000.00). Almost 15% of the children in the county in which the city is located live in poverty. Substantiated victims of child abuse stands at 10%.

Interviewed community leaders characterize this city as possessing a strong volunteer spirit, high levels of philanthropy, strong business and economic

diversity and a strong faith base. According to interviews with persons in the secular and religious communities, these characteristics culminate in a fairly unified effort to meet community needs (Personal Communication B, 2002, Personal Communication E, 2003, Personal Communication F, 2003). Conversely, other community members hold the opinion that the "churched" image combined with the "All American City" image serve as impetus to cover-up the extent of social problems such as child sexual abuse, child poverty and prostitution. Maintenance of image appears to override the urge to identify and intervene with social problems that, when made more public, could mar the City's image (Personal Communication B, 2002, Personal Communication E, 2003). Both attitudes were mentioned in stakeholder responses to the data collection interview for this research endeavor.

Changing population demographics coupled with the historic homogeneity in community leadership contribute to what one City leader terms a "very parochial image" that is being "shaken up". Some community leaders see a tension between the "old guard" leadership and the younger "new guard". For example, the growing African-American and Hispanic communities are actively vying for a larger "share of the action" that has been previously denied to them except via tokenistic gestures (Personal Communication E, 2003). In regard to philanthropy, the level of generosity is strong, but selective. The Arts are well funded, as are mainstream agencies that provide "services of mercy". However, if any of these agencies challenge the status quo – e.g., by supporting the AIDS

population, the gay population or support needle exchange for substance abusers – their funding support could be severely curtailed or withdrawn. "Generosity is extended to those organizations perceived as efficient, to be doing the caring or mercy, but not the social justice issues. You see, a social justice perspective puts the responsibility back on the privileged. They may have to look at how their choices contribute to the plight of others." (Personal Communication E, 2003, Personal Communication F, 2003).

Other community leaders commented that the City could be an oppressive environment for people who are not mainstreamed: racial/ethnic minority, differently-abled, poor, gay or lesbian, or immoral [PW]. The tacit moral code puts a high level of emphasis on personal responsibility, e.g., the "pull yourself up by your bootstraps" idea. What is misleading about this moral code is the misperception that the playing field is level. Too often social issues are identified as character issues; that a weak character is the core cause when a person persists in a life of crime, substance abuse and/or prostitution. (Personal Communication B, 2002, Personal Communication E, 2003, Personal Communication F, 2003).

Many interviewed community leaders shared the thought that there is a dynamic in this City, a perception of conservatism – that a lot of power is in the hands of the conservative element. This contributes to an overall misperception of conservatism in the City in general. However, when social change agents do

take a thoughtful approach and progress slowly and steadily, the general response can be very positive. This is the hope of the City – that leaders and communities can be encouraged to acknowledge a more comprehensive, collaborative, and accepting attitude toward social problem-solving (Personal Communication E, 2003, Personal Communication F, 2003).

Perspectives of the Vice Police

Two police vice officers employed by the city were asked to describe the issue of prostitution. One officer had over 15 years experience and the other about four years on the Vice Squad. The more experienced officer stated that his job responsibilities in regard to prostituted women changed significantly during the past six to seven years since a new Police Chief was installed. The newer policy is to "clear the streets" and make prostitution less visible. This has been successfully accomplished by increasing the number of "operations" or "stings" to clear the streets of soliciting women and johns. A drive through the areas of town previously known for active street prostitution provides validation of this success. When asked if, in their opinion as Vice Officers, the population of prostituted women (PW) has decreased, they commented that women who work in street prostitution are part of a throwaway, invisible population, i.e., they are very difficult to track. They may "run the course" – work for a few weeks in one city, "lay low for a few weeks, and then move to another near-by city, thereby working a circuit of 3-5 cities in the geographic area. Others make enough money to "take a vacation" only to return to the "work" when more money is needed. Some women left prostitution and switched to "boosting" (shoplifting) as a source of

income. Others have gone "underground" or "inside" working as "barflies" or for escort services.

From the perspectives and experiences of these two vice officers, women usually work the "trade" for only one year or "one season". Nonetheless, they described a few women by name that have been on the streets for 5-10 years. They describe the age range of PW as 18-30 years with an ethnic/racial breakdown of 75% Black, 25% White, a few Hispanics, and virtually no Asians. They conjecture that about 90% of the women regularly use condoms and the majority is "crack-heads".

When asked about the potential for rehabilitation for women in prostitution, both officers expressed doubt. In their opinion, the criminal justice system is more of a barrier than a facilitator of rehabilitation. When a woman is arrested for unlawful solicitation, lewd behavior and/or active prostitution, the criminal justice system simply becomes a revolving door of arrest, fines and/or brief incarceration and back to the "job". When asked about health needs of PW, the officers responded that that responsibility lies with the public health department.

City Arrest Statistics

Arrest statistics were obtained after permission was gained from the Lieutenant of the Vice Department of the police department. Particular information is required to be documented during an arrest of a woman in prostitution and/or her customer/john. The primary statistic of interest to the city

is the number of arrests. Recording of demographic data is limited by the format utilized in the data collection system of the police department's computer software system. Of particular interest is that the software program provides space to record only two races: black and white. Racial categories other than these two tend to be placed in the "white" category according to the two vice police officers interviewed.

During the time period January 1, 2001 and March 28, 2002, a total of 150 women in prostitution were arrested; 22 were "repeaters". Males presenting themselves as female prostitutes (He/She) are included in this count. The race of the "he/she" is not available for this time period. Females age 16 years and younger are transferred to the Juvenile Division. Information about this age group is not readily available. The age range categories used create a bit of confusion. Rather than recording a 10-year span, e.g., 23-32 years or 43-52 years, the year used to designate the decade demarcation is repeated (See Table 1). It appears that no consistent method is in place to determine into which category a "cusp" age (one at the edge of the categories) should be placed.

During the month of July 2001, a sting operation to "bust johns" was instituted. While incomplete recording keeping occurred, the opinion is that about 10% of the men stopped for soliciting prostitution were actually arrested (Personal communication A, 2001). Most were simply "talked to" on the street. A total of 167 men were arrested and arraigned.

Race Category	Age Range	# Arrested
White	17-22 years	14
	22-32 years	28
	32-42 years	23
	42-52 years	4
Black	17-22 years	15
	22-32 years	39
	32-42 years	16
	42-52 years	0
He/She	17-22 years	2
	22-32 years	6
	32-42 years	3
	42-52 years	0

Table 1. PW Arrests 1-01-01 through 7-28-01

Note that the sum of all arrests from Table 1 is 179. This is in discrepancy with the reported number of 150. Interestingly, a second source within this same police department reported that the "sting" operation of July 2001 resulted in 692 arrests nearly 33% (228) of which were customers and 66% (456) of which were PW.

Public Health and Social Service Perspectives in the City

No formal program exists within the public health department, either on the county or state level, to track or monitor health issues for women in prostitution unless they have been diagnosed with syphilis. In this situation, the women are "followed rigorously" per mandated protocols (Personal Communication D, 2002). Likewise, the local department of social services has no formal method to follow or to "tease out" data about women in prostitution (Personal Communication D, 2002).

No formal, over-arching method, intervention, or collaborative to deal with the issues surrounding the prostitution phenomenon exists in this City. Select agencies provide some services, but no collective efforts exits (Personal Communication, 2002). Many agencies report efforts in coordinating services and cooperating to share information, but except for the original 18 month PWSN, an active, interorganizational collaborative does not exist. Speculation can be made that this lack of direct services could be due to denial of the extent of the social problem, the overwhelming challenge of dealing with such a complex social problem, or some combination of both (Personal Communication C, 2002). This lack of intervention services surrounding to the phenomenon of prostitution underscores the need for the research herein.

Needs Assessment of City's Nonprofit Organizations

In 1998, a local university's philanthropy department and a nonprofit leadership organization conducted a needs assessment of nonprofit organizations in the county in which the city is located (CPNL, undated). Board Chairs and CEOs were surveyed to determine the highest priority needs for the nonprofit organizations. The top 5 most crucial *needs* (ranked here in order of descending importance) of the nonprofit organizations were marketing, resource development, collaborative partnerships, planning and information systems. *Priorities* for collaborative partnerships included the need for collaboration (highest ranked need) followed by affiliations and mergers. In this same vein, the three most serious *problems* (ranked in descending importance) facing the

nonprofit organizations were funding sources, competition for contributions and people, and collaboration.

This needs assessment result underscores the motivation for the research undertaken herein. An understanding of the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration is imperative to laying groundwork for approaching the social problem of prostitution and the need for collaboration among stakeholder organizations.

Interorganizational collaboration

Literature review

Interorganizational collaboration efforts for social problem solving are not rare. Partnerships among business, public sector and nonprofit organizations occur at an impressive rate (Logsdon, 1991, Edwards & Stern 1998, Greening & Gray 1884, Hamalaine, Kettunen, & Ehtamo 2001, Lopez 1999, Austin, 2000). Such efforts are usually aimed at intervening on multi-layered problems that cut across society, such as, improvement of the image of the commercial sewing industry to enhance recruitment and retention of potential employees (Sharfman, et al, 1991), community development to enhance the diversity and quality of human services in a region (Selsky, 1991), a state government initiative to look at the merits of open enrollment and school of choice issue (Roberts & Bradley, 1991), and a citizen participation effort in community health planning (Perlstadt, Jackson-Elmoore, Freddolino, & Reed, 1999). No reviewed journal articles that report research endeavors about collaborative efforts that focus on the social problem of prostitution were found. Several websites were located that provide descriptions of actual experiences of collaborative efforts, but none are validated by formal research and validated theoretical basis.

While much has been written about the importance and outcomes of interorganizational collaborations, less is available about the structural aspects and process issues that must be addressed for successful convening. Nonetheless, five theories that deal with structure and process do dominate the literature. The first three theories, Gray and Wood's theory, Resource

Dependency Theory, and Political Theory describe the structural aspects of interorganizational collaboration. Relationship Capital Theory and Civil Society Theory describe more of the process issues. Gray and Wood's (1991) classic theory of collaboration is presented in detail and the other related theories, Resource Dependency, and Political Theory, Relationship Capital, and Civil Society Theory are discussed. *Please note that the special interest of this research is preconditions to interorganizational collaboration and that the selection of reviewed theories neglects other relevant and valuable theories, for example, theories of social capital or civic capital.*

Definition of Interorganizational Collaboration

Interorganizational collaborations occur "to address problems too complex and too protracted to be resolved by unilateral organizational action" (Gray & Wood, 1991, p.4 Edwards & Stern 1998, Greening & Gray 1994, Hamalaine, et al 2001, Lopez 1999, Mattessich, et al,, 2001) and to create synergies based in the recognition of "inescapable interdependence" (Austin, 2000, p. 10, Gray & Wood, 1991) that offer opportunities for broader, more strategic engagement with the community to deal with social issues. This main theme of multi-stakeholder effort in social problem solving is inherent in many of the definitions of collaboration proffered in the literature. Fleisher (1991) defines collaboration as interorganizational networks established to resolve collective action dilemmas, which are pressing problems that no individual organization can solve by itself (p. 117). Pasquero (1991) states that "supraorganizational systems of collaboration are loosely coupled, multi-layered networks of referent organizations designed to

lead stakeholders to take voluntary initiatives toward solving a shared social problem" (p. 38). In contrast to the idea of "loosely coupled", Winer and Ray (2000, p. 24) describe collaboration as a "mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve results they are more likely to achieve together than alone".

After painstaking review of nine research articles that utilize six theoretical perspectives, Wood & Gray (1991) present the following definition: "Collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain (p. 146).

Common components to these definitions include:

- a shared recognition or definition of the problem;
- recognition that the problem is too complex or too large to be handled by only one organization;
- some type of interaction or networking among the organizations;
- problem-solving or resolution outcome is anticipated; and
- mutually desired ends

What seems to be assumed in these definitions and common components is a mutual interest in the problem and/or its resolution and some level of common agreement about the term, organization

Common understanding of the term "organization" seems to be assumed in many of the definitions. For the purposes of this research, organizations may be formal or informal groups, legally incorporated or not, that provide services for or are concerned about the issue of prostitution.

Components that are not necessarily assumed or are not evident in these definitions include trust, a sense of interdependence, context of the collaboration, and the role of the convener. Trust is not necessarily inherent to interaction or networking. Likewise, recognition that the problem is too complex or too large to be handled by only one organization need not include recognition of the need for interdependency. Consideration of the concepts of context and convener could lead the investigation toward a process orientation of evolving interorganizational collaboration as opposed to a more static one. When the evident and less than evident components are mutually considered, it becomes clear that interorganizational collaboration involves structure and process. Stakeholder organizations come together to create a new structure with commitment to a common mission. This requires a comprehensive planning process that arises from acknowledgment of interdependence, formal communication, and mutual trust. Resources and reputations are shared, as are rewards and risks of failure. (Austin, 2000, Mattessich, et al,, 2001.)

In the ensuing paragraphs, each of the common and non-evident components in the definition of collaboration are discussed as a means to more

fully explore the phenomenon of interorganizational collaboration. This is done via description of Wood and Gray's (1991) proposed theoretical framework: preconditions, process and outcomes of collaboration as well as the other related theories. Then, a theoretical framework is proposed to investigate the pre-conditions for interorganizational collaboration among agencies that provide intervention services and interest groups for women in prostitution.

Chapter Four

Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration

According to Gray (1989) and Wood and Gray (1991), collaboration occurs within a multi-organizational problem domain. Problem domain is the configuration of the organizations that are linked to a particular problem. Inherent to this concept of collaboration are the characteristics of each organization, how the organizations relate, the issues surrounding the particular problem, and how movement occurs toward problem resolution. In the case of this research, the problem domain is the formal interorganizational collaborative of agencies and interest groups focused on social problem solving of the issue of women in prostitution, i.e., the Prostituted Women's Support Network.

Wood and Gray (1991) identify three broad issues essential to understanding the interorganizational collaboration: 1) the preconditions that make a collaboration possible and that motivate stakeholder organizations to participate; 2) the process through which collaboration occurs; and 3) the outcomes of the collaboration.

Preconditions

Preconditions are those issues or factors that motivate organizations to participate in some form of collaborative process, e.g., motivations of individual organizations or environmental/market stimulants (Gray, 1989, p 5, Gray & Wood, 1991). Preconditions are those issues that must be addressed during the early phase of collaboration:

- Context:
    - A commitment to collaborate, based on both the interests of the organization and conditions related to trusting other potential participants;

- Problem Domain:
    - A common definition of the problem, stemming from interdependence;

- Stakeholder Organizations:
    - Identification of other stakeholder organizations with which to collaborate;
    - Acceptance of other stakeholder organizations;

- Convener:
    - The presence of a convener to bring stakeholder organizations together;

Context

A central theme of Gray's theory of collaboration is the need to understand the context within which the collaborative emerges and occurs. Context contributes to the preconditions that create motivation for stakeholder organizations to participate. More specifically, context is the organizational field (OF), the totality of the relevant actors, and the competitive and institutional forces that create the space for collaboration. Organizational fields exert powerful influences on the individual organizations via two kinds of forces: 1) competitive forces and 2) institutional demands placed on organizations by government or the professions.

The concept of competitive forces arises from the assumption that organizations are concerned primarily with their own survival and that because no organization has all the resources it needs, competition for existing resources always occurs (Sharfman, Gray, & Yan, 1991). Competitive forces can be categorized as competitive driving forces (the desire to decrease uncertainty by working with a competitor) and competitive restraining forces (the desire to protect proprietary knowledge or products).

Institutional forces are the elaboration of rules and requirements to which organizations must conform in order to receive support and legitimacy from those that have power over the organization and those that have power within the organization. Institutional forces can be categorized as institutional driving forces and institutional restraining forces. These forces describe or dictate the structures, procedures, and norms to which an organization must conform. They many originate from organized constituencies, e.g., government and the professions, that exert pressure on organizations to comply with institutional rules or practices in exchange for the conferral of legitimacy (Sharfman, Gray, & Yan, 1991) and they may originate from within an organization in the form of missions and policies.

The organizational field specific to the particular collaborative can encourage or impede the formation of a collaborative effort and can shape the interorganizational behavior of that collaborative effort (Sharfman, Gray, & Yan

1991, p. 183). Hamalainen, Kettunen & Ehtamo (2001) describe a similar theoretical framework for multi-stakeholder decision support. In the framework's first stage, not only must stakeholder organizations be identified, but also the overall value dimensions and decision criteria surrounding the issue at hand must be clarified.

In the case of the agencies that provide intervention services for PW and the related interest groups, the competitive force of the organizational field is represented by the integration of the stakeholder organization into the community and the supportive infrastructure and availability of funding within the stakeholder organization.

Institutional driving forces include the stakeholder organizations' perceptions of the social problem of prostitution. Institutional restraining forces arise from the multiple or competing missions of the different organizations or stakeholders, i.e., the subcultures or specialty interest groups that support particular stakeholders, ethnic/racial, gender and class issues and the economy or financial stability of the community. All these are influenced by mandates from the criminal justice system, the public health authorities and the department of social services.

Questions to explore regarding the preconditions/context issues include: Which organizations or groups have access to power and resources? and Which

control the distribution of resources? and Who benefits or loses from various distributions of power and resources? (Gray & Wood, 1991).

Problem Domain

When exploring an interorganizational collaborative effort, the investigation must rise above the needs and auspices of individual organizations to focus on domain-level questions and problems. According to Gray & Wood (1991), a collaborative occurs within a multi-organizational problem domain. In order to explain collaborative organizational forms, the focus of theorizing must shift from the individual organization to the interorganizational domain (Gray & Wood, 1991, p.6). This problem domain is the configuration of the organizations that are linked to a particular problem. Inherent in this definition are how the organizations relate and the issues surrounding the particular problem. Focusing on the problem domain moves the questions asked and critical analysis away from the level of activities of a single organization to those occurring at the interorganizational level.

In the case of this research, the problem domain is the interorganizational effort of the stakeholders focused on social problem solving the issue of prostitution. The problem domain is the field of activity in which the collaborative effort occurs – not the services of a particular agency, per say, but the field in which the interorganizational social problem solving strategies occurs. For example, instead of asking what is the role of a single organization in problem solving about the phenomenon of PW, the domain-level question would

investigate the effectiveness of the relationship among the collaborative members to find common ground through mutual conceptualization of the social problem of prostitution, to determine the impact of the problem on individuals and the community, and to determine what a collaborative response would look like. Such questions move toward distinguishing the substance of the collaborative relationship and away from individual agency product or result (Roberts & Bradley, 1991).

Stakeholder organizations

The phrase "stakeholders of a problem domain" refers to the groups or organizations with an interest in the problem domain. (Wood & Gray, 1991, p. 146). Not all stakeholders of a problem domain need to be involved for a collaborative effort in that domain to occur. Stakeholders may have common or differing interests initially; these may be reconfigured or reprioritized during the process of collaboration. It is crucial that stakeholders retain their independent decision-making powers in the collaborative (Wood & Gray, 1991). Even when agreeing to abide by shared rules, this autonomy must exist. Otherwise, the collaborative effort disintegrates or moves more toward being a merger. In order for the interorganizational collaborative to function, all stakeholder organizations must be regarded as legitimate, i.e., each of them must be valued as an entity and as providing value to the collaborative.

In the case of this research, the stakeholder organizations of the problem domain are those that provide intervention services for women in prostitution and

the relevant interest groups. For example, a local chapter of a private, national, non-profit organization that provides reproductive health care and primary health care services could be a stakeholder. Because this organization offers services in sexually transmitted infection screening and treatment, general health screening, and referrals for partner violence as well as a support group for PW incarcerated in the County Jail, many of their clientele are PW. A religious sect in the City supports transition housing and programming for women who are leaving prostitution. This agency could be another stakeholder. Moving toward a more diversified conceptualization of stakeholder organizations, a representative of the local community media watch organization could be invested in the collaborative effort for different reasons. Commitment to exposing misrepresentation in the media of PW as a social justice issue would surely broaden the genre of the interorganizational collaborative effort's make-up.

Role of the Convener

The convener's role in an interorganizational collaboration is to identify and bring all the legitimate stakeholders to the table (Gray, 1989, p. 71). Paramount to the convener role are certain characteristics: legitimacy among the stakeholders; the ability to induce stakeholders to participate; an unbiased approach; and the ability to establish a collaborative process (Gray, 1989, pp. 71, 72). The convener holds the important and complex social function of facilitating commitment, trust and cooperation among autonomous stakeholder organizations. Therefore, the convener must possess strong organizational and interpersonal skills and be respected by collaborative members (Winer & Ray

2000, Mettessich, et al 2001). Finally, the convener must have a good image in the community and knowledge of the subject area (Mettessich, et al 2001).

The Collaborative Process

Domain level questions that address the process of collaboration include:

- What is the process of interaction used by stakeholder organizations to achieve or reach the collaborative's goals?
- and what is the interactive process that occurs that indicates a change-oriented relationship of some lasting nature exists and that indicates the stakeholder organizations are involved in that relationship?

Shared Norms, Rules and Structures

According to Wood & Gray (1991) collaboration is an interactive process among autonomous stakeholder organizations using shared rules, norms and structures. Because the organizations in a collaborative arise from different segments of society – non-profit, religious, for-profit and secular – autonomy is evidenced by the diverse missions. It is precisely the issue of autonomy that creates the necessity for shared rules, norms and structures; these are the fabrics of the collaborative effort.

Even if the shared norms and rules seem implicit, during the life of the collaborative some level of explicit agreement about them usually becomes necessary. This agreement arises from the relationship among the stakeholder organizations and is indicative of an effort to create a sense of certainty (based on confidence and predictability) in the collaboration. Such rules and norms help to maintain the sense of autonomy among the stakeholder organizations. Actions

or decisions by the interorganizational collaborative become possible through use of shared norms and rules. Indeed, it is the engagement of the stakeholder organizations in the process of creating actions or decisions that is the heart of the collaborative, not the actual implementation of services.

What might interfere with the achievement of a shared understanding and collective response are conflicting values and ideology. According to Gray and Ariss (1985), ideologies form the basis for interorganizational consensus or dissonance. If a value or ideology is widely shared within an interorganizational collaborative, agreements about mission and strategies may occur with fair ease giving the impression of a highly rational process. Yet, when values and ideologies of the participating organizations are divergent, i.e., common ground is difficult to find, then conflicts can erupt, leading to an impression of non-rationality. Therefore, interorganizational collaboratives run the risk that the pervasive dictates of ideologies, and not rational choice, may under gird strategic decision-making.

Outcomes of Collaboration

Wood & Gray (1991) suggest that a definition of collaboration should leave the consequences of collaborating unspecified and open to empirical investigations. Nonetheless, several questions can be posed to provide direction for investigating this third broad issue essential to understanding interorganizational collaborative:

- Were problems solved?
- Whose problems were solved?
- Were shared norms achieved?
- Did the collaborative survive?
- Did survival occur through transformation? (Gray & Wood, 1991).

This last question was posed by Gray & Wood as one that has yet to be addressed in the literature. While the authors state that interorganizational collaboratives are usually temporary and evolving structures, they query whether or not an interorganizational collaborative can survive after its initial objective has been met. This could occur by moving on to more general collective interests of players in the organizational field (Gulati & Garigiulo 1998).

Other Related Theories

Resource Dependency Theory

The focus of Resource Dependency Theory is on minimizing interorganizational dependencies and preserving the organization's autonomy while recognizing that interorganizational relationships are necessary to acquire

resources and to obtain otherwise unavailable competitive advantage and values (Das & Teng, 2000, Greening & Gray, 1994, Sharfman, et al, 1991). The precondition or urge to collaborate is motivated by the need of individual organizations to maximize efficiency and to reduce transaction costs (Fleisher, 1991, Labiance Brass & Gray 1998, Van Alstyne 1997). This perspective emphasizes a rational tone, i.e., that organizations approach problems logically. This suggests that collaborative group members use a rational approach to discussion and decision-making, centering on substantive collaborative issues rather than interpersonal, relationship, and trust issues.

Two important components or preconditions that must be in place before a business organization makes a commitment to a cross-sectored social collaboration are the interests or stakes the organization has in resolving the social problem and the degree of interdependence the organization perceives that it has with other stakeholders in dealing with the problem (Logsden, 1991, p. 24). Therefore, the advantage of collaborating is to draw upon the strengths of more than one stakeholder organization to ensure better odds for success in the problem solving effort. The corollary is the acknowledgement of the weakness of each member of the collaboration. Ideally, these strong or weak attributes are accepted without assigning values of good or bad (Lopez, 1999). Collaboration would result in greater control over the environment to reduce uncertainty and achieve stability (Mendonca, 1998).

Resource Dependency Theory describes competition and relationships among corporations. While competition can cause organizations to focus more concern on their own survival and autonomy, this same competitive attitude can, instead, become a driving force for a more positive level of interorganizational collaboration. If the focus is shifted to the domain level, essential questions could become: What are the circumstances in which stakeholders will form or join collaborative alliances? What are the patterns of interdependencies that result from resource exchanges? (Sharfman, et al, 1991, p. 7). This shifts the theoretical focus from that of a single organization and resources to the overall distribution of resources in the interorganizational field.

Working within the framework of RDT, stakeholder organizations that provide intervention services for PW may be motivated to collaborate due to frustrations about PW "falling through the cracks" of intervention efforts or due to a desire to create a joint funding proposal to improve overall efficiency of resource use.

Political Theory

Political Theory focuses on private interests and conflict while emphasizing organizational structure and power. This theory attempts to describe who has access to power and resources and who does and does not benefit from various distributions of power and resources (Sharfman, et al, 1991).

Golich (1991) uses political theory to describe disparate political cultures, i.e., that differing values, attitudes and beliefs, can influence perceptions of stakeholder organizations to the extent that the collaborative effort could be jeopardized or might never emerge. Much like the previously discussed findings by Gray & Ariss (1985), conflicting values and ideologies can interfere with or give the impression of non-rational decision-making. Therefore, an important precondition to collaboration is to find the common, rational ground through which the participating organizations can navigate to create an outcome or problem resolution. This must occur within the context of resolved divergence in values and ideologies. Stakeholders must perceive that their interests are fairly represented, even if their preferred policies are not selected (Golich, 1991, p. 242).

In their work on collaborative efforts to initiate innovative public policy, Roberts & Bradley (1991) claim that stakeholder organizations are motivated to collaborate by a shared purpose or at least one common interest to achieve a "common transmutational end" [meaning to transform ideas and stakeholders relations into a developed outcome] (p. 212). Golich (1991) takes the shared interest issue further by emphasizing that stakeholders must be encouraged to see the compelling rationale for the collaboration. Cognizance of the compelling rationale serves to create the connection between agency self-interest and community interest in the problem solving. However, core values of an organization might be so proscriptive that compromise cannot be considered an

option (Westley & Vredenburg, 1991, Golich, 1991, Edwards & Stern 1998). For example, if a collaborative of stakeholder organizations were to choose to deal with the health risk of exposure to sexually transmitted infections in prostitution by establishing a condom distribution program, a participating stakeholder might find it necessary to leave the collaborative effort due to its strong tenet against sexual activity outside marriage.

In a similar vein, some organizations have, historically, held such positions of opposition to each other that participation in a collaborative effort simply cannot be considered. When exploring international collaborations, Golich (1991) found that the US style of individualism promotes an approach that gives power to the participant who has the capabilities and desire to use or acquire a resource. In contrast, an organization that functions with a more collectivist approach may view resource domains as public goods and that no one participant should monopolize or hoard any resources or goods (Van Alstyne 1997). This individualistic versus collective approach could manifest in an interorganizational collaboration of agencies that provide intervention services for PW as a "pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps" mentality versus a social welfare approach.

Golich (1991), Gray (1989) and Van Alstyne (1997), identify asymmetrical distribution of power among stakeholder organizations as a clear barrier to collaboration, an important component of Political Theory. Such asymmetry

separates the collaboration participants into two competitive groups: relevant actors and weaker actors (Gray, 1989, p. 235). Relevant actors are often able to influence decisions, even unilaterally, while weaker actors are less successful at influencing decision outcomes. The political implications of asymmetrical distribution of power and the resulting conflict could be devastating to interorganizational collaborative efforts. Conflict usually involves perceptions of incompatible goals or threats to relationships (Peck & Hague, year unknown). These perceptions lead to "turf protection" based, in part, on fears of power asymmetry and behavior incompatible with collaborative endeavor.

Relationship Capital Theory

While the theories described so far have dealt with the more structural aspects of collaborative efforts, Relationship Capital Theory (RCT) focuses on the socio-psychological aspects. Competition, resources, finances, power and influence provide fodder for the previous theories. Use of these discrete markers of interaction results in theories that are more static, i.e., they provide a framework for obtaining insight about interorganizational designs or structures at a point in time. In contrast, the process-oriented RCT tries to explain the pattern of interaction among collaborative participants that facilitates and allows for effective functioning on a regular basis (Cullen, Johnson, & Sakano, 2000). It involves attending to and investing time and effort toward building positive feelings and interaction patterns in the collaborative relationship (Ring & Van de Ven 1994, Van Alstyne 1997, Lester 2001). The findings of McAllister (1995) support the importance of the affective qualities of working relationships and the

expressive qualities of various forms of interpersonal conduct. This is similar to what Ross & Ross (1988) describe as the avoidance of "affective conflicts" through attendance to socio-emotional or interpersonal relations (p. 139). RCT purports that focusing on the development of positive feelings and constructive interaction patterns can assist participants to feel attended to and allows for the effective functioning of the collaborative. The process oriented Relationship Capital Theory investigates that which influences motivations to continue in or to end the collaborative relationship and the perceptions or interactions that could impact positive or negative attitudes about the collaborative relationship.

According to Cullen, commitment to the collaboration occurs first at the more rational or instrumental level and then progresses to a deeper attitudinal level. The rational level provides the foundation for "credibility trust" (Cullen, et al, 2000, p. 7). This refers to being reliable, to delivering that which is promised at the agreed upon quantity, quality, and date. Ring (1999) refers to this as the "fragile trust" that permits stakeholder organization representatives to deal with each other, but only in guarded ways. Once credibility trust is established, movement toward confidence in the goodwill of others (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994), "benevolent trust" (Cullen, et al, 2000), "affect-based trust" (McAllister, 1995), or "resilient trust" (Ring, 1999) can occur. A track record of credibility-based trust is necessary for affect-based trust to develop.

A generally accepted axiom of collaborative group behavior is that trust is an important antecedent to cooperation; that it permits pursuit of common goals (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994, Van Alstyne, 1997). Belief in the credibility of other stakeholder organizations, then, leads to commitment. Behaviors and interactions among the stakeholder organizations that signal deeper, more emotional levels of trust further reinforce commitment. In other words, trust is a result of cumulative experience via numerous transactions. This suggests that credibility trust is a precondition to interorganizational collaboration and that benevolent- or affect-based trust occurs farther into the collaborative relationship.

The concept of credibility trust seems to be consistent with the rational approach presented in Resource Dependency Theory (RDT) and its description of the motivation/commitment to collaborate based in the need of individual organizations to maximize efficiency and to reduce transaction costs. RDT, however, does not contain the psychosocial element of emotional/attitudinal trust as seen in RCT. Likewise, Wood and Gray's Theory of Collaboration talks about conditions related to trusting the potential participants, but focuses more on the rules and requirements to which organizations must conform; the organizational field that shapes the interorganizational behavior of the effort.

Interorganizational collaborative efforts can be a place of dysfunctional conflict and mistrust. Differing values, missions and objectives may come into conflict. Relationship Capital Theory states that the collaborative should operate

in a manner that all participants believe they receive benefits from the relationship that equal their contributions. Similar to perceived task interdependence described by Lester (2001), i. e., the level of interaction that group members feel is required in order to ensure that the group can accomplish its task, this is dependent upon a high confidence level in communication and cooperation. Likewise, Wood & Gray (1991) discuss the importance of individual organizations rising above their own needs and auspices to focus on domain-level questions and problems. Now, it seems that this effort could occur formally and guardedly in a context of limited trust. Yet, the RCT purports that, when trust occurs and an attitudinal commitment to the collaborative occurs, then the relationship can often and better sustain periods of unequal exchange and conflict (Cullen, et al 2000, Lester 2001, McAllister 1995, Van Alstyne 1997).

Development of credibility trust is a precondition and domain-level issue for the collaborative effort. Domain level questions include:

- Is it possible to intentionally assemble a diverse group of stakeholder organizations that have expressed interest in the phenomenon of PW for the purpose of initiating problem solving?
- When dealing with an issue as controversial and poorly operationalized as prostitution, can such a domain-level analysis and problem solving occur?

Because stakeholder organizations come to the collaborative effort with distinctive missions and purposes, yet with some idea of the problem domain at hand, it falls upon the role of the convener to create a context in which credibility trust and later, resilient trust, could be fostered.

Civil Society Theory

Civil Society Theory describes the process of the involvement of citizens in social problem solving in their community. The goals of citizen participation are to improve programs, to increase their responsiveness to people's needs, and to gain community acceptance (Perlstadt, Jackson-Elmoore, Freddolino, & Reed, 1999, p. 76). While this framework developed as the result of intensive work to explain citizen involvement in health planning, the framework bears merit for application to other venues. Seven broad themes are identified that are necessary for effective citizen involvement in community decision-making. These themes reflect elements of Gray's theory, Political Theory, Resource Dependency Theory and Relationship Capital Theory.

- Systems change – characterized by a sustainable and institutionalized transformation of the interorganizational relationships.
- Knowledge transfer – the process of transferring from the expert's abstract and science-based statistical knowledge to the participants' need for practical insight and specific solutions.
- Civic engagement – creating a community of shared experiences and reciprocal relationships that enables a group to develop and select programs that match their needs and values.
- Inclusion – deciding which citizens should be involved, how they should be selected, and the implications of these choices for the desired outcomes.

- Decision making – commitment to consensus or compromise, whether citizen input is advisory or governing, and what is being governed.
- Project organization – the structures, processes, and mechanisms required to attain goals.
- Project leadership – ideally an emergent leader; the responsibility is to establish and maintain a participative decision-making process.

Civil Society Theory reflects integration of concepts from other theories presented herein and application of a structure- and process-oriented framework to an existing problem domain of complex health planning in a community.

Summary

It is difficult for any one theory to explain all facets of a complex phenomenon. Gray's Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration emphasizes working at the problem domain level. Resource Dependency Theory describes particular preconditions for collaboration: competition and dependence as well as the need for relationships to acquire resources while maintaining autonomy. Political Theory is more concerned about accessing resources and the ongoing power relationships among the stakeholder organizations and their environments. These three theories lean toward a rational approach, i.e., one in which decisions are made objectively, weighing pros and cons, with an eye on the desired end product.

Relationship Capital Theory delves even more into the interaction process of collaboration by looking at the quality of the relationships that exist among the

collaborative participants. Here is where the concepts of Credibility Trust and Benevolent Trust can be investigated.

Civil Society Theory offers a fairly comprehensive framework that includes elements of the other four related theories presented. None of the theories clearly articulate preconditions to interorganizational collaboration or explain outcomes of the collaborative experience.

Chapter Five

Theoretical Framework

As stated earlier, the social problem of prostitution is such a complex issue that individual, single-shot solutions are inadequate. Collaborative involvement of a variety of community agencies and interest groups to mobilize community-wide resources could be a more effective strategy. In the case of this research, the social problem of adult, female prostitution is not well conceptualized in the literature or in the City. It is an ill-structured problem with incomplete definitions. Therefore, effective problem solving for prostitution in the City requires greater management of multiple knowledge sources and stakeholder organizations through interorganizational collaboration.

The intent of this research is to investigate the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration among stakeholder organizations involved in the social problem of prostituted women. (Preconditions are those factors that cause organizations to participate in a collaborative). To accomplish this, first a working definition of interorganizational collaboration is offered, followed by a description of the theoretical framework to investigate the five elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration. Interview questions are derived from the elements. Then a working paradigm for application of the theoretical framework to the investigation is discussed.

Several definitions of collaboration were offered earlier. For the purpose of this research, the term "interorganizational collaboration" is defined as the

process in which a group of autonomous stakeholder organizations of a problem domain engage in an interactive process using shared rules, norms, and structures to act on issues related to that problem domain. Interorganizational collaboration occurs in a communication- and relationship-rich environment focused on the problem domain rather than specific stakeholder organization-oriented projects.

The proposed theoretical framework integrates the preconditions phase of Wood & Gray's Theory of Collaboration (1991) with the trust component of Relationship Capital Theory to explore the structure- and process-oriented elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration. Components of asymmetrical relationships from Political Theory, and access to resources issues from Resource Dependency Theory are also integrated.

Wood & Gray's theory focuses on the problem domain level, i.e., interorganizational issues and strategies surrounding the over-arching phenomenon and the collaborative effort necessary to create them. This approach takes the emphasis away from studying individual stakeholder organization interests and functioning and moves it toward investigation of what is necessary for the stakeholder organizations to effectively come together under a common mission. Gray's theoretical framework includes three broad phases essential to understanding the interorganizational collaboration:

1) the preconditions that make a collaborative possible and that motivate stakeholder organizations to participate;

2) the process through which collaboration occurs; and

3) the outcomes of the collaboration.

According to Gray (1989), the preconditions phase is comprised of four elements: Context; Problem Domain, Stakeholders; and Convener. Context is the organizational field, that is, the totality of the relevant actors and the driving forces for mutual interest in the problem and for collaboration. These driving forces may be competitive based or founded in institutional demands (Gray 1989, Wood & Gray 1991 Sharfman & Gray 1991). In this proposed framework, competitive forces emerge from the stakeholder organizations' integration into the community and the divergent infrastructure and funding. The Institutional forces emerge from stakeholder organizations' missions and their perceptions of the phenomenon of prostitution. Problem Domain is the configuration of the organizations that are linked to a particular problem: the characteristics of each organization, how the organizations relate to each other and the issues surrounding the particular problem (Wood & Gray 1991, Roberts & Bradley 1991). The term, Stakeholder Organizations, refers to the agencies and groups with an interest in the problem domain (Wood & Gray 1991). The Convener serves to bring stakeholder organizations to the table and to facilitate the collaborative process.

According to Gray (1989) and Wood & Gray (1991), preconditions related to trusting other potential participants are important to the Context element. While

this concept of trust is briefly discussed by those authors, it remains undeveloped. Reviewed literature supports the contribution of trust to interpersonal and inter-agency communication, cooperation and interdependence (Cullen, et al, 2000, Johnson-George & Swap, 1982, Lester, 2001, McAllister, 1995, and Ring & Van de Ven, 1994). Commitment to an interorganizational collaborative is assumed to be highly unlikely without trust as the antecedent (Austin, 2000). Trust is defined at two levels: Credibility trust - confidence that the other stakeholder organizations have intent and ability to meet obligations and Benevolent or Resilient trust - that they will behave with good will toward the collaborative (Cullen 2000, McAllister 1995, Ring & Van de van 1994, Ring 1999). Credibility trust occurs in the precondition phase; benevolent trust in the process phase.

This proposed theory describes the Context precondition element as more structure-oriented (i.e., those stakeholder characteristics that remain unchanged regardless of participation in a collaborative) and the Problem Domain, Stakeholder Organizations, and Convener precondition elements as more process-oriented (i.e., those stakeholder characteristics that are malleable and can be influence by participation in the collaborative). Added to these four elements from Gray's theory is the process-oriented precondition of Credibility Trust. This modification of Gray's theory creates a broader based framework with which to investigate the issue of preconditions to interorganizational

collaboration. Five elements of preconditions are proposed: Context, Credibility Trust, Problem Domain, Stakeholder Organizations, and Conveners.

Structure-Oriented Precondition Elements

Structure-oriented refers to those unchanging stakeholder organizational characteristics that *existed prior to and separate from participation* in the interorganizational collaborative. These include the competitive forces described as integration of the stakeholder organization in the community (agency age, racial/ethnic representation of the governing or advisory board) and its infrastructure and funding (number of employees and volunteers, population targeted for services, and services offered for PW, annual operating budget, and funding). Structure also includes the institutional restraining forces (those institutional forces that influence the mission statement, existence of a strategic plan for services for PW,)

Process-Oriented Precondition Elements

Process-oriented elements describe those attitudes among stakeholder organizations that were influenced *as a result of participation* in the original PWSN. Process-oriented has to do with how capabilities and ideologies/values are negotiated. The process-oriented preconditions include one component of the Context element: the institutional driving forces (the agency's view of prostitution, the scope of in the City, effect prostituting has on women, and opinions about the legal status of prostitution). Credibility Trust, Problem

Domain, Stakeholder Organizations, and Convener comprise the remaining four preconditions,

Credibility trust is an attitude that is based on experience of past interactions (ranking of success of the stakeholder organization's efforts with other agencies, awareness of other efforts to create an interorganizational collaborative, and opining strengths and weaknesses of the original PWSN). The Problem Domain precondition describes recognition of interdependency with other stakeholder organizations (networking efforts, priority projects to collaborate on, barriers and gaps to services, possible role in and goals for an interorganizational collaborative). The process-oriented Stakeholder Organizations precondition describes acceptance of other stakeholder organizations (identifying those that might help or hinder the establishment of an interorganizational collaboration). Identification of a person or agency that could take the lead in the interorganizational collaborative describes the Convener precondition element.

This proposed theory holds five assumptions. First, it assumes that stakeholder organizations are autonomous, self-sufficient units and that stakeholder organizations are inevitably interdependent at some time and in some manner (Astley & Fombrun 1987). Second, it emphasizes that collaboration occurs when a larger vision and purpose are focused on the problem domain; this involves both structure and process. The third assumption

is that the potential exists for creation of a new and common mission that reflects the commitment of the stakeholder organizations and facilitated by a convener. That stakeholder organizations strive to minimize uncertainty in their environments and move toward problem solving by collectively creating systems of interrelationships is the fourth assumption. And finally, the theory assumes that Interrelationships are based in acceptance of and interdependency with other organizations. In this precondition phase, groundwork is laid for foundational trust, collaborative comprehensive planning, sharing and/or pooling of resources and sharing of risk by all collaborative members. In the end, more can be accomplished than could have been if collaborative members acted individually. (Mattessich, et al,, 2001, Winner & Ray 2000).

This theoretical model describes preconditions to interorganizational collaboration that occur within an over-arching problem domain that emerges from perceptions and decisions to create an endeavor to integrate stakeholder organizations' efforts to strategize response, make more efficient use of scarce resources, and to minimize uncertainty in dealing with the identified social problem. It attempts to explain how differences in context, problem domain, stakeholder organizations, credibility trust; and convener might be explored to find common ground for collaboration. These five elements are the identified factors that cause stakeholder organizations to join the interorganizational collaborative process.

This framework may also reveal the potential for interorganizational conflict. This is to say, the very elements that may contribute to interorganizational collaboration are those that may contribute to conflict. Literature review reveals little comment on this idea – that collaboration and conflict could be incorporated into the same model. Aiken and Hage (1968) do suggest that relationships among organizations are likely to involve an element of conflict. Therefore, the dialectic of collaboration and conflict within the same model may offer more fruitful, future investigation of interorganizational collaboration.

Overall, this framework combines the ideas of a more structure-oriented approach with a more process-oriented approach. It suggests a framework for investigating preconditions to interorganizational collaboration in the environment within which it occurs. It is an acknowledgment that, within the arena of careful decision-making and informed awareness of competition, values conflicts, and at-odds missions lays an opportunity for variety of and richness in possible meanings and outcomes for the interorganizational collaborative. In the following paragraphs the research question is described, the theoretical elements are reframed as hypotheses and interview questions are used to investigate the hypotheses.

Research question

The original Prostituted Women's Support Network (PWSN) was initiated in the spring of 2001by two conveners and with support funds, both, from a local foundation; it lasted through autumn of 2002. Documents from the PWSN indicate that, during its 18 month existence, support network members (the participant stakeholder organizations) were educated about the issue or prostitution, communication among members was encouraged, and the concluding event of the network, a one-day conference about prostitution in the City occurred. The goals of the conveners of the original PWSN were to identify the problem of prostitution in the City and to educate stakeholders about the social problem. These goals were fairly well accomplished. However, some participant stakeholder organizations expressed disappointment that a long-range plan for further collaboration was not developed and stated plans to create a second PWSN. This researcher was curious: would the participant stakeholder organizations from the original PWSN demonstrate more of the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than those stakeholder organizations that did not participate? And, if participants in the original PWSN do demonstrate more preconditions than the non-participants based on responses to the structured interview, could the researcher speculate about the likelihood of participation in a second PWSN?

Data was collected during the spring and early summer of 2003. The question investigated was:

Do stakeholder organizations that participated in the original Prostituted Women's Support Network demonstrate more elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than those who did not?

Framework Elements and Hypotheses

The preconditions framework contains five elements: Context, Credibility Trust, Problem Domain, Stakeholder Organizations, and Convener. These five elements distinguish the interorganizational collaborative from casual associations among organizations and from a simple referral process through established channels of communication. In this sense, the elements are consistent with the collaborative theory proposed by Gray (1989). But Gray's theory is not used in its pure form. As discussed earlier, the process oriented Credibility Trust element has been added to round out the framework.

Another difference is that this researcher proposed to use the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration theory in a different manner than did Gray. Literature search findings indicate that Gray performed single or comparative case studies without any prior and known prior attempts to collaborate among the stakeholder organizations. This research begins at the dissolution of the original PWSN collaborative endeavor with speculation about the desire to form a follow-up interorganizational collaborative. Therefore, not only are the elements (factors – Gray's term) of preconditions somewhat modified from Gray's theory, but the intent of this research outcome is to explore

the likelihood of participation in a second PWSN, not participation in an original collaborative endeavor (as in Gray's case studies).

Likelihood of participation in a second PWSN is explored by assessing stakeholder organizations' demonstration of the preconditions elements. The elements are organized as structural-oriented and process-oriented. For the first precondition element – Context - pertinent data is derived by exploring the competitive forces described as integration of the stakeholder organization in the community (agency age, racial/ethnic representation on the board, organization size, budget, and funding). Context, also, is explored through the institutional restraining forces (stakeholder organization mission, strategic plan for services for PW,) and the institutional driving forces (stakeholder organization view of prostitution). Pertinent data for the second precondition – Credibility Trust – is derived by exploring success of interaction with other organizations). Problem Domain, the third precondition, is explored by exploring interaction among organizations, views about gaps and barriers to services for PW, goals for a future collaborative, and role the stakeholder organizations might take in a future collaborative. The fourth precondition – Stakeholder Organizations is explored by inquiring which organizations might help or hinder the establishment of a collaborative. Finally, the fifth precondition element – Convener – is explored by querying about who might take the lead to pull together a collaborative.

Context: Element I.A: (structure oriented) Competitive forces that influence preconditions to collaboration are based on:

1. integration of the stakeholder organization in the community; and
2. available infrastructure and funding.

Competitive forces have to do with the characteristics that keep a stakeholder organization viable and resilient in the face of competition with other organizations. (The reader is referred back to the description of Gray's theory in Chapter Four for more detail.) Ideally, a stakeholder organization that is actively involved with and well integrated into the community possesses some level of visibility, position, connections and expertise to offer the interorganizational collaborative (Gray 1989, Gray & Wood 1991). The stakeholder organization's infrastructure should be able to support the commitment and staff involvement needed for participation in the collaborative effort and, if possible, to contribute funding (Austin 2000, Mattessich, & Monsey, 2001, Winer & Ray 2000). Capability of stakeholder organization would be demonstrated through specific services/programming provided to targeted populations and, more narrowly, to prostituted women. Therefore, integration into the community, infrastructure, and funding are the competitive forces in the context component of the precondition phase.

The **Context: Hypothesis I.A (structure oriented)** investigated is:
(See Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area.)

Hypothesis I.A.1:
Participants in the PWSN will report more years of existence in the City than did non-participants. (Q1)*[1]

Participants in the PWSN will report board membership reflective of City demographics (Q12).

Hypothesis I.A.2:
Participants in the PWSN will report available infrastructure and funding as indicated by:

- Number of people employed (Q13)
- A broader variety of sources of funding or support (Q14).
- Fewer funding constraints on programming (Q15).
- More services charged or sliding scale (Q5).
- Annual budget (Q16).
- Target population for services (Q3).
- Percentage of clients who are prostituted women (Q6).
- Specific services/programming offered to prostituted women (Q7).

Context: Element I.B: (structure oriented) Institutional restraining forces to collaboration are based on conflicting/"at odds" missions of the stakeholder organizations.

The **Context: Hypothesis I.B** investigated is:
(See Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area.):

Participants in the PWSN will report fewer institutional restraining forces to preconditions than non-participants as evidenced by:

- Overlap in mission statements (Q2).
- Reporting a strategic plan for PW (Q8).

A major function of interorganizational collaboration is to coordinate or integrate efforts across formal stakeholder organization boundaries. Stakeholder organizations' mission statements designate stakeholder boundaries – a form of

[1] * The parenthetical symbols, e.g., (Q1), (Q12), etc., refer to the numbered interview questions found on Table 2 and Appendix II.

institutional restraining forces. The institutional restraining forces are influenced by stakeholder category (mission/ministry, transitional housing, substance abuse treatment/mental health, physical health, neighborhood associations, and criminal justice) and by stakeholder type (religious or secular). Differences among stakeholder organizations' missions or competing projects could lead to competition, dislike and boundary guarding. If collaborating stakeholder organizations' missions are at odds, then the commitment to collaborate cannot occur. Collaborative members need not have completely congruent values, but the differences need to be within acceptable limits (Austin, 2000).

Finding a common ground in an interorganizational collaborative mission arises from a joint discovery process founded in the problem domain that creates cohesion for the collaborative effort (Mattessich, et al 2001, Winer & Ray 2000). This precondition phase element involves identifying overlap and diversity in mission statements, separate self-interests, and programming and projects to lay the groundwork for mutual creation of a common mission. Yet, participation in the PWSN would not cause the mission of each stakeholder organization to change. Therefore, this is a structure oriented, pre-participation stakeholder organization characteristic.

Context: Element I.C: (process-oriented) Institutional driving forces that influence preconditions to collaboration are based on some level of overlap in stakeholder organization perception of the phenomenon of prostituted women as a social problem.

Collaborative stakeholder organizations must find agreement or common ground on how the phenomenon or social problem is to be conceptualized (Austin 2000, Gray & Wood 1991, Mattessich, & Monsey. 2001). Perception of the social problem of prostitution is founded in the institutional driving forces of each stakeholder organization, i.e., the forces external and internal to the organization that shape conformity. The hypothesis purports that participation in the PWSN would result in more agreement about the phenomenon of prostitution. Stakeholder organizations must agree, or willingly compromise to reach agreement, on how the social problem of women in prostitution is to be described. Lack of coherence in description of the social problem could lead to lack of clarity in the mission. Clearly stated agreement on the parameters of the social problem clarifies common ground and the "sphere of activity" (Mattessich, & Monsey, 2001) for the collaborative. Variables that influence finding this common ground include perceptions of the characteristics of prostitution and the impact of prostitution on women, and barriers and gaps to services.

The **Context: Hypothesis I.C** investigated is:
(See Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area.)

In comparison to non-participants, participants will report more
- Overlap in perceptions of PW. (Q18)
- Agreement of the size of the prostitution issue in the City (Q19.a)
- Agreement on locations of prostitution activity in the City (Q19.b)
- Agreement on why women enter prostitution (Q19.c)
- Agreement on what age women enter prostitution (Q19.d)

- Agreement on the average age of the PW (Q19.e)
- Commonality in listing common barriers and gaps to services for PW (Q29, Q30).
- Who could fill the gap (Q31)

In comparison to non-participants, participants will report more agreement on the effect prostitution has on women (Q21).

In comparison to non-participants, participants will report more agreement on issues of decriminalization, victimization, and advocacy for PW. (Q44)

Credibility Trust: Element II: (process-oriented) Credibility Trust, based on past experiences, is a precondition to interorganizational collaboration.

Effective interorganizational collaboration requires trust. Credibility trust arises from success of past interactions. Credibility trust is a precursor to benevolent or resilient trust; it is a precondition to interorganizational collaboration (Cullen, et al, 2000, Ring 1999, Van Alstyne 1997). Once the more rational credibility trust has been established, the more attitudinal benevolent or resilient trust can develop. A history of positive working relationships that predate the collaborative creates a sense of familiarity and of credibility trust. If stakeholder organizations have had negative experiences in interactions through collaborative attempts with other potential collaborative stakeholder members, then the basis for credibility trust and, thereby, benevolent trust, may have been compromised. (Interorganizational relationships based on benevolent trust are better able to sustain periods of disagreement and unbalanced exchange.) Variables that influence credibility trust include success of past efforts with other stakeholder organizations and identification of anticipated priorities and challenges in working collaboratively with other agencies.

The **Credibility Trust: Hypothesis II)** investigated is:
(See Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area.)

Compared to non-participants, participants in the PWSN will report Credibility Trust, based on past experiences, as evidenced by:

- Reporting a higher rate of success in interactive efforts with other stakeholder organizations (Q28).
- Reporting knowledge of other efforts to create a collaborative (Q42).
- Describe more strengths than weaknesses in the original PWSN (Q43).

Problem Domain: Element III: (process-oriented) A precondition to collaboration is recognition of interdependency among the stakeholder organizations.

Problem domain is the configuration of stakeholder organizations that are linked to a particular problem; it has to do with the effectiveness of the relationships among the stakeholder organizations (Wood & Gray 1991). In the precondition phase, an essential component in the Problem Domain is recognition of interdependence among the stakeholder organizations.

Recognition of interdependence, in an environment of trust, can move the collaborative toward successful strategies aimed at the social problem that appear intractable when using a single agency approach. All collaborative stakeholder organizations must recognize the need for multi-stakeholder contribution of resources and services (Das & Teng 2000, Greening & Gray 1994). Respectful acknowledgment that other stakeholder organizations provide

a valuable service to the community and can make vital contributions to the collaborative endeavors is necessary for success (Austin 2000).

Through collaborative endeavors, the communication distance among stakeholder organizations is reduced as interdependence becomes more highly valued. This permits sharing of information to create a more complete conception of the problem domain and, thereby, creates space for more effective problem solving. Hence, the interorganizational collaborative can explore a greater variety of interventions and solutions and the overall health of the community could be enhanced by consideration and implementation of diverse solution options. Variables that influence recognition of interdependency include interactions among the organizations, e.g., referrals, joint programming, advising/consulting, perceptions of gaps in and barriers to services, and ideas about who could fill the gaps.

The **Problem Domain: Hypothesis III** investigated is:
(See Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area.)

Participants in the PWSN will report more recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations than non-participants as evidenced by:

- Reporting networking with various agencies (Q22-27)
- Reporting commonality in projects they could or could not work with in a collaborative (Q32, Q33).
- Reporting commonality in what they would be willing to do to improve services for PW (W34).
- Reporting a role they might take in a collaborative that is consistent with the collaborative concept (Q38)
- Reporting commonality in listing three major goals of a collaborative (Q41).

Stakeholder Organizations: Element IV: (process-oriented) A precondition to successful interorganizational collaboration is acceptance of other stakeholder organizations

Identification of appropriate stakeholder organizations, missions and capabilities must occur before the interorganizational collaborative can effectively function. This assists in clarifying a common ground mission and respecting of interdependencies, which keeps the focus on the problem domain and not individual missions and project-oriented interventions. If some stakeholder organizations are seen to be overly powerful, leading to fear of power asymmetry, then lack of acceptance of them as potential collaborative members could occur (Golich 1991, Gray 1989, Van Alstyne 1997)

Ideally, collaborative stakeholder organizations represent a cross-section of those portions of the community that would be impacted by collaborative endeavors (Mattessich, et al 2000, Winer & Ray 2000). Identifying this cross-section or stakeholder organizations is one demonstration of recognition of legitimacy of interorganizational collaborative stakeholder organizations.

The **Stakeholder Organizations: Hypothesis IV** investigated is:
(See Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area.)

Compared to non-participants, participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about which stakeholder organizations might be helpful to or a hindrance to an interorganizational collaborative as evidenced by:

- Identifying those stakeholder organizations that might be helpful in the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative (Q36).
- Identifying those stakeholder organizations that might be a hindrance to the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative (Q36).

Convener: Element V: (process-oriented) The Convener serves to bring stakeholder organizations to the table and to facilitate the collaborative process.

Identification of an appropriate convener is vital to the establishment and process and outcome of the interorganizational collaborative. Whether performing as an independent facilitator or as a stakeholder organization representative, the convener must be respected by collaborative members as well as by the community and must have a working knowledge of the collaborative process.

The **Convener: Hypothesis V** investigated is:
(See Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area.)

Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about who could take the lead for an interorganizational collaborative compared to non-participants (Q35).

Research Method and Design

This non-experimental research is a retrospective case study using a case-control design. The compared "cases" are the participant stakeholder organizations in the original Prostituted Women's Support Network (PWSN) and the non-participant stakeholder organizations. Stakeholder organizations were interviewed to garner description of their pre-participation stakeholder organization characteristics that would remain unchanged after participation in the PWSN and description of those that could be influenced by participation.. The researcher's speculation is that those stakeholder organizations that demonstrate more preconditions would be more likely to participate in the proposed second PWSN.

From the outset, the researcher must acknowledge that interpretation of the findings may be challenged due to working with pre-existing groups that formed, more or less, through self-selection. In other words, pre-existing differences might be a plausible alternative explanation for any observed group differences. Nonetheless, this design was chosen because the problem of interest was not amenable to experimentation and is based in the real-life experiences of the stakeholder organizations. The small number of stakeholder organizations that provide services for and/or care about the problem of adult female prostitution in the city negates the possibility of random sampling.

Convenience Sampling

Convenience sampling entails the use of the most conveniently available study participants. For the research in the City of interest, 30 stakeholder organizations (agencies and interest groups) were invited by the researcher to participate in the interview. The term "stakeholder organization" refers to agencies and interest groups that are concerned about prostituted women. In general, agencies provide health, social, or legal intervention services, while interest groups are those that want something done about prostitution problem, but do not provide services or interventions.

Stakeholder organizations were identified through professional contacts of the researcher, a United Way publication of funded agencies, the yellow pages of the local telephone book, and by recommendations offered by interviewed stakeholder organizations. Eligibility criteria included that the stakeholder must be an agency or interest group in the City, one that cares about prostituted women, and that, in some manner, directly or indirectly provided serviced for, advocated for, or had a valid reason for interest in the issue of prostituted women. This was a non-probability, convenience sample selected by a nonrandom method. A small amount of snowball sampling was used by acceptance of suggestions from some stakeholder organizations about others to interview. Sampling bias was unavoidable; generalizations cannot be made beyond the sample population.

Stakeholder organizations were asked if they would agree to provide a representative to be interviewed to assist the researcher investigate issues surrounding prostitution and interorganizational collaboration. Each stakeholder organization contacted was informed that participation in the proposed research was protected by the university institutional review board. Stakeholder organizations were informed that the data would be used solely for academic purposes and were assured of confidentiality (See Appendix I, Informed Consent Form.). Pseudonyms would be used to ensure anonymity.

Twenty-one of the identified stakeholder organizations agreed to provide representatives to participate in interviews. A total of nine either refused or did not respond to invitations, even when repeated a second and third time.

The informed consent form (See Appendix I) was sent to the stakeholder organization at least one week before the interview session. At the time of the interview, the informed consent was reviewed, questions answered, and signature obtained.

For the purpose of this research, stakeholder organizations were categorized into two groups: those that did and did not participate in the Prostituted Women's Support Network. Fourteen participant stakeholder organizations in the Prostituted Women's Support Network and seven non-participant stakeholder organizations were interviewed.

Structured Interview

Structured interview questions are focused on exploring the hypotheses, derived from the five elements in the theoretical framework. No attempt was made to weigh the importance of or to explore the priority importance of the five hypotheses and elements. Neither are the hypotheses or elements presented in priority order. While the literature search findings suggest support for use of the five elements, no findings were identified that substantiate weighting or prioritizing.

The researcher sought validation of the structured interview questions at a neighboring, major metropolitan city. During the previous two years, a non-profit research forum had investigated the social problem of prostitution in this neighboring city. Concurrent to and in conjunction with this investigation was the formation of a multi-stakeholder organization Prostituted Women's Support Network in that city. To refine the proposed theoretical framework, hypotheses, and structured interview format, the researcher interviewed stakeholder organizations in this neighboring PWSN. Consistently replicated comments and recommendations by these participants served to refine the framework and structured interview format and framework. In the final format, the interview protocol includes a common set of open- and close-ended questions and various specific follow-up probes used as needed. (See Appendix II.)

The interviews lasted about one hour and were conducted at a location of the stakeholders' choosing and where confidentiality of the interview could be guaranteed. Nineteen of the interviews took place in a closed office space. Two interviews were conducted at a corner table in a coffee shop.

Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative analysis was used. Quantitative data analysis was achieved by use of the SPSS program. Some interview questions contained forced yes or no answers or forced choices. These responses were readily coded into the SPSS database. Other questions requested a listing of major ideas and yet others provided the stakeholder with an open-ended option. These responses were carefully reviewed, looking for similarities. When similarities were identified and clustered, categories of key words and phrases emerged. The categories that contained at least three stakeholder responses were coded and entered into the SPSS database.

Nonparametric statistical analysis was not used due to the small sample size. Differences in those unchanging, structure oriented stakeholder organization characteristics were analyzed by comparing those participants above the median with those below. Analysis of the malleable, process oriented precondition elements occurred by comparing participant stakeholder organizations with non-participant. Differences in findings for those structural characteristics were reported as proportions or percentages. Likewise, difference in findings between participants and non-participants is reported as

percentages. Comparative findings are particularly noted if the differences in percentages is 10% or greater. That is, results that are 10% or greater in difference between groups is noted to support the hypothesis.

Stakeholder organizations' mission statements were so varied in the use of words and phrases that clustering and categorization was not possible. Therefore, qualitative analysis was used to compare mission statements. This process involved immersion in and reflection on the data, "sifting" the data, and putting pieces together to determine prominent themes. Stakeholder organizations' responses were grouped as participant and non-participant responses. These provided a field in which to compare their responses.

When qualitative comprehension and SPSS data analysis were achieved, effort was made to prepare a thorough and rich description of the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration among stakeholder organizations in the City.

Questionnaire Content Organized by Substantive Area

Earlier in this chapter, the framework elements and hypotheses were described and detailed with the appropriate interview question numbers. To further demonstrate how the interview questions fit the hypotheses, questions are presented in the substantive areas (See Table 2.). For the actual interviews, the questions were re-organized into a more useful sequence from "warm-up" to the more interrogatory. A brief scenario was offered to assist the interviewees to

think about the prospect of an interorganizational collaborative. (See Appendix II.)

Hypotheses	Question	Interview Question #
CONTEXT: **Hypothesis I.A**: Participants in the PWSN will report more competitive forces than non-participants.		
1.integration of the stakeholder organization in the community;	1. How long has your agency been in existence?	1
	1. What is the racial/ethnic breakdown of your governing body or board of directors?	12
2.available infrastructure and funding; and	2. How many people does your agency employ?	13
	2. What is/are your agency's main sources of funding or support?	14
	2. How much do funding constraints impact programming?	15
	2. Approximately what is your operating budget for the current year?	16
	2. Are your services free, charged, sliding scale?	5
	2. On what specific set of clients or target population does your agency focus?	3
	2. What percentage of your clients is prostituted women?	6
	2. What specific services or programming does your agency offer for prostituted women?	7
CONTEXT: **Hypothesis I.B.** Participants in the PWSN will report fewer institutional restraining forces than non-participants	B. What are your agency's mission and goals? (Please provide a document about the mission and goals of your agency/interest group.)	2
	B. Do you have a strategic plan for services for prostituted women?	8

Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area

Hypotheses	Question	Interview Question #
CONTEXT: **Hypothesis I.C:** Participants in the PWSN will report more institutional driving forces than non-participants	C. What is your agency's view of prostitution	18
	C. To what extent does your agency think prostitution is a problem in this City?	19
	• How large is the prostitution issue in this City?	19.a.
	• What percent of prostituted women work a. on the street, in parks; b. in brothels, parlors; c. as off-site call girls/escorts?	19.b
	• In general, why do women enter prostitution?	19.c
	• In general, at what age do most women enter prostitution?	19.d.
	• What was the average age of the prostituted woman in 2002	19.e.
	C. What effect does prostitution have on the women who walk through the door of your agency.	21
	C. Finally, how strongly does your agency believe that prostitution should be • Decriminalized? • Victimizes women? • Requires advocacy?	44
	C. List the three most common barriers to services for women in prostitution in this city	29
	C. List the three most common gaps in services for women in prostitution in this city.]	30

Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area (continued)

Hypotheses	Question	Interview Question #
CREDIBILITY TRUST: **Hypothesis II**: Participants in the PWSN will report more Credibility Trust, based on past experiences, than non-participants	On a scale of 1-4, what is the success of your agency/s efforts with the agencies you have listed?	28
	Do you know of other efforts to create a collaborative to work on the issue of prostitution?	42
	What were the strengths and weaknesses of the first PWSN?	43
PROBLEM DOMAIN: **Hypothesis III** Participants in the PWSN will report more recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations than non-participants.	In regard to intervention services, with which agencies has yours worked in the past 5 years?	22
	To which agencies does your agency refer?	23
	To which agencies would you not refer? Why?	24

Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area (continued)

Hypotheses	Question	Interview Question #
PROBLEM DOMAIN: Hypothesis III: (continued) Participants in the PWSN will report more recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations than non-participants.	From which agencies would you receive referrals? Why?	25
	With which agency(s) has yours worked in an advisory or consultative capacity?	26
	With which agency(s) has yours worked on a joint program?	27
	In what areas (types of projects) could your agency work with other agencies to establish a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution?	32
	In what areas (types of projects) would your agency find difficulties working with other agencies to establish a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution?	33
	In regard to your agency's mission and services, what would your be willing to do to improve or better coordinate services for women in prostitution?	34
	What should be the goals of a collaborative? (What would you want from a collaborative?)	41
	What role would you see your agency taking in a collaborative?	38

Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area (continued)

Hypotheses	Question	Interview Question #
STAKEHOLDER ORGANIZATIONS: **Hypothesis IV**: Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about which stakeholder organizations might be helpful to or a hindrance to an interorganizational collaborative than non-participants..	Which agencies might be helpful in establishing a collaborative?	36
	Which agencies might hinder the establishment of a collaborative?	37
CONVENER: **Hypothesis V:** Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about who could take the lead for an interorganizational collaborative than non-participants..	Who do you think could take the lead to pull together a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution?	35
	C. Who could fill this gap?	31

Table 2: Questions by Substantive Area (continued)

Chapter Six

Integrated Findings and Discussion

In this section, the data analysis findings are interpreted and discussed. Investigation of the likelihood of participation in a second Prostituted Women's Support Network is organized by the elements of preconditions, reframed as hypotheses, and represented by stakeholder organizations' responses to the interview questions. Preconditions and hypotheses are further organized as structural and process. Whether or not the hypotheses were supported is discussed. Implications, limitations and recommendations for future research are presented.

Information extrapolated from the literature search suggests that interorganizational collaboratives progress through stages of preconditions, process and outcomes (Austin 2000, Gray 1985, Hulse-Killacky & Killacky 1997, Mattessich, et al, 1992, Winer & Ray 2000, Wood & Gray 1991). This research looks at only the preconditions stage. Preconditions to interorganizational collaboration describes those elements or factors that cause a stakeholder organization to participate in an interorganizational collaborative endeavor. The preconditions stage is comprised of five elements: context, problem domain, trust, stakeholder organizations, and convener. The context element describes three types of forces: competitive forces, institutional restraining forces, and institutional driving forces. The first two are structure-oriented. Structure-oriented refers to those unchanging stakeholder organizational characteristics that *existed prior to and separate from participation* in the interorganizational

collaborative. The third part of the context element, institutional driving forces, credibility trust, problem domain, stakeholder organizations, and convener are all process-oriented. Process-oriented elements describe those attitudes among stakeholder organizations that were influenced *as a result of participation* in the original PWSN.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration among agencies and interest groups, i.e., the stakeholder organizations, which care about prostituted women. Participants in the original Prostituted Women's Support Network and non-participants, who knew about the PWSN, were interviewed. The question under investigation was:

> Do the stakeholder organizations that participated in the original Prostituted Women's Support Network demonstrate more elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than those that did not?

Participant/non-participant status was determined by stakeholder organizations' responses to Q43, did you participate in the PWSN? Fourteen of the twenty-one interviewed stakeholder organizations participated in the original PWSN, seven did not. However, all non-participant stakeholder organizations were aware of the existence of the original PWSN.

Religious and secular categorization of the stakeholders was identified by the researcher; this was not an interview item. This information is of limited

interest to the current research. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that within the participant group 64.3% were secular compared to 42.9% of the non-participant group; more participants were secular (64.3%) and more non-participants were religious (57.1%).

	Religious	Secular	Total
Participant n=14	5 35.7%	9 64.3%	14 100%
NonParticipant n=7	4 57.1%	3 42.9%	7 100%

Table 3: Grouping by Religious/Secular categories

The Elements and Hypotheses

Structure-Oriented Preconditions

Context: Element I.A: Competitive forces that influence preconditions to collaboration are based on:

1. integration of the stakeholder organization in the community; and
2. available infrastructure and funding.

The **hypothesis** investigated for **Context: Element I.A** is:

Participants in the PWSN will report more competitive forces that are preconditions to interorganizational collaborative than non-participants:

Hypothesis I.A.1:
Participants in the PWSN will report more years of existence in the City. (Q1)*[2]

Participants in the PWSN will report board membership reflective of City demographics (Q12).

[2] * The parenthetical symbols, e.g., (Q1), (Q12), etc., refer to the numbered interview questions found on Table 2 and Appendix II.

The **Context: Hypothesis I.A.2:**
Participants in the PWSN will report available infrastructure and funding as indicated by:

- Number of people employed (Q13)
- A broader variety of sources of funding or support (Q14).
- Fewer funding constraints on programming (Q15).
- Annual budget (Q16).
- Target population for services (Q3).
- Percentage of clients who are prostituted women (Q6).
- Specific services/programming offered to prostituted women (Q7).

Findings for Context: Hypothesis I.A

One measure of integration of the stakeholder organization in the community was by years of service, Context Hypothesis I.A.1. Most stakeholder organizations enjoy longevity in the City with years of existence ranging from 5 to 103, the mean being 30 years and median 21 years. Of those stakeholder organizations that had been providing services for 22 years or more, 60.0% were participants in the original PWSN and 40.0% were non-participants. Of those that were below the median, 73.0% were participants and 27.0% were non-participants. (See Table 4.)

	21 years or less	22 years or more
Participant n=14	8 73.0%	6 60.0%
Non-Participant n=7	3 27.0%	4 40.0%
Total[3]	100%	100%

Table 4: Q1 Years of Service by Participant/Non-Participant

[3] Figures in Total column reflect totals across the row (total numbers within the median subgroup).

Another measure of integration of the stakeholder organizations in the community (Context Hypothesis I.A.1.) was assessment of the racial/ethnic breakdown of the board membership (Thirteen of the 14 participants responded to this question; all seven non-participants responded.) (See Table 5.) In the previous section about City population demographics, it was noted that 62% of the total population claims to be white, about 20% Black, and less than 2% are Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, some other race, and two or more races. Also, of the approximately 200,000 people living in the City, about 13% reported themselves as Hispanic or Latino people (this category subsumes race). (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

Having Whites and Blacks on a board was moderately associated with participating in first round table, but having other racial groups on the board did not seem to have less influence on whether or not the stakeholder participated in first round table. (See Table 5.) Those stakeholder orgs that had Others on their board were less likely to participate in the first round table.

	Whites on board	Black on board	Other on board
Participant n=13	13 65.0%	11 61.1%	6 46.2%
Non Participant N=7	7 35.0%	7 38.9%	7 53.8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 5: Q12 Percentage of Stakeholder Organizations Reporting Racial/Ethnic Breakdown of Board

Available infrastructure and funding, Context Hypothesis I.A.2, was measured in several ways. Stakeholder organization size (by number of employees), sources of funding or support, accreditation status, annual operating budget, target population, percentage of clients who are PW, and services offered for PW.

Stakeholder organization size was measured by number of people employed. The total range of employees for all stakeholder organizations was one to 105 with an overall median of 8. (See Table 6: Q13a.) Of those stakeholder organizations with 9 or more paid staff, 75.0% participated in the original PWSN compared to only 25.0% of the non-participants. Non-participants tended to have smaller staffs than participants.

	1-8 (lower median)	9-105 (upper median)
Participant n=14	8 61.5%	6 75.0%
Non-Participant n=7	5 48.5%	2 25.0%
Total	100%	100%

Table 6: Q13a # People Employed by Participant/Non-Participant

When asked if any employees were survivors of prostitution, three options were offered: unknown, yes, or no. (Findings from pilot interviews in the neighboring city indicted a majority opinion that women who have survived prostitution are often the best type of employee to work with active PW.) Of

those stakeholder organizations that stated some of their employees were survivors of prostitution, 60.0% (n=3) were participants compared to 40.0% (n=2) who were non-participants. Four stakeholder organizations stated that none of their employees were survivors of prostitution, 50.0% participants and 50.0% non-participants. More stakeholder organizations did not know if employees were survivors or not, 75.0% participants (n=9) and 25.0% non-participants (n=3). (See Table 7: Q13d.) Therefore, employment of survivors of prostitution did not make a real difference in terms of whether or not a stakeholder organization participated in the original PWSN.

	Yes	No	Unknown
Participant n=14	3 60.0%	2 50.0%	9 75.0%
Non-Participant n=7	2 40.0%	2 50.0%	3 25.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 7: Q13d # Employees who are Survivors of Prostitution

Twenty of the twenty-one stakeholder organizations reported use of volunteers. The largest number of volunteers reported by a PWSN participant was 1000 and by a non-participant, 6200 Numbers of volunteers among the stakeholder organizations ranged from 3 to 6,200 with an overall median of 35. (See Table 8.) Of those stakeholder organizations whose number of volunteers were greater than the median 75.0%participated in the original PWSN compared with only 61.5% of participants with 35 or fewer volunteers. Those stakeholder

organizations with higher numbers of volunteers were more likely to participate in the original PWSN.

	3-35 volunteers (lower median)	36-6200 volunteers (upper median)
Participant n=13	8 61.5%	6 75.0%
Non-Participant n=7	5 48.5%	2 25.0%
Total	100%	100%

Table 8: Q13b Volunteers by median of 35

Stakeholder organization size was further investigated by asking the total number of people served annually through all offered services (PW population undetermined) (Q4). Number of people served ranged from 30 to 90,250 for participants and 90 to 16,000 for non-participants. Some stakeholder organizations reported the number of clients served by the actual number of individual people served. Other stakeholder organizations reported number of clients served by the number of encounters; one person may have repeated encounters with an agency for, e.g., counseling sessions, "dry out", financial assistance, or as a "drop-in". Therefore, a comparison of the number served is not valid except to speculate that repeated encounters may underscore the need for on-going and/or long-term services. No table was prepared for this data due to lack of clarity in the meaning of the phrase "number of people served".

Stakeholder size was also indicated by annual operating budget. Nineteen of 21 stakeholder organizations disclosed their annual operating budget. (See Table 9:) Here, as with number of people employed, the range is wide – from $32,000 to $90 million. Mean operating budget for participants was $8,858,166.70 and for non-participants, $1,486,428.60 with an overall mean of $6,142,263.00. The overall median of $350,000.00, when compared to the overall mean, reveals the broad range of operating budgets as does the participant median, $400,000, when compared with the non-participant median, $175,000. Of the seven stakeholder organizations whose budgets are in the millions of dollars, five of them participated in the PWSN. No real difference is found between participants whose annual operating budget was above the median, 66.7%, and those below the median, 60.0%. (See Table 9.)

	$30-350 thousand (lower median)	$351thousand-90 million (upper median)
Participant n=12	6 60.0%	6 66.7%
Non-Participant n=7	4 40.0%	3 33.3%
Total	100%	100%

Table 9: Q16 Annual Operating Budget by median of $350,000

Available infrastructure and funding were investigated by also asking what sources for funding were used and whether or not constraints were imposed on the use of funding. About one-half of both participants and non-participants

reported that some funding sources impose constraints on programming (Q15). (No table constructed for Q15.)

External sources of funding were vitally important for the stakeholder organizations, both participant and non-participant PWSN. All stakeholder organizations reported dependence upon funding to continue to provide services This was a multiple response question (none to all options could be selected, the categories were not mutually exclusive), stakeholders can and do receive money from multiple sources. (See Table 10: Q10.) Of interest, however, is that receiving money from business foundations or the United Way was highly associated with participation in the original PWSN. Similarly, receiving money from non-profit foundations, individual contributions, religious organizations, or government sources, was only moderately associated with participation. Of those participants in the original PWSN, 91.0% of them received money from business foundations or the United Way, compared to 75.0% receiving from religious organizations, 68.8% from non-profit foundations, 66.7% from individual contributions, and 61.5% from government sources.

	Nonprofit Found-ations	Individual Contribu-tions	Religious Organiza-tions	Government Sources	Business Foundations, United Way
Participant n=14	11 68.8%	10 66.7%	9 75.0%	8 61.5%	10 91.0%
Non-Participant n=7	5 31.2%	5 33.3%	3 25.0%	5 38.5%	1 9.0%
Total	16 100%	15 100%	12 100%	13 100%	11 100%

Table 10: Q14 Sources of Funding

Stakeholder organizations were asked about the accreditation status of their agencies (Q17). Five of 14 participant stakeholder organizations (35.7%) reported being accredited, while four of seven non-participants (57.1%) reported accredited status. The interview question did not ask for clarification about what type of service was accredited. This data is not especially revealing as many agencies provide services for which an accrediting body does not exist. For example, substance abuse treatment services must have accredited status to be licensed by the State while transitional housing, ministries, and neighborhood associations need not be accredited (Personal Communication, 2002). Therefore, no table was constructed for this data.

Infrastructure was, also, investigated by inquiring about target populations, percentage of clients that are prostituted women and services offered for PW. (See Table 11: Q3.) Of those stakeholder organizations that participated in the original PWSN, over 60.0% of them targeted the poor and homeless, people with mental health problems, and prostituted women compared to fewer than 40%

that targeted substance abusers. Therefore, targeting these three groups is more highly associated with participating in the original PWSN.

	Poor & Homeless	Substance Abusers	Mental Health	Prostituted Women
Participants n=14	5 62.5%	3 37.5%	3 60.0%	2 66.7%
NonParticipants n=7	3 37.5%	5 62.5%	2 40.0%	1 33.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 11: Q3 Target Populations

While services may be offered to meet needs of many clients, including prostituted women, these services are not offered exclusively to the PW. This finding is suggested in responses to the question about what percentage of stakeholder clients is prostituted women (Q6). Seventeen stakeholder organizations responded to this question, eleven participants and 6 non-participants. Four stakeholder organizations, 3 participants and 1 non-participant, could not provide an estimate offering explanations such as, "We couldn't know, we don't ask them", "This number is not tracked", and "I don't know."

The median percentage of clients who are prostituted women for all stakeholder organizations was 15%. (See Table 12: Q6.) Of those stakeholder organizations that participated in the original PWSN, 87.5% of them reported the percentage of their clients as greater than the median (16.0%) compared to only 44.4% of the whose PW clients numbered below the median. Therefore,

participants in the PWSN were more likely to have a larger client population of PW.

	1-15%	16-100%
Participant n=11	4 44.4%	7 87.5%
NonParticipant n=6	5 55.6%	1 12.5%
Total	100%	100%

Table 12: Q6 Percentage of Clients Who are Prostituted Women

When asked what specific services or programming the stakeholder organizations offer for PW, again, acknowledgement of prostituted women, as a population in need of services becomes evident (Q7). Most of the stakeholder organizations do not provide services exclusively to prostituted women, that is, their services are offered to a broader population in need. Moreover, no stakeholder was able to provide any "hard statistics" about prostituted women in their care, except for the one transitional housing agency that provides services solely for prostituted women leaving the "trade". Nonetheless, when asked what services or programming were offered for PW, those that offered legal services, health care, job training, and financial services were more likely to participate in the original PWSN than those offering substance abuse services or transitional housing. (See Table 13: Q7.) Financial assistance was offered by 85.7% of participants, job training and health care were offered by 80.0%, and legal services were offered by 75.0% of participants in the original PWSN. Substance

abuse services were offered by approximately 65% and transitional housing was offered by about 57% of original participants.

	Transi-tional Housing	Sub-stance Abuse	Legal Services	Health Care	Job Train-ing	Finan-cial Assist-ance
Participant n=14	4 57.1%	6 66.6%	3 75.0%	4 80.0%	8 80.0%	6 85.7%
NonParticipant n=7	3 42.9%	3 33.3%	1 25.0%	1 20.0%	2 20.0%	1 14.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 13: Q7 Services for Prostituted Women

Discussion for Context: Hypothesis I.A.

The hypothesis: Participants in the PWSN will report more competitive forces that are preconditions to interorganizational collaborative than non-participants:

The predicted outcome for this portion of the hypothesis is that stakeholder organizations that participated in the original PWSN are more likely to have been in existence for several years, have more available infrastructure and funding, have a broad community representation on the board, a supportive annual operating budget, employ sufficient number of people, target services and programming to PW. These are structure-oriented stakeholder organization characteristics that contribute to participation in an interorganizational collaborative, yet remain unchanged regardless of participation. The findings are mixed, but somewhat support the hypothesis.

Integration in the community was measured by asking the number of years the stakeholder organization has been in existence (See Table 4.). Of the participants, 60% reported years of service over the median (21 years) while 73.0% participants had provided services for 21 years or less. Therefore, longevity, as a measure of integration in the community, was not a contributing factor to participation.

Integration in to community was also investigated by assessing the racial/ethnic representation on the governing/advisory boards. Findings indicated that representation of the two largest racial/ethnic groups in the city, Blacks and Whites, was associated with participation in the original PWSN. Inclusion of other racial/ethnic groups, e.g., Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, etc., seemed to have lesser influence on participation. Interestingly, more non-participants than participants reported more groups other than Black and White on their boards. This one measure of the hypothesis, of Context Element I.A.1, integration in the community, is somewhat supported.

Context hypothesis I.A.2 predicts that those stakeholders with more available infrastructure and funding would be more likely to have participated in the original PWSN. Involvement in a collaborative necessitates an adequate and consistent financial base as well as sufficient staff and materials (Mattessich 2001, Austin 2000).

Findings suggest several structure-oriented factors that contributed to participation in the original PWSN. Participants reported higher numbers of people employed than non-participants. Therefore, having more employees contributed to participation. Those stakeholder organizations with higher numbers of volunteers were more likely to have participated. Those stakeholder organizations that received more funding support from business foundations and the United Way were more likely to be participants. Stakeholder organizations who reported targeting the poor and homeless and prostituted women and those who reported a higher percentage of clients who are prostituted women were more likely to be participants in the original PWSN. Additionally, those stakeholders that offered legal services, health care, job training, and financial services were more likely to participate than those offering substance abuse services or transitional housing.

As for factors that seemed not to contribute to participation in the original PWSN, employment of survivors of prostitution did not make a real difference in terms of whether or not a stakeholder organization participated in the original PWSN and no real difference was found between participants whose annual operating budget was above or below the median.

Context hypothesis I.A.1, integrated/involvement in the community, was not supported. Context Hypothesis I.A.2, the available infrastructure and funding as a competitive force, is somewhat supported.

Context: Element I.B: Institutional restraining forces to collaboration are based on conflicting/"at odds" missions of the stakeholder organizations.

The hypothesis investigated for Context Element I.B is

Participants in the PWSN will report fewer institutional restraining forces to preconditions as evidenced by:

- overlap in mission statements (Q2).
- reporting a strategic plan for PW (Q8).

Findings for Context: Hypothesis I.B

The mission statements for participants and non-participants were reviewed. In general, the mission statements were fairly broadly stated and did not include a listing of all services provided by the stakeholder. Recurrent words, phrases or themes were noted. Ten words or phrases were identified that were used by at least two stakeholder organizations: God/Christian/Jesus Christ/Spiritual, community neighborhood, substance abuse treatment, mental health, diversity in population served, family support, advocacy, housing, physical health, and referral. More commonly shared words and phrases were found among participant stakeholder organizations than among non-participant stakeholder organizations. (See Table 14:Q2.) All key words were mentioned in at least one of the participants' mission statements; some key words were not found in non-participant mission statements.

Non-participants seemed to have more narrowly constructed and focused missions. These statements mention only 6 of the 10 key words/phrases – mental health, diversity in population served, physical health, and referral are not

mentioned. Included in the non-participant mission statements are God/Christian/Jesus Christ/Spirituality, community/neighborhood, substance abuse treatment, family support, advocacy and housing.

	Participant	Non-Participant	Total
God/Christian/ Jesus Christ/Spiritual	3	3	6
Community Neighborhood	4	1	5
Substance Abuse Treatment	3	2	5
Mental Health	4	0	4
Diversity in population served	4	0	4
Family Support	2	2	4
Advocacy	2	1	3
Housing	1	2	3
Physical Health	2	0	2
Referral	2	0	2
Supportive Services	Inherent in all statements	Inherent in all statements	

Table14: Q2 Key Words in Mission Statements

Only four of 21 stakeholder organizations reported having a strategic plan for women in prostitution (Q8). All four of these stakeholder organizations, 28.7%, participated in the original PWSN. Each of the stakeholder organizations that reported having a strategic plan represents a different category: one provides healthcare, another transitional housing, another a street ministry, and the fourth is criminal justice. Spontaneously offered explanatory comments by the remaining 17 stakeholder organizations about why no specified strategic plan for PW existed included: "many women do not identify themselves as prostituted";

"prostitution, itself, is not the problem source – it is a manifestation of multiple problems" and "it is a segment of a life experience, not the whole life experience".

Discussion of Context: Hypothesis I.B

The hypothesis: Participants in the PWSN will report fewer institutional restraining forces to preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than non-participants.

The mission statement is a reflection of the formalized values and purpose of the stakeholder organization. Through the mission, values are transformed into rules that mandate conformity to particular behaviors. This sets the base upon which the stakeholder identity and purpose can be sustained and predictable outcomes enabled and upon which outsiders can count (McPhee & Zaug 2001). Therefore, it is a fair assumption that the mission statement of the stakeholder organization guides perceptions of a social problem, strategic plans, and types of services offered.

This hypothesis predicted that stakeholder organizations that participated in the PWSN would share more commonalities in their missions than those that did not participate. For this reason, mission statements were reviewed and compared (Q2). The outcome: mission statements were as varied as the agency and interest group types, but more agreement was found among participant's than non-participants' missions. A broad variety of words and phrases appear in the twenty mission statements (one missing). This finding may raise concern that a common ground in mission could not be found to support a multi-stakeholder

interorganizational collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution in the City. Doubts arise further when the lack of strategic plans for services for prostituted women is noted – except for four participants - along with the failure to identify prostituted women as a targeted population for all but two of the stakeholder organizations. Nonetheless, fairly consistently, participant and non-participant stakeholder organizations do identify prostituted women as in need of many support services such as financial assistance, job training, legal services, and health care. Therefore, although common words and phrases were not consistently found among the mission statements, that many stakeholder organizations do identify the need for similar services for prostituted women might be interpreted to imply a common value. Common values could lead to a common collaborative mission and mutual expectations, which, then, could be translated, into commitment and results (Austin, 2000).

Support for this hypothesis is rather fuzzy. Lack of commonality in words and phrases in the mission statements suggest that institutional restraining forces are at work. Nonetheless, more common ground was found in participants' mission statements than non-participants; and four participants reported having strategic plans to provide services for PW. Therefore, the hypothesis portion for Context Element I.B is somewhat supported. (See Table 38.)

Process Oriented Preconditions

Context: Element I C: Institutional driving forces to collaboration are based on some level of overlap in stakeholder organization perception of the phenomenon prostituted women as a social problem.

The hypothesis investigated for Context Element I.B is

Participants in the PWSN will report more institutional driving forces that are preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than non-participants.
Stakeholder organizations will report more

- overlap in perceptions of PW. (Q18)
- agreement of the size of the prostitution issue in the City (Q19.a)
- agreement on locations of prostitution activity in the City (Q19.b)
- agreement on why women enter prostitution (Q19.c)
- agreement on what age women enter prostitution (Q19.d)
- agreement on the average age of the PW (Q19.e)

Stakeholder organizations will report more agreement on the effect prostitution has on women (Q21).

Stakeholder organizations will report more agreement on issues of decriminalization, victimization, and advocacy for PW. (Q44)

Findings for Context: Hypothesis I.C

Context Element I.B asserts that institutional driving forces to collaboration are based on some level of overlap in stakeholder organizations' perceptions of women in prostitution as a social problem. Q18 and Q19 attempt to investigate information in this area. Q18 asks, "What is your agency's view of prostitution?" Key words and phrases were identified and categorized into five main words or phrases: victims, multi-factorial cause, mental health, need support, and criminal activity. Several stakeholder organizations used more than one phrase or word to describe their agency's view of prostitution. (Questions 18 and 19 were multiple

response questions, none to all options could be selected, the categories were not mutually exclusive.) Findings are summarized on Table 15: Q18.

Those stakeholder organizations that participated in the PWSN noted more often that prostituted women are victims. Slightly over 71% of participants identified as victims while only 14.3% of the non-participants did. Two participants sum up this opinion:

> "It is not a victimless crime. It is a horror what it does to the women – it's degrading."
>
> "We see these women as victims of sexual molestation, rape, domestic violence and who have a lack of choices."
>
> One non-participant who identified PW as victims stated:
>
> "Prostitution is not necessarily the direct payment of money for services. It could be women living with men who have a lot of power over them – who do not see exchanging sex for drugs as prostitution. It has to do with women who are in a power relationship.... And she is powerless."

The stakeholder organizations that did not identify prostituted women as victims offered no descriptive statements.

During the 18-month PWSN meetings, participants were provided with the results of many studies and with descriptions of first-hand experiences by women who had been prostituted that confirmed prostitution stems from many causes. Nonetheless, only 57.1% of the participants identified this as an stakeholder view while 42.9% of the non-participants did. This is still a 10% or greater difference between the two groups. No stakeholder offered explanation about why

prostitution does not have multi-factorial causes. One participant and one non-participant made the following statements to illustrate that multi-factorial causes exist.

> "Women in prostitution tend to have complex issues – substance abuse, domestic violence, lack of education, health issues, etc. Becoming a prostitute is not a choice – it is usually the result of a history of abuse."

> "It's part of our society, part of homelessness, part of people meeting their needs. It can be an outcome of sexual abuse."

Perceptions about the social problem of prostitution that include mental health issues (and substance abuse) received low rankings by all stakeholder organizations: 21.4% participants and 14.3% non-participants. It is possible that some stakeholder organizations included mental health in the multi-factorial view or victim view. This was not determined during the interviews. Nonetheless, of the three participants and one non-participant who identified mental health in the agency view, two illustrated with these comments. One participant stated:

> "For prostitution – there's a very likely correlation between prostitution and mental health issues."

The non-participant made a more descriptive comment:

> "We see it as one of the impaired relations that is evidence of brokenness in our society and difficulties in the person' life - a problem behavior that can be addressed in a service plan. Most are coming out of an addiction – they became prostitutes to support their habit."

In surprising contrast to victim status, 42.9% of the non-participants stated that prostituted women needed support while only 14.3% of the participants did. Two non-participants described their agencies' views by stating:

> "People in prostitution are not just simply prostituted women – they are at risk ... and we need to help protect their health."

> "They need Christ. They need to take their time to rebuild their lives. And, they need good guidance and legal guidance."

Two participants, whose agencies' views included that PW are in need of support, offered the following statements:

> "It is a social responsibility to care for the victims on both sides [PW and johns]."

> "Our view is that prostituted women need to be supported "where they are" – whether on the street or transition out of the work. We provide education and services to promote risk reduction. Our view is that this is what the women need."

One participant, who did not identify the need for support, indicated that the PW should not be regarded as "less than" any other person, i.e., all people work together to make sense of their lives. The opinion was that giving help to another placed that "other" in a lower and receiving status, whereas, working together was more respectful.

> "We feel compassion for those involved and a desire to come along side them and to instill dignity and respect."

Criminal activity was least often mentioned as an agency view of prostitution among the stakeholder organizations. Only 14.3% of both

participants and non-participants identified prostitution as criminal activity. When asked why prostitution is not a criminal activity, many stakeholder organizations responded that criminal activity implies intent while prostitution is the result of a hurtful history and very limited life options. This researcher surmises that this rationale might be consistent with the views of PW as victims and prostitution as having multi-factorial causes. This stakeholder organization view may also be reflected in the type of service provided by the agency. If the stakeholder organization mission is to provide service to the underserved, then the victim status might be mentioned. However, if the stakeholder organization were a neighborhood association, then neighborhood integrity and quality would be important. This is reflected in the only comment offered about prostitution being a criminal activity.

> "They [prostituted women] are residents in our neighborhood. Our effort has been to get them out of the neighborhood. Their presence results in increased assaults, drug use, drug sales and robberies. It is a problem for neighborhood integrity. They solicit up and down the avenue. We have issues of condoms thrown in the schoolyards, behind churches, behind businesses. We have to call the police. Residents have seen that, once you have a drug house, you tend to see prostitutes hanging out. It is a criminal activity."

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
Victims	10 71.4%	1 14.3%
Multi-Factorial	8 57.1%	3 42.9%
Mental Health	3 21.4%	1 14.3%
Need Support	2 14.3%	3 42.9%
Criminal Activity	2 14.3%	1 14.3%

Table 15: Q18 Stakeholder Organizations' Views of Prostitution

Q19 explores the stakeholder organizations' perceptions of the extent and location of prostitution in the City. First, stakeholder organizations were asked how many prostituted women and how many customers/johns are in the City (Q19.a.1 & 2.). Several stakeholder organizations stated they could not answer these two question. Reasons offered include, "I have no clue" (non-participant), "I really can't answer this question" (participant), and "I don't have a good estimate" (non-participant).

Some who did offer estimates stated that "I'm just guessing (non-participant), "This is a guess...let's see, we have about one million people in the City..." (participant), and "This is just an estimate" (participant).

The mean number of PW in the City identified by all stakeholder organizations was 2,099 with a median of 500. The wide span between the mean

and median is caused by one participant's estimate of 20,000. However, even if the 20,000 estimate is not included in the mean calculation, participants still estimated more prostituted women in the City than did non-participants. Forty-six percent of the participants stated that the population is up to 500, 75% of the non-participants did. In contrast, 53.9% of the participants estimated 501-20,000 PW while only 25% of the non-participants did. (See Table 16: Q19.a.)

	Participant n=13	NonParticipant n=4
1-500 (lower median)	6 46.1%	3 75%
501-20,000 (upper median)	7 53.9%	1 25%

Table 16: Q19.a.1 Number of Women Involved in Prostitution

Estimations for the number of customers/johns held an even a wider range than did estimates of the population. Fifty percent of all stakeholder organizations estimated a population of up to 2,500 and 50% estimated a population of 2,500-90,000. These estimates result in a mean of 10,899 and median of 2,500. Again, the wide span between the mean and median is caused, in part, by one participant's estimate of 90,000 customers/johns. The highest estimation for non-participants were one each of 3,000 and 5,000 while five participants offered estimates of well over 5,000. Therefore, although the median is the same for participants and non-participants, participants estimated a much higher population of customers/johns than did non-participants. (See Table 17: Q19.a.2.)

	Participant n=12	NonParticipant n=4
1-2,500 (lower median)	6 50%	2 50%
2,500-90,000 (upper median)	6 50%	2 50%

Table 17: Q19.a.2. Number of Customers/Johns

What percentage of prostituted women work at which locations was explored by question 19.b. Interestingly, even though it was not requested of them, each Stakeholder worked to estimate the percentages for the three options so the sum would be 100%, thereby *treating the three options as mutually exclusive categories*. Therefore, a calculated mean of the total percentages is presented for each category. Options offered to stakeholder organizations were: a) on the street, in parks; b) in brothels, parlors and c) as off-site call-girls/escorts. Several stakeholder organizations stated that brothels or parlors often double as "crack houses" and vice versa. Therefore, they included "crack houses" in this option when they responded to the question.

Both participants' and non-participants' estimates of the percentage of prostituted women who work on the streets and in parks were fairly evenly distributed; participants' estimates mean was 47.25% and non-participants' mean was 41.43%. Participants and non-participants differed in their estimates of the percentage of prostituted women who work in brothels/parlors. PWSN participants estimated that about a quarter of prostituted women work in brothels/parlors (mean = 26.54%) while non-participants estimated about almost

half worked in this environment (mean = 44.29%). Non-participants offered the lowest estimates for the off-site call-girls/escorts locations for prostituted activities (mean = 18.57%). Participants' estimates were higher with a mean of 29.02%. (See Table 18: Q 19b.) Therefore, the most disagreement about location of prostituted activity was concerning the percentage of women who work in brothels/parlors with non-participants almost 18% higher than participants. Of interest is the low estimate for off-site call-girls/escorts by non-participants, 18.57%, ten percent lower than participants. This is in contrast to Vice Police comments that more of the prostituted activity was moving underground due to street stings.

	Participants n=14	NonParticipants n=7
Streets, Parks	47.25%	41.43%
Brothels, Parlors	26.54%	44.29%
Off Site, Call Girls, Escorts	29.02%	18.57%

Table 18: Q19b Percentage of Prostituted Women at Three Sites (presented as a mean percentage for each category)

Question 19.c queried, "In general, why do women enter prostitution?" The three most frequently cited responses are recorded in Table 19: Q19.c. History of abuse was listed most frequently by participants (92.9%) and non-participants (100%). Participants and non-participants (85.7%) equally listed substance abuse as the next most frequent reason for entry into prostitution.

Poverty/homelessness was the least often chosen reason. However, 57.1% of the participants chose this reason while only 14.3% non-participants did.

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
History Abuse	13 92.9%	7 100%
Substance Abuse	12 85.7%	6 85.7%
Poverty/Homeless	8 57.1%	1 14.3%

Table 19: Q19.c Why Women Enter Prostitution

When questioned about average age of entry into prostitution (Q19d) and the average age of prostituted women (Q19e) in the City, some differences emerged. The mean age for entry into prostitution estimated by participants was 15.4 years and for non-participants was 17 years. (See Table 20). Issues surrounding age of minority- and majority-status were not investigated.)

Participants' selections ranged from 21 to 35 years for the average age of the prostituted women, except for one whom estimated 15-17 years. This resulted in a mean of 27.6 years. In contrast, non-participants estimated a younger mean age of 24.6 years. Comparison of age of entry into prostitution with average age of prostituted women suggests perceived career longevity of 10 to 23 years. (See Table 20: Q19 d. & e.)

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
Age Women Enter Prostitution	Mean: 15.4 years	Mean: 17.0 years
Average Age of Prostituted Women	Mean: 27.6 years	Mean: 24.6 years

Table 20: Q19 d&e Means in Years of Age

Question 21 asked, "What effect does prostitution have on the women who walk through the door of your agency?" PWSN participants offered more variety in their word choice to describe the effect. Several stakeholder organizations, participant and non-participant, stated more than one word to describe the effect of prostitution on women. An emotional problem was the most common response to the question with participants at 92.9% and non-participants at 100%. This is a less than 10% difference between the two groups. Half of the PWSN participants verbalized the word "devastating" to describe the effect prostitution has on women; none of the non-participants did. It is possible that the word "devastating" was emphasized at the PWSN meetings.

If a correlation is possible, it is interesting to compare the high percentage of emotional problems as an effect of prostitution to the stakeholder organizations' views of prostitution summarized on Table 15:Q18. Fewer than 25% of participants and less than 15% non-participants listed mental health problems in their views of prostitution. Yet, almost all stakeholders reported that prostitution causes emotional problems for the women. Possibly emotional health and mental health are seen as different phenomenon.

Thirty-five point seven percent of the participants and 28.6% of non-participants reported addiction, as an effect of prostitution, a less than 10% difference. Only 14.3% of participants reported poor health as an effect of prostitution while none on the non-participants did. Seven point one percent of both groups reported that prostitution was the livelihood of the women. (See Table 21: Q21.)

	Participant n=14	Nonparticipant n=7
Emotional Problems	13 92.9%	7 100%
Devastating	7 50%	0 0%
Addiction	5 35.7%	2 28.6%
Poor Health	2 14.3%	0 0%
Is Their Livelihood	1 7.1%	1 7.1%

Table 21: Q21 Effect Prostitution has on Women

Stakeholder organizations were asked to express their opinion about whether or not prostitution should be decriminalized, if it victimizes women, and if prostitution [as a social problem] requires advocacy (Q44). They ranked their responses on a Likert scale; number one being strongly agrees, three as no opinion, to number five being strongly disagrees.

Careful explanation was given to the stakeholder organizations to distinguish between "decriminalized" and "legalized". Decriminalized was described as causing the behavior/work to be neutral, essentially no legal status, much like walking across the street or like adult consensual sex. To legalize prostitution would result in certifying or licensing the women with the City, requiring health check-ups, etc.

More PWSN participants than non-participants disagreed that prostitution should be decriminalized (mean 3.57 vs. 3.00). (See Table 22: Q44.) While two representatives from different stakeholder organizations and in separate interviews stated that their organization would disagree that prostitution should be decriminalized, they each stated a personal belief that prostitution should not be a crime or a "jailable" offense unless it was linked with organized crime. They saw adolescent and adult women prostituting due to a history of abuse and neglect and to survive. An example was offered of a 13-year-old girl who began to prostitute because her mother was "strung-out on drugs" and her younger siblings were hungry. After she dropped out of school to work the streets to support her siblings, prostitution seemed the only option for her to make money as she grew older.

Concerning victimization and need for advocacy, participants and non-participants responded similarly with high levels of agreement. (See Table 22: Q44.) This is consistent with participants' responses about agency views of PW

as victims (71.4%), but is contradictory to the non-participants' response (14.3%) (Q18). In addition, Q18 found that only 14.3% of participants and 42.9% non-participants stated that PW need support, yet, here in Q44 they strongly agree the PW require advocacy. Possibly, the terms "need support" and "advocacy" were conceived as different types of interventions or activities.

	Participants n=14	NonParticipants n=7
Prostitution should be Decriminalized	Mean: 3.57	Mean: 3.00
Prostitution Victimizes	Mean: 1.14	Mean: 1.14
Prostituted Women Require Advocacy	Mean: 1.07	Mean: 1.00
1-strongly agree; 2-agree; 3-no opinion; 4-disagree; 5-strongly disagree		

Table 22: Q44 Means for Decriminalization, Victimization and Required Advocacy

Discussion of Context Hypothesis I.C.

The hypothesis: Participants in the PWSN will report more institutional driving forces that are preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than non-participants.

One predicted outcome for this portion of the hypothesis for element, I.B., is that stakeholder organizations who participated in the PWSN would demonstrate more overlap in perception of PW than those that did not participate. As Mattessich, et al, (2001) asserts, a clearly stated agreement of the social problem clarifies common ground and the "sphere of activity" for the interorganizational collaborative. In regard to stakeholder organizations' views of

prostitution, five common views were identified: prostituted women are victims, prostitution has multi-factorial causes, it is viewed as a mental health problem, PW are in need of support, and prostitution is a criminal activity.

Over 70% of the participants reported that prostitution victimizes women, only 14.3% of non-participants did. This higher ranking by participants, indeed, may be an outcome of the education gleaned from the original Prostituted Women's Support Network and is supported by the literature. Prostitution is the epitome of subordination and oppression of women's human rights, a social phenomenon of unequal gender-power relations, and emanates from the social construction of women (Barry, 1995, Davidson, 1998, Farley & Kelly, 2000). This higher ranking by participants may also contribute to the institutional driving force to collaborate among participants based on overlap of perceptions, thereby suggesting support for this hypothesis portion for Context Element I.B.

Consideration of multi-factorial causes for prostitution by approximately 50% of participants and non-participants is consistent with findings in the literature. Many authors assert that prostituted women do not constitute a single, unified social group and it is, therefore, difficult to implicate a singular cause (Barry, 1979, Delacoste & Alexander, 1987, Davidson, 1998, Dworkin, 1989, O'Leary & Howard, 2001).

Mental health as a characteristic of prostituted women was mentioned by fewer than 22% of participants and non-participants. This may reflect a lack of desire to stigmatize PW. It is also possible that mental health was subsumed under multi-factorial causes for prostitution. While these two characteristics have a low frequency of report by participants (21.45) and non-participants (14.3%), they do reflect a very minor level of overlap in stakeholder organization perception of the phenomenon of PW as a social problem, suggesting lack of support for the hypothesis portion for Element I.B.

All stakeholder organizations reported criminal activity with the least frequency of the five agency views. This is interesting when, in fact, prostitution is mandated as a criminal activity in the City and county. Possibly, participants and non-participants, alike, might agree with the findings in the literature that the stigma label of criminal deviance on the prostituted woman leads to disrespect for the woman and possible oppression due to unequal power relations (Barry, 1995, Chapkis, 1997, Delacoste & Alexander, 1987, Dworkin, 1989, O'Leary & Howard, 2001).

In surprising contrast to participants high ranking of victim status (Table 15), more non-participants stated that prostituted women needed support than did participants (42.9% vs. 14.3%). (See Table 22: Q44). The findings regarding victim status and the need for support seem to be contradictory. Without follow-up interviews, explanation for this seeming contradiction can only be speculated.

Possibly, participants consider need for support to be inherent in victim status. This finding is even more confusing when compared to that which the stakeholder organizations' identified as barriers to services: substance addiction, lack of personal motivation, fear of police, pimps, boyfriends, and lack of personal resources (Discussed later with Table 29: Q29.). While all stakeholder organizations ranked barriers at over 70%, consistently, participants ranked barriers higher than did non-participants. So, if participants ranked victim status, multi-factorial causes and mental health issues higher than non-participants and ranked barriers higher, then why would they rank the need for support at such a low level?

Another interesting outcome in these findings is that, while mental health concerns were reported, no stakeholder organizations mentioned physical health concerns or needs in their views of prostitution. The literature is replete with evidence of violence "on the job" (Goswami, 2002, Brock, 1979, King, 1990, Rhodes, et al, 1994) which causes physical health concerns. Many prostituted women suffer from HIV/AIDS concerns and multiple health needs (Brock 1979, King 1990, Farley & Kelly 2000, O'Leary & Howard 200, Rhodes, et al 1994, Scambler, et al 1990, US Center for Disease Control 1987). Possibly, physical health issues were not included in the content for the original PWSN, but this does not explain why non-participants did not identify this characteristic. Is there a general societal prejudice toward PW, possibly influenced by a judgmental

attitude about sexually transmitted infections that causes neglect of physical health needs?

Another measure of overlap in perceptions of prostitution as a social problem was investigated by asking stakeholder organizations about the extent and location of prostitution in the City. Non-participants reported lower estimates of the number of women involved in prostitution as well as the number of customers/johns. When the outlier estimate of 20,000 prostituted women is excluded from the report, the participants' estimated average number of prostituted women is 1083 (when included, the average jumps to 2538). Non-participants estimated an average number of 375 prostituted women. When the outlier of 90,000 customers/johns is removed from the report of participants' estimates, the average number is 6431 (when included, the average jumps to 13,395). Non-participants' average estimate of customers/johns is 1687.

The U.S. Census 2000 estimate of the population for the City is 200,000, suggesting a female population of approximately 102,000 and an adolescent and adult female population of about 50,000. When the average number of prostituted women is estimated at 1083, this suggests that approximately 2.2% of the City's adult female population is prostituted women. This finding is less than the 1999 estimate for PW in Chicago by researchers O'Leary & Howard (2001). However, it is considerably lower than the 10-15% of total population estimated

by Alexander (1987). No estimates for the numbers of customers/johns were found in the literature.

Lack of agreement exists between participants and non-participants in regard to the estimated total number of prostituted women and customer/johns in the City lending support to the hypothesis portion for Context Element I.B - if higher estimates of total number of PW and customer/johns are reflective of better knowledge on the subject as learned at the PWSN meetings.

Brothels/parlors and off-site call-girls/escorts are considered a less visible form of prostitution. According to the interviewed vice police officers, it has been the intent of the current Chief of Police to "rid the streets of prostitutes". As reported earlier in this paper, a number of City Police force "stings" to arrest both prostitutes and johns have occurred over the past two to three years. When interviewed, stakeholder organizations were not asked if they were aware of the "sting operations". However, these operations were well publicized in the local written press, radio and television. This may have contributed to the lower estimates of prostituted women on the streets and in parks due to the perceived street clearings. Conversely, this may have resulted in higher estimates due to the media hype on street prostitution. Therefore, insufficient information is found to determine agreement or lack thereof among participants and non-participants.

When statistical means are considered, participants and non-participants estimated somewhat similar rates of street prostitution. Participants estimated

statistical means of about 10% higher rates for off-site/call-girl activity compared to non-participants while non-participants estimated means ranked almost 20% higher for brothels/parlors than did the participants. Therefore, there is some level of difference in stakeholder organizations' perceptions of the locations of prostitution in the City. However, it would seem that participants should have been more aware of the movement of prostitution underground due to the increased "street stings" by the police. Therefore, inadequate information exists to claim that this hypothesis portion of Element I.B. is supported.

Interviewed stakeholder organizations offered three main reasons for why women enter prostitution: history of abuse, substance abuse and poverty/homelessness. A high level of agreement exists between participants and non-participants for the reasons of history of abuse and substance abuse. However, only 14.3% of the non-participants listed poverty/homeless as a reason while 57.1% of the participants did. When compared to agency views of prostitution, it seems contradictory that almost 50% of non-participants identified that PW need support, yet so few non-participants listed poverty/homelessness as a reason for entry into prostitution. However, it was, also, only 14.3% of the non-participants who stated that PW are victims. Again, the findings seem to be contradictory.

Overall, these findings are consistent with information from the reviewed literature: poverty induced homelessness, violence, child sexual abuse, and substance abuse are significant contributing factors to entry into prostitution

(Goswami, 2002, Phoenix, 1999, Schoot & Goswami, 2001, Farley & Barkan, 1998, Farley & Kelly, 2000, Simons & Whitbeck, 1991, James & Meyerding, 1977, O'Leary & Howard, 2001). The literature offered no data on the weight or importance of each of the factors. For this hypothesis portion of Element I.B., participants and non-participants are similar in their responses for two of the reasons for entry into prostitution; therefore, the hypothesis is not supported.

Age of entry into prostitution is difficult to derive from the literature. According to the reviewed literature, statutes about run-away laws, minimum age for statutory rape, and age of majority vary state by state. Additionally, laws vary about at what age an adolescent female may be considered prostituted or sexually abused, held hostage, or be making decisions to participate in prostitution. These inconsistencies among statutes cause difficulty in comparison of findings for research done in various areas of the United States.

Prostituted Women's Support Network participants estimated younger ages for entry into prostitution (mean age of 15.4 years) than did non-participants (mean age of 17.0 years). Estimates for the average age of prostituted women for participant and non-participant groups differed as well, the statistical mean being somewhat younger for non-participants (24.6 years) than for participants (27.6 years). Therefore, there is disagreement between the participants and non-participants for age of entry and average age. However, because the reviewed literature offers little information about age of entry, it is difficult to compare

stakeholder organizations' age difference estimates. (The reader is referred to the section on Entry into Prostitution earlier in the document.) Nonetheless, participants' suggestion of a younger age of entry and older average of PW may suggest acknowledgment of a more comprehensive perspective on the social problem of prostitution than that of non-participants.

The next portion of the Context element asserts that stakeholder organizations that participated in the PWSN would demonstrate more agreement about the effect prostitution has on women. The literature emphasizes HIV, health problems, and violence as frequent effects of prostituting (Farley & Kelly, 2000, O'Leary & Howard, 2001, Goswami, 2002, Brock, 1979, King, 1990, Rhodes, Donoghoe, Hunter, & Stimson 1994, Scambler, Penswani, Renton, & Scambler 1990, and a US Center for Disease Control cumulative study 1987). In contrast, over 90% of participants and non-participants listed emotional problems as an effect. Substance addiction was listed by about 30% of both groups. A few in both groups stated that prostituting is the women's livelihood; this was stated by more of the non-participants than participants. Therefore, some agreement between participants and non-participants is noted. However, in addition to identifying emotional problems, half of the participants also used the word "devastating" to describe the effect, while none on the non-participants did. This suggests that the idea that prostitution causes a devastating effect on women was learned at the PWSN. The researcher did not actively seek a definition for the word "devastating"; its meaning and implications remain unclarified.

Nonetheless, more difference is found between participants and non-participants, the hypothesis portion of Context I.B is supported.

The hypothesis portion for Context Element I.B asserts that stakeholder organizations that participated in the PWSN would demonstrate more agreement on issues of decriminalization, victimization and advocacy for women in prostitution than would non-participants. As seen in the findings, no major difference exists between participants and non-participants on victimization and need for advocacy. Almost all agreed that prostitution victimizes women and also that prostituted women need advocacy. However participants leaned toward disagreement with the statement that prostitution should be decriminalized (mean 3.57 vs. mean of 3.00 for non-participants on a Likert scale of 1 strongly agree, to 3 no opinion, to 5 strongly disagree). Findings suggest that participation or non-participation in the PWSN had minimal impact on opinions of two of the three listed issues.

Some disagreement exists on the issue of decriminalization. Common sense suggests that, stakeholder organizations whose purpose is to provide rehabilitative or criminal justice services for prostituted women would agree that prostitution victimizes women and that advocacy for PW is needed. What is interesting is the lack of strong opinion about decriminalization or legalization of prostitution. Only two social workers and one ministry/mission stakeholder made the following statements based on their selection of number 2 (Likert scale),

agree, that prostitution should be decriminalized: "These women are not criminals, they're victims." "My agency would say number 4 [Likert scale], disagree. Personally, I agree on number 2: prostitution should not be a jailable offense. Only when it is linked with organized crime is it really a crime." " The johns need to be criminalized –more prosecutions." No other stakeholder organizations offered comments to this question.

These statements may reflect an individual versus stakeholder organization conflict that was not anticipated by the proposed theory. Their expressed values conflict with that of their employers. This introduces a level of uncertainty to the potential collaborative if these agencies choose to participate. First, it remains unknown if the stakeholder organization administrations are aware of the value conflict. Second, if the agencies do become collaborative members with these individuals as the representatives, would the value conflict become an internal problem for the stakeholder organization and/or a problem for the collaborative? Would the individual be better able to negotiate compromise within the problem domain or would s/he be more of a renegade member?

Stakeholder responses to questions related to this hypothesis portion of Element I.B. demonstrate more agreement among participants than non-participants in regard to stakeholder organizations' views about prostitution. Participants reported higher populations of PW and johns, younger age of entry and older average age, more reported poverty/homelessness as a contributing factor to entry into prostitution, that prostitution has negative impact on the women, and slightly more agreed that prostitution should be decriminalized.

Therefore, outcomes of the comparison of participant and non-participant agency views of prostitution somewhat support the hypothesis portion of Element I.B. (See Table 38.)

Credibility Trust: Element II: Based on past experience, Credibility Trust is a precondition to interorganizational collaboration.

The hypothesis investigated for Credibility Trust Element II is:

Participants in the PWSN will report Credibility Trust, based on past experiences, as evidenced by:

- reporting a higher rate of success in interactive efforts with other stakeholder organizations (Q28).
- reporting knowledge of other efforts to create a collaborative (Q42).
- describe more strengths than weaknesses in the original PWSN (Q43).

Findings for Credibility Trust: Hypothesis II

Credibility trust is based on past experience or track record with other stakeholder organizations. Credibility trust was investigated by querying about the strengths and weaknesses of the PWSN, knowledge of efforts to create a collaborative to deal with the issue of prostitution, and a Likert-scale assessment of success of interaction efforts with other organizations.

For Q43a and Q43b, stakeholder organizations were asked to identify three strengths and three weaknesses in the PWSN. Again, stakeholder responses were grouped by key words and phrases. The key words and phrases to describe strengths are: brought agencies together; education; the leadership of the PWSN; and the final report and conference. Weakness key words and

phrases are: no long-term plan; territoriality of some agencies; lack of male involvement; and lack of use of appropriate agencies. A higher percentage of participants reported strengths of the PWSN than did non-participants. Bringing agencies together was identified as a strength by 92.9% of the participants and by only 28.6% of the non-participants. More than half the participants (64.3%) stated that education of the participants and the community was a strength, while only 14.3% of the non-participants did. Slightly less than half of the participants reported that the leadership of the PWSN was a strength (42.9%), none of the non-participants did. Both participants (21.4%) and non-participants (14.3%) ranked the final report and one-day conference lowest. (See Table 23: Q43.a.)

	Participants n=14	Nonparticipants n=7
Brought Agencies Together	13 92.9%	2 28.6%
Education	9 64.3%	1 14.3%
The Leadership of the PWSN	6 42.9%	0 0%
The Final Report & Conference	3 21.4%	1 14.3%

Table 23: Q43a Strengths of the original PWSN

Concerning weaknesses of the PWSN, again, participants reported the most comments. Seventy-one percent of participants reported that the lack of a long-term plan was a weakness of the PWSN while 14.3% of the non-participants did. Twenty-eight percent of the participants expressed concern about

territoriality among some agencies; no non-participants did. Likewise, 21.4% participants expressed that lack of male involvement in the PWSN was a weakness, no non-participants did. Twenty-eight percent of the non-participants reported lack of use of appropriate agencies as a weakness; these non-participants stated that they had not been invited to join the PWSN; only 7.1% of the participants reported this as a weakness. (See Table 24: Q43.b.)

	Participants n=14	NonParticipants n=7
No Long-Term Plan	10 71.4%	1 14.3%
Territoriality of Some Agencies	4 28.6%	0 0%
Lack of Male Involvement	3 21.4%	0 0%
Lack of use of Appropriate Agencies	1 7.1%	2 28.6%

Table 24: Q43b Weaknesses of the Original PWSN

Stakeholder organizations were asked if they knew of any other efforts to create a collaborative to work on the issue prostitution in the City. About twice as many participants (50%) than non-participants (28.6%) knew about the recent effort to re-establish the PWSN. Thirty five point seven percent of the participants and 28.6% of the non-participants mentioned another project, the Counseling and Criminal Justice Program (pseudonym). (See Table 25: Q42.)

	Participants n=14	NonParticipants n=7
Re-establish PWSN	7 50.0%	2 28.6%
Counseling and Criminal Justice Program	5 35.7%	2 28.6%

Table 25: Q42 Know of Other Efforts to Create a Collaborative?

For Q28 in this section on Credibility Trust and for Q22-27 in the Problem Domain section, a list of thirty-six agencies that directly or indirectly provide services for prostituted women was developed. (Data for questions 22-28 are compiled on Table 26. Question 28 is discussed in this section and questions 22-28 are discussed in the following section, Problem Domain.) The list was initiated by including all interviewed stakeholder organizations except the media. Next, other agencies known by the researcher were included. Finally, the Social Services section of the yellow pages of the local telephone book was reviewed for additional information. These 36 agencies were categorized into nine groups: Criminal Justice, Mental Health, Transitional Housing, Ministry/Mission, Social Service, Business, Schools, Neighborhood Associations, Health.

Responses to this set of questions relied on stakeholder recall; they were not asked if records of inter-agency or inter-group interactions were kept. Data from questions 22-28 are compiled on Table 26.

Stakeholder organizations were presented the list of agencies and asked to rate on a Likert scale the overall level of success of their efforts with agency

categories in the past five years (Q28): 1-very poor; 2-poor-; 3-fair; 4-good; 5-excellent. Each stakeholder rated only those categories with which they worked, therefore, the number of responses in each category are not equal. Rankings in all categories were fair (mean = 3.1) or good (mean = 4.4) except for the non-participants ranking of success with Transitional Housing (mean = 2.7). However, this was only slightly less than fair (See Table 26: Q28.).

	Criminal Justice	Mental Health	Transitional Housing	Missions/ Ministries	Social Services	Neighborhood Associations	Health	Schools	Business
Q22 Work With									
Participant	11 78.6%	11 78.6%	12 85.7%	10 71.4%	8 57.1%	5 35.7%	7 50.0%	3 21.4%	2 14.3%
Nonparticipant	7 100%	6 85.7%	5 71.4%	4 57.1%	5 71.4%	4 57.1%	5 71.4%	5 71.4%	2 28.6%
Q23 Refer to									
Participant	7 50.0%	11 78.6%	12 85.7%	7 50.0%	8 57.1%	4 28.6%	7 50.0%	5 35.7%	2 14.3%
Nonparticipant	4 57.1%	6 85.7%	7 100%	5 71.4%	6 85.7%	2 28.6%	4 57.1%	2 28.6%	1 14.3%
Q24 Not Refer To									
Participant	3 21.4%	2 14.3%	2 14.3%	3 14.3%	1 7.1%	1 7.1%	1 7.1%	1 7.1%	1 7.1%
Nonparticipant	3 42.9%	0 0.0%	2 28.6%	2 28.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	0 0.0%
Q25 Receive Referral From									
Participant	11 78.6%	8 57.1%	9 64.3%	7 50.0%	4 28.6%	3 21.4%	4 28.6%	3 21.4%	3 21.4%
Nonparticipant	4 57.1%	3 42.9%	4 57.1%	4 57.1%	2 28.6%	0 0.0%	2 28.6%	2 28.6%	2 28.6%
Q26 Advisory Consult									
Participant	5 35.7%	5 35.7%	1 7.1%	5 35.7%	1 7.1%	2 14.3%	2 14.3%	4 28.6%	1 7.1%
Nonparticipant	4 57.1%	4 57.1%	1 14.3%	4 57.1%	2 28.6%	2 28.6%	2 28.6%	4 57.1%	1 14.3%
Q27 Joint Program									
Participant	7 50.0%	5 35.7%	3 21.4%	4 28.6%	3 21.4%	4 28.6%	3 21.4%	3 21.4%	2 14.3%
Nonparticipant	3 42.9%	6 85.7%	4 57.1%	3 42.9%	3 42.9%	1 14.3%	4 57.1%	3 42.9%	0 0.0%
Q28 Success of Effort (mean: 1=very poor; 2=poor; 3=fair; 4=good; 5=excellent)									
Participant	3.1	4.2	3.6	3.5	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.4	3.3
Nonparticipant	3.5	3.2	2.7	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.0	4.2	3.5

Table 26: Responses to Q22-28

Discussion of Credibility Trust: Hypothesis II

The hypothesis: Participants in the PWSN will report more Credibility Trust, based on past experiences, as a precondition to interorganizational collaboration than non-participants.

The predicted finding for the Credibility Trust hypothesis II was that stakeholder organizations that participated in the PWSN would report a higher level of satisfaction in their interaction with other agencies and groups than those who did not participate would. Past experiences in working together or networking result in a track record, a memory of positive and negative experiences upon which trust may or may not be built (Gray 1985, Gray & Wood 1991). Credibility Trust, based on past experiences with other stakeholder organizations, is a precondition to interorganizational collaboration (Cullen, et al 2000, Lester 2001, McAllister 1995). (Benevolent or resilient trust, mentioned earlier, occurs as part of the process phase, so is not considered here.) As Austin (2000, p. 127) wrote: "Trust is the essential intangible asset of effective alliances, the interpersonal webbing that knits organizations together and facilitates concerted action. Communication and interaction are central to the trust-building process."

Credibility trust was investigated by asking stakeholder organizations to assess their success of past efforts with other agencies (Q28). Overall, participants and non-participants, alike, generally reported fair to good rankings and several excellent rankings in their efforts with the agencies list provided (Likert scale of 1-5). These high levels of rankings may be because the agencies

were self-selected from the list; i.e. stakeholder organizations may have avoided ranking agencies for which they hold a negative opinion.

Interviewed stakeholder organizations were asked to identify strengths and weaknesses of the original PWSN. One bias in this question is that participants could respond with first-hand knowledge while non-participants needed to rely on second-hand knowledge. The possibility exists that some non-participants attended the one-day conference that was the culmination of the PWSN eighteen-month programming. Because neither participants nor non-participants were asked if they attended the conference, the potential influence of this event on stakeholder organizations' responses remains unknown. Nonetheless, the differences between the two groups are striking. Participants were much more positive in their assessment of the strengths than were the non-participants. They seemed particularly positive that the PWSN brought agencies together, 92.9%, and provided education about the issue of prostitution, 64.3% (See Table 23: Q43.a.). Two of the stakeholder organizations that had not been invited to participate in the PWSN indicated concern that the network demonstrated lack of use of appropriate agencies in the make-up of the network. This concern could be a barrier to the development of credibility trust for these two stakeholder organizations.

Almost 70% of the participants expressed concern that no long-term planning came from the PWSN; this is in contrast to 14.3% of the non-

participants (See Table 24: Q43.b.). While this is an expressed weakness of the PWSN, it also might be interpreted as a perceived need for further interorganizational collaboration. These findings are similar to those given when asked what the major goals of a collaborative should be. Nine participants (64.3%) and two non-participants (28.6%) stated that a major goal should be to work together (See Table 33: Q41.). While working together does not necessarily indicate a desire to work with an interorganizational collaborative, it might be interpreted that credibility trust based on a track record of working together was reported more highly among participants .

Overall, more participants knew of other efforts to create a collaborative Fifty percent knew of the effort to re-establish the PWSN and 35.7% knew of the proposed Counseling and Criminal Justice Program compared to only 28.6% each for non-participants knowledge.

In regard to determining differences between participant and non-participant stakeholder organizations in their demonstration of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration, responses about strengths and weaknesses of the PWSN and knowledge about proposed collaboratives suggests some evidence that participation enhanced credibility trust; the hypothesis is somewhat supported. (See Table 38.)

Problem Domain: Element III: A precondition to collaboration is recognition of interdependency among the stakeholder organizations.

The hypothesis investigated for Problem Domain Element III is:

Participants in the PWSN will report more recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations as evidenced by:

- reporting networking with various agencies (Q23-27)
- reporting commonality in projects they could or could not work with in a collaborative (Q32, Q33).
- reporting commonality in what they would be willing to do to improve services for PW (W34).
- reporting a role they might take in a collaborative that is consistent with the collaborative concept (Q38)
- reporting commonality in listing three major goals of a collaborative (Q41).

Findings for Problem Domain: Hypothesis III

Recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations, is the third element in the problem domain for preconditions to interorganizational collaboration framework. Recognition of interdependency was explored was by tracking the networking among stakeholder organizations in the City, including the interviewed stakeholder organizations (See Table 26: Q22-27). The nine categories of organizations were presented to the stakeholder organizations. Stakeholder organizations chose among those presented to respond to the questions. As for all the data, responses are presented in percentages. Stakeholder organizations were also asked what types of projects they would or would not have difficulty working with, what were the barriers and gaps to services for PW, what their agency would be willing to do to better coordinate services, possible role for their agency in an interorganizational collaborative,

and what should be the goals for a collaborative. Comparisons are noted if a difference of 10% or greater exists between participants and non-participants.

Question 22 asked, "In regard to intervention services, with which [stakeholder] has yours worked in the past 5 years?". (See Table 26: Q22.). Stakeholder organizations were encouraged to offer a general response, meaning "worked with" in any manner. Non-participants reported working with other agencies more often than did participants. Their highest report was with criminal justice, 100% vs. 78.6% for participants. Mental health ranked next highest: non-participants 85.7% and participants 78.6%, however, this is not a 10% difference. (Recall that stakeholder organizations' views of prostitution as including mental health issues was very low (<25%. Table 15: Q18) while emotional problems as an effect of prostitution ranked greater that 92% (Table 21:Q21).) More participants reported working with transitional housing than did non-participants (85.7% vs. 71.4%). Likewise, more participants reported working with missions/ministries than did non-participants (71.4% vs. 57.1%). Non-participants worked more with social service (71.4% vs. 57.1%), neighborhood associations (57.1% vs. 35.7%), health agencies (71.4% vs.50%), and schools (71.4% vs. 21.4%). Both groups worked least with businesses, participants 14.3% and non-participants 28.6%

Stakeholder statements that describe working together include:

> "[Agency] joined us for a training class. We have a good acceptance of each other as agencies, staff, and of the women." (participant)

"The [health agency] provides on-site programs here [at our agency]. She knows the content well, relates to the clients well." (non-participant)

Question 23 asked, "to which [stakeholder organizations] does your agency refer?" (See Table 26:Q23.) In these responses, a decrease in networking from Q22 is noted concerning the criminal justice system. Only 50% of participants and 57.1% of non-participants refer to criminal justice, not a difference of 10% between the two groups. Likewise, referrals to mental health agencies lacked a 10% or greater difference (participants 78.6% and non-participants 85.7%). Non-participants referred more often to transitional housing (100% vs. 85.7%), missions/ministries (71.4% vs. 50%), and social services (85.7% vs. 57.1%). Similar rates of referrals were reported for all stakeholder organizations for neighborhood associations (both at 28.6%), health agencies (participants 50%, non-participants 57.1%), schools (participants 35.7%, non-participants 28.6%) and businesses (both at 14.3%).

In addition to identifying which agencies were referred to, stakeholder organizations were asked to describe an example of a positive relationship or experience in regard to referring to another [stakeholder]. The following are excerpts from these statements:

"We regularly use transitional housing for women working toward the next step." (participant)

"The person with the mental health agency who makes the funding decisions about where women can go – works really well with me." (participant)

"We do a lot of referrals to [a transitional housing agency]. Many women have succeeded through that programming. It's the waiting list that causes the challenges." (participant)

"We have a reciprocal relationship with the [criminal justice] and [substance abuse treatment] programs. They refer to us for education and health care." (participant)

"Nothing comes to mind." (non-participant)

"I trust _____ [a transitional housing agency]" (non-participant)

Stakeholder organizations were asked "to which agencies would yours not refer and why?" (See Table 26: Q24.). Many of the stakeholder organizations expressed some discomfort at responding to this question. Nevertheless, all but three of the stakeholder organizations identified an agency to which they would not refer. One stakeholder stated, "I wouldn't refuse referral to any." another stated "I won't answer this question." and the third stated "none" and "I could not give an example of a negative relationship." Criminal justice (participant 21.4%, non-participant 42.9%) and missions/ministries (participant 21.4%, non-participant 28.6%) ranked highest as agencies to which stakeholder organizations would not refer; the remaining seven stakeholder organizations ranked 28.6% and lower for refusal to refer.

Several stakeholder organizations offered comments about why referrals would not be made. One participant described a negative situation that has led to not referring to a particular transitional housing agency.

"Late one Friday afternoon, a prostitute needed a place to stay or be arrested. I was given a telephone number for a person that worked for a residential service. The number was for a pager. I left a message. On the

return call, I was told to "lose the number" and that services for the prostitute were not provided. The [transitional housing] worker said that because it was so late on Friday, he needed to talk with the woman personally. I said, you can't, she is waiting at a fast food place. So, he refused her services"

Another participant described why her/his agency would no longer refer to an assistance agency.

"They tell people that if they are mentally ill, they are demon possessed and that if they are prostituted women, they are evil. Some people who went there have decompensated [were unable to cope and experienced a mental health crisis] and had to be admitted."

Other concerns expressed by participants include:

"Too many deals are cut with the [criminal justice] for the women to trust them. In addition, if they try to say that the [criminal justice] abuses them – "I was gang raped by 3 policemen" – no one will believe them. Look at the power issues: the disposable people vs. the icons of society."

"In order for a client to remain at [ministry/mission], they have to accept their religious program. A family with two parents and three kids had to leave for not attending services – they were Bosnian Muslims. I found them a place to live."

"A woman for whom we were trying to find shelter – and she was well known in the system and had clearly burned some bridges. We were frustrated with the doors that were closed to her."

Only one non-participant offered a reason for not referring to an agency:

"One of our alumni died in a room at [transitional housing] and was not discovered for a week."

Question 25 asked "from which agencies would yours receive referrals and why?" (See Table 26: Q25.) Again, participants receive more referrals from criminal justice (78.6%) than do non-participant (57.1%), from mental health (57.1% vs. 42.9%) and transitional housing (64.3 vs. 57.1%). Non-participants

receive somewhat more referrals from the missions/ministries (57.1% vs. 50%). All stakeholder organizations receive referrals from social service agencies at an equal rate of 28.6%. Twenty-one percent of participants receive referrals from neighborhood associations while none of the non-participants does. Referrals are received from health agencies at equal rates (28.6%). Non-participants receive referrals from schools and businesses somewhat more often than do participants (28.6% vs. 21.4%).

Comments to explain receiving referrals include:

"We have a reputation for providing what they need. In those referrals, prostitution isn't the necessary reason ... it is usually revealed through the assessment we do." (participant)

"The majority of our referrals come from treatment centers and word of mouth from the prison. A woman will go to prison and say, "I spent time at _____." ... Then other women will come here from prison." (participant)

Fewer stakeholder organizations responded to Q26 than to the previous questions in this element: "With which agencies has yours worked with in an advisory or consultative capacity?" (See Table 26: Q26.) Advisory or consultative roles seemed to occur on a much less frequent basis than other types of interactions among stakeholder organizations except for refusal to refer. Non-participants reported the most frequent advisory or consultative roles with criminal justice and mental health agencies (both are 57.1% vs. 35.7%). Transitional housing ranked among the lowest at 7.1% for all stakeholder organizations. Non-participants advised/consulted more often with

missions/ministries than did participants (57.1% vs. 35.7%). Rates of advising/consulting were reported at the same percentages for all stakeholder organizations for the remaining agencies: social service 7.1%, neighborhood associations 14.3%, health agencies 14.3%, schools 28.6%, and businesses 7.1%.

Joint programming interactions seemed to occur more often than advising/consulting, yet still considerably less often than referring or receiving referrals (See Table 26: Q27.) About half the participants reported joint programming with criminal justice, compared to 42.9% of the non-participants while 85.7% of non-participants reported joint programming with mental health agencies compared to 35.7% of the participants. Differences in findings for other agency categories are: transitional housing - 21.4% participants, 57.1% non-participants; missions/ministries - 28.6% participants, 42.9% non-participants; social service - 21.4% participants, 42.9% non-participants; and neighborhood associations - 28.6% participants, 14.3% non-participants. Non-participants, also, reported more joint programming with health agencies (57.1% vs. 21.4% participants) and schools (42.9% vs. 21.4% participants). Participants reported joint programming the least with businesses (14.3%) while non-participants reported 0% joint programming with businesses.

Another way recognition of interdependency within the problem domain was explored was by asking what types of projects the stakeholder would not or

would have difficulty working with in a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution (Q32 & Q33). Both these questions were open-ended. Responses were grouped into categories by keywords. Most commonly identified projects could work with without difficulty in a collaborative were treatment, housing, long-term services, and collaboration among agencies (Q32). Projects identified as being too difficult work with in a collaborative were strict faith-based agencies, required contribution of money, and if they involved controversial programming, e.g., needle exchange, abortion referral (Q33).

The project most commonly identified as could work with without difficulty in a collaborative (See Table 27: Q 32.) was treatment (participants 64.3%, non-participants 57.1%). Stakeholder organizations described treatment as: of prostituted women, of sexually transmitted infections, for substance abuse, for early identification of problems, and for spiritual needs. Housing, the second most commonly stated project (participants 28.6%, non-participants 42.9%), included emergency and transitional housing. Long-term services were also ranked with higher frequency by non-participants (42.9%) than by participants (21.4%). Interestingly, collaboration was mentioned by only 7.1% of participants, but by 28.6% of the non-participants. Overall, more non-participants identified projects they could work with without difficulty in a collaborative than did participants.

	Participants n=14	NonParticipants n=7
Treatment	9 64.3%	4 57.1%
Housing	4 28.6%	3 42.9%
Long-Term Services	3 21.4%	3 42.9%
Collaboration Among Agencies	1 7.1%	2 28.6%

Table 27: Q32 Projects Could Work Without Difficulty in a Collaborative

For Q33, stakeholder organizations were asked, "What types of projects would your agency find difficulty working with to establish a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution?" Both participants and non-participants identified difficulty working with the strict faith-based agencies at 42.9%. (See Table 27: Q32.)

Statements made by stakeholder organizations to describe this category include:

> "If it were conservatively based – a 'religiosity' rather than spirituality."
>
> "If there is a strong religious agenda to save souls as the primary motivator."
>
> "If restrictions were placed on appropriate health interventions, e.g., condom distribution and preventive programming."
>
> "We'd have difficulty with a program that wants them to quit prostitution ... and programs that deny services to people who have previously failed."
>
> "If a woman must identify herself as a Christian or had to deny the fact she was a sexual human being and could not address this."

Both participants and non-participants equally identified required contribution of money as difficult (28.6%). This "difficulty working with" category is best described by the following two statements:

"Who is going to pay for it [the collaborative]?"

"Staff and money to support involvement."

Controversial programming was of more concern to non-participants (71.4%) than for participants (28.6%). (See Table 28: Q33). It seemed as if the implementation of ideology through programming was more divisive than simply holding the beliefs. This is reflected in the following statements from stakeholder organizations:

"If they supported abortions."

"We would struggle with needle exchange, the "clean condom crowd", and agencies that support abortion."

"We would struggle with those who see religion as an incursion in people's lives."

"If they think they [prostituted women] should go to jail."

"If anything was politically controversial, e.g., to decriminalize prostitution."

"Anything that promotes prostitution or the continuation of prostitutes on the streets or in houses."

	Participants =14	NonParticipants n=7
Strict Faith-Based Agencies	6 42.9%	3 42.9%
Required Contribution of Money	4 28.6%	2 28.6%
Controversial Programming	4 28.6%	5 71.4%

Table 28: Q33 Projects Difficulty Working With in a Collaborative

Recognition of interdependency was also investigated by determining stakeholder organizations' perceptions of barriers (Q29) and gaps (Q30) to services for prostituted women in the City. These questions were asked in an open-ended manner. During the interview, the researcher clarified the difference between barriers and gaps by offering the following statements: "What are the barriers to services? That is, what prevents prostituted women from accessing services?" and "What are the gaps in services? How are women lost or what are the cracks they fall through among the services?"

Responses to Q29 and Q30 were grouped according to key words and phrases. Findings for barriers to services (See Table 29: Q29.) suggest a combination of personal responsibility, victimization, criminal status, and problems with the services, themselves. Substance addiction (participants, 92.9%, non-participants, 71.4%) could be viewed as either personal responsibility (choose to use) or victim status (to numb the pain of the prostitution lifestyle), depending on one's perspective. (Substance abuse was regarded as a barrier to accessing services by many stakeholder organizations because most agencies

will take a PW only if she is "clean" or drug free). Lack of personal-motivation by the prostituted woman points the finger of responsibility directly at her (participants 85.7%, non-participants 71.4%). Fear of police, pimps and boyfriends (85.7% participants and 71.4% non-participants) places prostituted women in a victim status. Lack of personal-resources (79.6% participants, 71.4% no-participants) could be victim status if poverty is deemed to be caused by oppression or as personal responsibility status if the prostituted woman is noted to squander resources or expects the "system" to take care of her.

Criminal status was reported as a barrier by all the participants and non-participants. Lack of coordination of services was reported by 100% of the participants and by 85.7% of the non-participants. Lack of services was reported as a barrier by 42.9% of participants and non-participants. The stigma of and denial of prostitution as a social problem was a concern for 42.9% of participants and non-participants. If the correlation is possible, it is interesting to note that more than half of the stakeholder organizations seemed to not consider criminal status a stigma. (See Table 29: Q29.)

	Participants n=14	NonParticipants n=7
Substance Addiction	13 92.9%	5 71.4%
Lack of Personal Motivation	12 85.7%	5 71.4%
Fear of Police, Pimps, Boyfriends	12 85.7%	5 71.4%
Lack of Personal Resource	11 78.6%	5 71.4%
Criminal Status	14 100%	7 100%
Lack of Coordination of Services	14 100%	6 85.7%
Lack of Services	6 42.9%	3 42.9%
Stigma/Denial	6 42.9%	3 42.9%

Table 29: Q29 Barriers to Services

When stakeholder organizations were asked "What are the gaps in services for prostituted women?" (Q30) their responses fell into two categories: Lack of coordination of services (participants 64.3%, non-participants 57.1% - less than a 10% difference) and service gaps (participants 14.3%, non-participants 14.3%). This researcher's impression is that, in Q29, the lack of coordination of services indicated the prostituted woman's own lack of effort to coordinate services. In Q30, the same phrase was used to refer to lack of effort by agencies, themselves, to coordinate services. If this impression is valid, then it seems that more stakeholder organizations put responsibility on the PW to work with various agencies to meet her needs than on the agencies. (See Table 30: Q30.)

	Participants n=14	NonParticipants n=7
Lack of Coordination of Services	9 64.3%	4 57.1%
Service Gaps	2 14.3%	1 14.3%

Table 30: Q30 Gaps in Services

Stakeholder organizations were asked what their agency or interest group would be willing to do to improve or better coordinate services for prostituted women (See Table 31: Q34). Half of the PWSN participants stated that they would be willing to collaborate efforts or share information, only 28.6% of the non-participants stated thusly. This is an interesting finding when compared to q31 (Table 36) in which 100% of participants reported that several agencies working together could best fill the gap in services (discussed in the next section on Element V, Convener).

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
Collaborate/Share	7 50%	2 28.6%
Job Training	1 7.1%	2 28.6%
Advisory/Support	4 28.6%	2 28.6%
Provide Services	1 7.1%	1 14.3%

Table 31: Q34 Willing to Do to Improve or Better Coordinate Services for Prostituted Women

Fifty percent of participants and 28.6% non-participants identified to collaborate/share as something they would be willing to do to improve or better coordinate services (Table 31: Q34). For responses to Q30, greater than half the participants (64.3%) and non-participants (57.1%) identified lack of coordination of services as a gap problem (See Table 30: Q30.). Note, this finding in contrast to the half that identify a willingness to collaborate or share to better coordinate services in Q34, Why this difference exists is a curiosity. Possibly, it is easier to identify a problem then to work cooperatively given the concerns about faith-based agencies and controversial programming reported in Q33 (See Table 28.).

Only 7.1% of participants compared to 28.6% of non-participants identified job training while 28.6% of both groups identified advisory/support as something they would be willing to do. The actual provision of services ranked at only 7.1% for participants and 14.3% for non-participants. (See Table 31: Q34.)

Question 38 asked what role the stakeholder would see her organization taking in a collaborative. Participants of the PWSN were much more likely to mention coordination of services than were non-participants (85.7% to 28.6% - this is the only finding with a greater than 10% difference). Both groups identified planning at 71.4%, and collaborating with others, 42.9%. Non-participants identified approval [of the collaborative] more often than did participants (42.9% vs. 35.7%). Conversely, participants identified leadership as a role more often than did non-participants (35.7% vs. 28.6%). As in the responses for Q33 (Table

28), financial support seems to be of concern to the majority of participants and non-participants. Only 7.1% participants and 14.3% non-participants identified financial support as a possible role in a collaborative. (See Table 32: Q38.)

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
Coordination of Services	12 85.7%	2 28.6%
Planning	10 71.4%	5 71.4%
Collaborating With Others	6 42.9%	3 42.9%
Approval	5 35.7%	3 42.9%
Leadership	5 35.7%	2 28.6%
Financial Support	1 7.1%	1 14.3%

Table 32: Q38 Role Would Take in a Collaborative

Another question to explore recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations was "What should be the goals of a collaborative?" (Q41). The underlying intent was to determine if the stated goals would include working together or if they would be agency service oriented. Key words in stakeholder organizations' responses were categorized and those that had five or more responses in the category are summarized on Table 33: Q41.

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
To Establish Utilizable/ Sustainable Services	9 64.3%	7 100%
To Work Together	9 64.3%	2 28.6%
To Establish a Speaker's Bureau	5 35.7%	0 0%
To do Research	4 28.6%	3 42.9%

Table 33: Q41 Major Goals of a Collaborative

To establish utilizable/sustainable services was identified by 64.3% of participants and 100% of non-participants in open-ended response to Q41. Sixty-four point three percent of the participants and 28.6% on the non-participants identified working together. Establishing a speaker's bureau was important to 35.7% of participants and to none of the non-participants while research ranked higher for non-participants, 42.9%, than for participants, 28.6%. It was not investigated whether or not any association existed among responses to Q29 barriers to services, Q30 gaps in services, Q34 willing to do to improve or better coordinate services and Q41, major goals of a collaborative.

Discussion of Problem Domain: Hypothesis III

The hypothesis: Participants in the PWSN will report more recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations as a precondition to interorganizational collaboration than non-participants.

Interdependency among stakeholder organizations was investigated by exploring networking activities. The predicted outcome was that stakeholder

organizations that participated in the PWSN would report more successful interaction with other agencies and groups than non-participants would. Interestingly, participant and non-participant stakeholder organizations reported working together in various venues at similar rates. A few differences between participants and non-participants are worthy of note. All stakeholder organizations reported a low percentage level of agencies to which they would not refer except for non-participants' referrals to the criminal justice system. Almost 43% of non-participants reported they would not refer to the criminal justice system while 21.4% participants reported the same (See Table 26: Q24.). This is somewhat consistent with stakeholder organizations' identification of those agencies that might hinder the establishment of a collaborative: 42.9% of both participants and non-participants reported that criminal justice would be a hindrance (See Table 35: Q37.).

The reported low percentage level of referral to criminal justice, also, seems to be consistent with stakeholder organizations' views of prostitution. Fewer than 15% of both participants and non-participants stated that prostitution was a criminal activity (See Table 15: Q18.). These findings suggest that most stakeholder organizations, whether participants or non-participants, prefer to provide services for and support prostituted women in a manner that avoids the criminal justice system. This makes sense when the intent of most stakeholder organizations' services is to rehabilitate PW and to provide support to leave the trade. In order to leave the trade, PW need to be able to find employment with a

living wage. When one has a felony charge on her record, employment and education options are limited.

Therefore, some level of overlap in problem domain appears evident among participants and non-participants, at least in networking for implementation of services. However, other findings suggest that a reasonably positive attitude toward networking does not suggest a desire to collaborate. When stakeholder organizations were asked what projects they would most likely work with without difficulty to establish a collaborative, collaboration among agencies ranked the lowest: participants 7.1% and non-participants 28.6%. Treatment, physically and spiritually, ranked the highest (See Table 27: Q32.). Likewise, differences in ideologies and types of services deemed appropriate appeared as issues when stakeholder organizations were asked what projects they would have difficulty working with in a collaborative. Almost 50% of all stakeholder organizations reported difficulty working with strict faith-based agencies. Controversial programming was a much larger concern for non-participants, 71.4%, than for participants, 28.6% (See Table 28: Q33.)

Another effort to determine recognition of interdependency (problem domain) was to ask about what should be the major goals of a collaborative. The prediction was that those stakeholder organizations that participated in the PWSN would identify more common goals for an interorganizational collaborative than those that did not. The most highly ranked goal was "to establish

utilizable/sustainable services" , participants 64.3% and non-participants 100%. The goal "to work together" was reported by 64.3% of participants and by 28.6% of non-participants (See Table 33: Q41.). These findings suggest that, for the non-participants, "to establish services" may not imply working together. Additionally, these findings are in direct contrast to responses about what projects stakeholder organizations would work with in a collaborative (participants and non-participants reported less than 30% interest in collaboration among agencies). These confusing findings might be due to stakeholder organizations' lack of distinction between cooperating, coordinating, or collaborating to enhance the provision of services and due to limited understanding about the problem domain level of interorganizational collaboration.

As a note of interest, these findings are somewhat similar to those of the previously reported 1998 survey of local non-profit CEOs and board chairs (CPNL,, undated) – if the stakeholder organizations' goals can be interpreted as an alternative way to state problems facing non-profit organizations. The 1998 survey found that CEOs and board chairs reported the three most serious problems facing non-profit organizations were funding services, competition for contributions and people, and collaborating. The majority of participants reported that the goal "to work together" was important – as did the 1998 survey respondents. Contribution of funds to support the interorganizational collaboration and lack of agency funding were concerns expressed by most of

the stakeholder organizations. This is consistent with the first two serious problems listed in the 1998 survey. While this note of interest does not help to determine whether this element is supported, the reasonable consistency in findings is reassuring.

During the interviews, stakeholder organizations were given the definition of the term "interorganizational collaboration" as Stakeholder organizations coming together to create a new structure with commitment to a common mission to deal with the social problem of prostitution in the City. This definition was discussed with each stakeholder in order to enhance understanding of the collaborative focus on problem domain versus on specific service projects. However, no attempt was made to measure stakeholder organizations' comprehension of the concept of interorganizational collaboration.

Stakeholder Organizations: Element IV: A precondition to successful interorganizational collaboration is acceptance of other stakeholder organizations

The hypothesis investigated for Stakeholder Organizations Element IV is:

Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about which stakeholder organizations might be helpful to or a hindrance to an interorganizational collaborative as evidenced by:

- identifying those stakeholder organizations that might be helpful in the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative (Q36).
- Identifying those stakeholder organizations that might be a hindrance to the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative (Q36).

Findings for Stakeholder Organizations: Hypothesis IV

Acceptance of other stakeholder organizations was explored by asking the open-ended question, who might help and who might hinder the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative. For Q36, stakeholder organizations were asked to identify who might be helpful in the establishment of a collaborative. Interestingly, stakeholder organizations identified two agency categories and two specific agencies as those that might be helpful in the establishment of a collaborative. The agency categories were: transitional housing programs (participants 64.3%, non-participants 57.1%) and substance abuse treatment programs (participants 57.1%, non-participants 57.1%). The two agencies identified were: Outreach Mental Health (again, a pseudonym), an assessment and referral agency (participants 35.7%, non-participants 42.9%) and Agape Ministry (pseudonym), a street ministry located in the section of town in which the homeless and underserved are concentrated (participants 28.6%, non-participants 14.3%). This may explain the higher number of comments for the agency categories than for the two specifically mentioned agencies. Only those percentages for Agape Ministry reveal greater than 10% difference between participants and non-participants. (See Table 34:Q36.)

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
Transitional Housing Programs	9 64.3%	4 57.1%
Substance Abuse Treatment Programs	8 57.1%	4 57.1%
Outreach Mental Health (pseudonym)	5 35.7%	3 42.95
Agape Ministry (pseudonym)	4 28.6%	1 14.3%

Table 34: Q36 Which Might be Helpful in the Establishment of a Collaborative

Four participants and two non-participants chose not to respond to Q37, a request to identify agencies that might hinder the establishment of a collaborative. Some stated that they "didn't know", most stated that they either did not want to answer the question or felt uncomfortable answering the question. Responses were very similar for the ten participants and five non-participants who did answer to the question. Those agencies that are "strict, faith-based" and the police were deemed to be a hindrance to the establishment of a collaborative. Slightly more than 40.0% of both participant and non-participants identified strict faith-based agencies while 28.6% of all stakeholder organizations identified the police. Other individual responses included those agencies that are territorial, the schools and those that are "in it for the funding". (See Table 35: Q37.)

	Participant n=10	NonParticipant n=5
Strict Faith-Based Agencies	6 42.9%	3 42.9%
The Police	4 28.6%	2 28.6%

Table 35: Q37 Which Might Hinder the Establishment of a Collaborative

Discussion of Stakeholder Organizations Hypothesis IV

The hypothesis: Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement than non-participants about which stakeholder organizations might be helpful to or a hindrance to an interorganizational collaborative as a measure of acceptance of said organizations.

Acceptance of other stakeholder organizations was investigated by two questions: which stakeholder organizations might be helpful and which might hinder the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative? The researcher's intent was to elicit more specific opinions than those garnered through Q22-28 (Table 26) that investigated interactions among the stakeholder organizations. Questions 36 and 37 are more direct in the query for positive and negative opinions about the effectiveness and, thereby, acceptance of other stakeholder organizations.

Transitional housing programs were mentioned most often when asked which stakeholder organizations might be helpful in the establishment of a collaborative (participants 64.3%, and non-participants 57.1%) followed closely by substance abuse treatment programs (participants 57.1% and non-participants 57.1%). (Table 34: Q36.)

Treatment and housing were listed in response to Q32 about which projects stakeholder organizations could work with without difficulty in a collaborative. (See Table 27: Q32.) If correlation between these two questions responses is possible, then the findings suggest that most stakeholder organizations not only identify that transitional housing programs and substance treatment programs might be most helpful in the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative (Table 34: Q36) but that there are stakeholder organizations that might be willing to work with such projects within a collaborative (Table 27: Q32).

When asked to consider which stakeholder(s) might hinder the establishment of a collaborative, the strict, faith-based agencies were identified by almost half the participants and non-participants, alike (Table 35: Q37). The concern expressed about strict, faith-based agencies appears to be consistent with the conservative restrictions concerns expressed by half of the interviewed stakeholder organizations in regard to projects they would have difficulty working with in a collaborative (Table 28: Q33). If a correlation can be made between "projects difficult to work with" and "which might hinder", then the suggestion is strong that strict faith-based agencies stand out as challenges to interorganizational collaborative endeavors.

Almost 30% of participants and non-participants identified the police as a possible hindrance to the establishment of a collaborative. Recall that fear of the

police was mentioned by the majority of participants and non-participants as a barrier to services (Table 29:Q29). Some stakeholder organizations' comments suggest that this is due more to prostituted women's fear of the police and the criminal status of prostitution than due to direct activities by the police to hinder a collaborative endeavor. Indeed, responses to Q22-28 (Table 26) indicate a high level of interaction with and a strong "fair" ranking of the strength of success in interacting with the police. Therefore, one is left to ponder if the police were considered a hindrance due to possible conflict of interest, i.e., the need to enforce misdemeanor and felony charges for PW while collaborating with intervention and rehabilitation agencies or as a hindrance due to the perception of prostituted women's fear of the police.

Findings for the stakeholder organizations hypothesis are too inconsistent to determine support or lack of support. (See Table 38.)

Convener: Element V: The Convener serves to bring stakeholder organizations to the table and to facilitate the collaborative process.

The hypothesis investigated for Convener Element V is:

Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about which stakeholder organizations might be helpful to or a hindrance to an interorganizational collaborative as evidenced by:

- identifying those stakeholder organizations that might be helpful in the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative (Q36).
- Identifying those stakeholder organizations that might be a hindrance to the establishment of an interorganizational collaborative (Q36).

Findings for Convener: Hypothesis V

Element V states that a convener serves to bring stakeholder organizations to the table and to facilitate the collaborative process. For the purpose of this research, possible identification of the convener was explored by asking two questions: Who could fill the gap? (Q31) [This question fell in sequence after stakeholder organizations were asked about barriers and gaps to services, Q 29 and Q30.]; and Who might take the lead to pull together a collaborative (Q35)? Questions 31 and 35 attempted to identify who might "take the lead" (be the convener) and whom these "several agencies working together" might be.

For Q31, "Who could fill the gap?", three forced options were given: a single agency, several agencies working independently, or several agencies working together. Once an option was chosen, the stakeholder was asked to name the single agency or the several agencies. One hundred percent of the stakeholder organizations reported that several agencies working together would be the best response to the problem of barriers and gaps. (See Table 36: Q31.) The "several agencies working together" were never clearly identified. Before responding to Q31, stakeholder organizations referred back to their responses to Q36 about which might be helpful in the establishment of a collaborative: the transitional housing programs and the substance abuse treatment programs. This association between the two questions occurred without direction from the researcher.

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
Several Agencies Working Together	14 100%	7 100%

Table 36: Q31 Who Could Fill the Gap

Participants in the PWSN offered more options for which agency might take the lead than did non-participants (See Table 37: Q35). The Home Agency (a pseudonym), mentioned by 28.6% of participants and non-participants, is the only stakeholder organization in the city that offered housing and other services specifically to assist prostituted women who desire to "leave the trade". About 20.0% of participants and none of the non-participants identified the need for a new entity to take the lead. Approximately 14.0% of participants identified The Health Agency (a pseudonym) as one that might take the lead, none of the participants did. Overall, fewer than 30% of stakeholder organizations identified either an existing agency or the creation of a new agency to take the lead or convene a collaborative. One wonders if this is because such a role seems so daunting that it is difficult to identify a lead agency or person, or if these responses suggest a lack of desire for a collaborative effort? These questions were not investigated.

	Participant n=14	NonParticipant n=7
The Home (pseudonym)	4 28.6%	2 28.6%
A New Entity	3 21.4%	0 0%
The Health Agency (pseudonym)	2 14.3%	0 0%

Table 37: Q35 Which Might Take the Lead to Establish a Collaborative

Discussion of Convener: Hypothesis V

The hypothesis: Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about who could take the lead for an interorganizational collaborative than non-participants.

It was predicted that stakeholder organizations that participated in the PWSN would share more agreement in identifying leadership or a convener for a future collaborative. The assumption was that leadership would arise from among the agencies and interest groups in the City. Fewer than 30% of the stakeholder organizations, participant and non-participant, identified an agency or group that might take the lead in establishing an interorganizational collaborative. Almost 30.0% of both participants and non-participants identified "The Home" as one that might take the lead. This was the only agency identified by both participants and non-participants. About 20.0% of the participants suggested creation of a new entity and 14.3% suggested "The Health Agency". This is an interesting finding when all stakeholder organizations reported fair to good and a few excellent success of efforts in their work with other agencies (Table 26: Q22-28).

Agreement is found between participants and non-participants about acceptance of "The Home" as a possible leader/convener to establish a collaborative, albeit not a majority - 28.6% for both groups. However, participants identify two other options for leadership, the non-participants do not. While some agreement exists between participants and non-participants about possible leadership, that more participants identify more options lends suggestive support for the Convener hypothesis V.

Question 35 specifically asked "If any one agency could take the lead to pull together a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution, which one should it be?" Throughout the interview, the word "agency" was used to refer to other stakeholder organizations (recall that a list of agencies was given to the stakeholder organizations to use to respond to Q22-28, Table 26). About 20.0% of participants suggested that a new entity be formed to take the lead or be the convener. It is unknown if these 21.3% participants who suggest a new entity correlate with the 57.1% participants who did not identify the leadership of the PWSN as a strength of that project (Table 23: Q43.a). It remains uninvestigated whether the desire of some participants for a new entity to take the lead to establish a collaborative is based on lack of satisfaction with the leadership of the original PWSN or recognition of the value of utilizing a fresh leadership with an outsider's objectivity.

What is striking about the responses to Q35 is how few participants, and even fewer non-participants, identified a source that might take the lead. Interpretation of these findings is speculative, at best: Might lack of identification of possible leadership be due to an unidentified desire to not establish a collaborative or an unidentified sense of threat or intimidation at the thought of a "leader" or "convener" who may take control? This might suggest a lack of demonstration of this precondition element.

Might it be that insufficient credibility trust exists at this point in time to identify a leader or convener? As stated earlier, responses to Q22-28 (Table 26) suggest a reasonable amount of interactivity among agencies, but this interaction may be based more on necessity or funding mandates than on trust. This begs the questions: Is a certain level of credibility trust needed before a leader/convener can be identified? Herein is a possible suggestion that Credibility Trust Element III, may be a priority phase or carry priority weight over the other elements.

In any event, inadequate findings exist to support the Convener hypothesis V. More agreement than disagreement between participants and non-participants is found. Additionally, fewer than 30% of the stakeholder organizations identified a possible convener. (See Table 38)

Chapter Seven

Summary of Integrated Findings and Discussions

Communities and organizations have striven to address social problems in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of success. Interorganizational collaboration is one tool to assist stakeholder organizations committed to working with a social problem to join together in effective ways to tackle issues that lie beyond the scope of any one organization – issues such as the social problem of prostitution. Prostitution, when regarded as a complex social problem, is a touchstone for elucidating the need to find solutions for other associated social problems, for example, emergency and transitional housing, poverty, crime, substance abuse, mental health, education and job training, unemployment, family issues, and spiritual issues. Therefore, when the phenomenon of prostitution comes under study, so do other related social problems.

To deal with such a range of related social problems requires collaboration of a wide range of talents and resources to strategize a multi-faceted response. The efficacy of collaboration is well summed up by Huxham, who writes:

> ...the really important problem issues facing society – poverty, conflict, crime and so on - cannot be tackled by any single organization acting alone. These issues have ramifications for so many aspects of society that they are inherently multi-organizational. Collaboration is thus essential if there is to be any hope of alleviating these problems. (Huxham, 1996, p.4)

Huxham's statement supports the underlying assumption of this research: that the complexity of the social problem of prostitution is best dealt with by

interorganizational collaborative effort. A beginning effort toward this strategy in the City of interest was the Prostituted Women's Support Network (PWSN). However, after eighteen months of existence, the funding for this endeavor was exhausted and the PWSN floundered. Many of the original participants expressed interest in formalizing a new collaborative to continue the work of the original Support Network. It was in this context that the stakeholder organizations were interviewed. Stakeholder organizations were grouped as participants and non-participants in the original PWSN and responses to questions were compared accordingly. The question under investigation was:

> Do the stakeholder organizations that participated in the original Prostituted Women's Support Network demonstrate more elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration than those that did not?

Competitive forces, Context Hypothesis I.A are inherent in the relationships among the stakeholder organizations – particularly in regard to integration in the community and available infrastructure and funding. These represent some of the structure-oriented preconditions. Pressure and strain to maintain a competitive edge by maintaining involvement in a community and adequate budget and funding is noted in several findings. Many funders encourage more efficient used of limited funds by giving preference to those stakeholder organizations that collaborate – possibly even when lack of Credibility Trust exists.

This pressure and strain is noted, also, in stakeholder organizations; reported dependency on external sources of funding for their agencies, that they provide services for low to very-low income and poverty-stricken clientele, and that they would have difficulty participating in a collaborative if contribution of funds were to be required.

Context Hypothesis I.A, competitive forces, investigated structure-oriented stakeholder characteristics, i.e., those stable characteristics that would remain unchanged regardless of participation in the PWSN. Overall findings for the Context Hypothesis I.A, indicate little difference between participants and non-participants in regard to longevity of existence in the City – and that longevity as a measure of integration in the community was not a contributing factor to participation. Representation of the two largest racial/ethnic groups in the City, Blacks and Whites, was associated with participation in the original PWSN. PWSN participants reported higher numbers of people employed and more volunteers. Targeting the poor and homeless and prostituted women, serving a higher percentage of PW, and offering support services were associated with participation. (See Table 38.) These findings suggest some support for speculation that participants in the original PWSN may be more likely to participate in the proposed second PWSN.

Institutional restraining forces, Context Hypothesis I.B, the second stricture-oriented element, are expressed by stakeholder organizations' missions

and strategic plan for PW. As stated earlier, missions are transformed into rules that mandate conformity – missions clarify the identify and purpose of the stakeholder – and guide problem identification and strategic plans and services (Mattessich, et al,, 2001).

While mission statements were quite varied, more commonality in use of key words and phrases were found among participants' missions than non-participants' – and four participants reported having strategic plans for PW while no non-participants did. This finding is interesting when compared to reports by all stakeholder organizations of the variety of offered support services that PW may use. In spite of differing missions, some common values may exist – and these common values may help create some common ground for an interorganizational collaborative. Then, again, the manner in which services for PW are offered was not investigated. In other words, the service may be available, but not reasonably accessible by the PW. Suggestions can be found among the data that some stakeholder organizations might be more conditional than others in the way their services are implemented. For example: some stakeholder organizations may restrict access to "frequent fliers" (PW who frequently use the services, but seem unmotivated to change or improve their lifestyle); or some stakeholder organizations may require adherence to particular religious standards for the PW to keep receiving services; or some stakeholder organizations services may be constrained by funding mandates.

Overall findings suggest that, while some institutional restraining forces may be not support participation in an interorganizational collaborative, hope is found in some common ground in the expression of the missions and that four participants had strategic plans for services for prostituted women. (See Table 38.) This finding is stronger among participants than non-participants. Therefore, it seems reasonable to speculate that participants in the original PWSN may be more likely to participate in the proposed second PWSN.

Institutional driving forces to collaborate, Context Hypothesis I.B, are based in overlap of perception of the social problem of prostitution – a process-oriented precondition. Inherent in this perception of prostituted women as a social problem are problem-solving strategies and interventions. This is to say that the perception or definition of the social problem influences chosen interventions.

More participants than non-participants identified PW as entering the trade younger and working longer and larger populations of PW and johns in the City. They also saw the PW more as a victim, having mental health (and substance abuse) problems, and/or multi-factorial problems and as being more adversely effected by the experience of prostituting. If these findings are interpreted to suggest more agreement among participants regarding the size and scope of the phenomenon of prostituted women in the City, then it may be surmised that

participants would be more likely to become involved in the proposed second PWSN.

Lack of identification of physical health concerns by both participants and non-participants may reveal an unidentified, but pervasive judgmental cultural attitude about illicit/immoral sexual activity. (Literature review findings support that, except for sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS, the general physical health of PW is ignored.) This poorly identified undercurrent of judgment may be an outgrowth of the high level of religiosity in the City, reported selective philanthropic generosity, and the perception of conservatism in the City. This cultural attitude may also indirectly be expressed by the police department mandate to "clear the streets" of obvious prostitutional activity. When these attitudes and actions are speculatively linked to the two other findings from the Problem Domain Element, then concern regarding judgmental attitudes may be even more founded: over 85% of the participants and over 70% non-participants reported that lack of personal motivation by the PW is a barrier to services and; over 40% of the participants and non-participants reported that strict faith-based agencies might be difficult to work with.

What is the relevance of these comments? The majority of participants represent secular groups (74.3%) while the more non-participants represent religious groups (57.2%). And, strict, faith-based organizations were represented at a higher rate in the non-participant group. Almost half of all interviewed

stakeholder organizations reported difficulty working with strict faith-based agencies and the same percentage reported that these same agencies might hinder the establishment of a collaborative. The research is left to speculate if some of the judgmental cultural attitude arises from the population and groups that support the strict faith-based agencies.

Yet, comments made during interviews of community leaders indicated that the City is in transition due to changing population demographics and gradual turnover of leadership from the more white, male-dominated older group to a newer group that is more diverse in age, gender, and race/ethnicity. And, not to neglect other findings in regard to institutional driving forces, all participants and over 85% of the non-participants reported that lack of coordination of services and criminal status are barriers to services for PW. Therefore, if this judgmental cultural attitude does exist, it may be modifying or diminishing. (See Table 38.)

Of interest, here is a comparison with responses to Q18 (Table 15: Q18), agency views of prostitution. Only 14.3% of all stakeholder organizations ranked prostitution as a criminal activity while 85.7% of all stakeholder organizations reported substance abuse as a reason for entry into prostitution. Can an association be drawn here that substance abuse by a PW is not a criminal behavior? Also of interest is the high ranking of history of abuse and poverty/homeless by both participants and non-participants in Q19.c (Table 19)

while only 14.3% of non-participants stated that their agency view of prostitution included PW as victims (Table 15: Q18). These findings seem contradictory if one agrees with the perceptive that girls and women are victimized by abuse and homelessness. Another seeming contradiction is the participants' low ranking of the agency view that PW need support (14.3%) compared to the findings to Q19.c that women enter prostitution due to a history of abuse, substance abuse, and poverty/homelessness.

Findings for the **Credibility Trust Hypothesis II** are, in the opinion of the researcher, the most readily challenged yet may be the most important precondition element. Assessment of trust among participants and non-participants necessitates a reasonable level of trust in the researcher and in maintained confidentiality of the research findings. Stakeholder organizations were reassured verbally and via the informed consent that confidentiality was mandated. Also, the researcher is a respected professional in the community as well as is active in a variety of community endeavors. But, these factors do not guarantee trust in the research process. The level of credibility or benevolent trust between researcher and stakeholder organizations was not formally assessed, therefore, remains somewhat speculative – and whether or not trust in the researcher confounded stakeholder organizations' responses to interview questions dealing with trust issues remains unknown. Nonetheless, because the literature supports that trust is paramount to interorganizational collaborative success, it was investigated.

Participants and non-participants reported overall fair to good levels of success in their interactions with nine categories of agencies and interest groups. As stated earlier, the positive slant of these findings could be due, in part, to stakeholder organizations' self-selection of agency interactions to assess. That the majority of findings are not good to excellent suggests an overall average of fair – which seems to be a realistic finding.

In regard to past experiences with the Prostituted Women's Support Network, participants reported more positive and negative responses. The most positive findings were that agencies were brought together via the PWSN and that education about the issued of prostitution in the City occurred. Over 70% of the participants expressed concern that no long-term plan came from the PWSN. However, participants must be reminded that the purpose of the 18-month funded network project was *to facilitate a collective learning process to enable organizations to more effectively address needs* of PW and issues surrounding prostitution. The purpose was not to create a long-term plan. Nonetheless, recognition of and commitment to this need for long-term planning may support speculation for involvement in the proposed second PWSN by participants in the original one.

Although the informed consent form stated that confidentiality would be maintained, this researcher couldn't assume that all stakeholder organizations trusted her enough to be fully open in their expression of opinions of other

agencies. This issue of lack of complete trust in the confidentiality process seems evident in stakeholder organizations' responses to questions about negative experiences with other stakeholder organizations (See Table 26: Q24.). Lack of trust may, also, be suggested in the Problem Domain hypothesis through which interdependence among stakeholder organizations is explored by identification of projects they would have difficulty working with in a collaborative (See Table 35: Q37.). Responses to the latter reveal barriers identified as "strict faith-based" and "controversial programming". Stakeholder organizations' comments reveal definite boundaries and "wedge issues" between perceived conservative and liberal ideologies and projects. For example, issues of abortion, needle exchange for substance abusers, and religious doctrinal requirements were identified as "make it or break it" issues for many stakeholder organizations. Even more than interfering with certain stakeholder organizations working together such boundaries and wedge issues could create a sense of tension and, possibly, disrespect that might prevent the development of credibility trust among certain stakeholder organizations and, thereby, impair desire to seek common ground to work collaboratively on the social problem of prostitution.

Therefore, the rather positive results of the rankings of success of efforts with other agencies must be viewed with discretion. The results may be biased positively due to lack of trust of the research confidentiality process, due to careful self selection of mostly those agencies with which the stakeholder holds a

good working relationship, or due to desire to avoid those agencies with which perceived significant ideological differences exist.

The challenge for participants in the proposed second PWSN will be to take specific action to enhance Credibility Trust and, thereby, Benevolent Trust. Challenges to this effort could be created by the "wedge issues" (earlier identified as issues surrounding abortion, needle exchanged for substance abusers, and religious doctrinal requirements) as well as lingering long-term memories of negative experiences among stakeholder organizations.

So, while **Credibility Trust Hypothesis II** is somewhat supported, challenges and barriers still remain.

Recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations was the criteria used to describe the precondition, **Problem Domain Hypothesis III**. This was explored by tracking networking or interaction among stakeholder organizations in the City.

Networking does occur among the stakeholder organizations due, in great part, to the need for diverse services to meet the needs of PW. No stakeholder interviewed for the research was, alone, able to meet the diversity of needs of their PW clientele. But, networking among stakeholder organizations does not

necessarily imply a desire to collaborate. Indeed, networking due to necessity is just that – necessity. And, even with recognition of the need for networking among the stakeholder organizations due to limited services, positive attitudes about networking may not be implied. The refusal to respond to Q24 – to whom would you not refer (Table 26) – by many stakeholder organizations may not imply a refusal to network, it may simply suggest lack of desire to criticize an agency they may need to work with in the future. Yet, when almost 50% of all stakeholder organizations interviewed reported difficulty working with strict faith-based agencies and over 71% of the non-participants identified controversial programming as a concern, interdependency issues, while seemingly obvious, may be more of a source of frustration rather than a source of opportunity to provide better services for PW

This recognition of the need to work together, at least in terms of networking, is evident in the identification of major goals for an interorganizational collaborative by the stakeholder organizations. The establishment of utilizable/sustainable services was identified by the majority of participants and by all the non-participants. Many of the participants also identified "to work together" as a major goal. Yet, once again, to establish services and to work together may not be indicative of a desire to collaborate – it may simply be recognition of the need for networking. Nonetheless, that more participants identify "to work together" as a major goal while non-participants do

not, suggests support for speculation that participants in the original PWSN may be more likely to join the proposed second PWSN.

Findings for the **Problem Domain Hypothesis III** (recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations explored by tracking networking activities, priority and difficulty projects to work with, willingness to improve services for PW, role in a collaborative, and goals for a collaborative) are inconsistent, therefore, the hypothesis is not supported, (See Table 38.)

Acceptance among stakeholder organizations is fundamental to the formation of an interorganizational collaborative – and is a challenging issue. Stakeholder organizations should represent a cross-section of the community that will be affected by the collaborative's activities, have sufficient infrastructure and funding to be committed members, be able to identify common ground in their missions, be regarded as legitimate agencies, and know in what way they would be willing to work with an interorganizational collaborative. Of paramount importance is the acceptance of stakeholder organizations in the collaborative. This is identified as a precondition to interorganizational collaboration, the **Stakeholder Organizations Element IV** and was explored by asking who would be helpful to or hinder the establishment of a collaborative.

Transitional housing programs ranked the highest by participants and non-participants, followed closely by substance abuse treatment programs when stakeholder organizations were asked who might be helpful. Those that might be a hindrance were identified as strict faith-based agencies and the police. Transitional housing was identified previously in response to Q32 when it was ranked highest as a project stakeholder organizations would be willing to work with in a collaborative. Most of the transitional housing programs in the City are operated by religion-based groups, some are the aforementioned strict, faith-based. Now, strict faith-based agencies have been identified by almost 50% of the participants and non-participants as a hindrance to collaborative effort and they control many of the transitional housing beds in the City. The challenge is evident: How could a collaborative be established to meet the many homeless and transitional housing needs of prostituted women when the problem of acceptance among stakeholder organizations exists? Surely, this will prove to be a major issue for the current PWSN collaborative effort. And, as stated earlier, because more of the strict faith-based organizations were in the non-participant group, it may be speculated that participants in the original PWSN will be more likely to do so in the proposed second PWSN.

The **Convener** described in **Hypothesis V**, holds the challenging jobs of bringing stakeholder organizations to the table and facilitating the collaborative process. Findings from this exploration creates concern for the readiness and willingness of the stakeholder organizations to participate in an

interorganizational collaborative. First, fewer than 30% of the non-participants identified a possible convener and just over 60% of the participants did so. However, this 60% was divided over three convener choices. The question becomes, if a leader/convener cannot be identified, will a leader "rise to the top" and will this leader be accepted? Lack of consensus may arise from a seeming lack of options for a leader or from fear of loss of autonomy and position (territoriality). When this is speculatively linked with other expressed concerns such as:

- competition for funding,
- conflicting views on prostitution and the effect of prostitution on women,
- disparate mission statements,
- the need to network even when missions and values might conflict,
- concerns expressed about strict faith-based agencies, and
- about controversial programming.

...then a Convener's job would be extremely challenging – if a convener could be located and accepted.

The results of this research are mixed. The Context hypothesis was somewhat supported. Some differences existed between participants and non-participants in regard to the Context elements. Findings for the competitive forces described by integration of the stakeholder in the community did not support the hypothesis. Findings for the competitive forces described by available infrastructure and funding somewhat supported the hypothesis because

participants tended to have larger budgets and larger staffs. And, findings for competitive forces described by access to power and resources somewhat support the hypothesis because participants reported more access to decision-makers. Findings for institutional driving forces, based on some level of overlap in stakeholder organizations' perceptions of PW as a social problem, somewhat supported the hypothesis– more agreement was found among participants than among non-participants. Findings for institutional restraining forces based on conflicting/at odds missions and services as a precondition somewhat supported the hypothesis – more common ground was found among participants' missions than non-participants and four participants reported having strategic plans to work with PW.

Findings for Credibility Trust as a precondition somewhat supported the hypothesis – participation in the PWSN seemed to enhance the existence of credibility trust. The hypotheses for the remaining three preconditions, Problem Domain, Stakeholder organizations, and Convener were inconsistently supported by the data.

These findings raise the question of weight of importance of each of the elements. Is it possible that the Context and Credibility Trust bear more weight in importance than Problem Domain, Stakeholder organizations, and Conveners? Might one of these three elements bear more weight than another? They also raise questions about limitations of the research.

CONTEXT: **Hypothesis I.A**: Participants in the PWSN will report more competitive forces than non-participants. 1.integration of the stakeholder in the community; 2.available infrastructure and funding;	1.Inadequate data to support: No difference between participants and non-participants. 2.Somewhat supported: Participants tend to have larger budgets and staffs.
CONTEXT: **Hypothesis I.B**: Participants in the PWSN will report fewer institutional restraining forces than non-participants	Somewhat supported: Institutional-restraining forces may be an interference; more common ground in participants' missions and four participants have strategic plans for PW.
CONTEXT: **Hypothesis IC**: Participants in the PWSN will report more institutional driving forces than non-participants	Somewhat supported: More agreement about perceptions among participants and differences with nonparticipants.
CREDIBILITY TRUST: Hypothesis II: Participants in the PWSN will report more Credibility Trust, based on past experiences, than non-participants	Somewhat supported Participation in the PWSN seemed to enhance credibility trust
PROBLEM DOMAIN: Hypothesis III Participants in the PWSN will report more recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations than non-participants.	Inconsistent findings to determine support or lack of support.

Table 38 Outcome of Analysis

STAKEHOLDER ORGANIZATIONS: Hypothesis IV: Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about which stakeholder organizations might be helpful to or a hindrance to an interorganizational collaborative than non-participants.	Inconsistent findings to determine support or lack of support.
CONVENER: **Hypothesis V:** Participants in the PWSN will report more agreement about who could take the lead for an interorganizational collaborative than non-participants.	Inadequate data to support: More agreement than disagreement between participants and non-participants. Fewer than 30% could identify a possible convener.

Table 38 Outcome of Analysis (continued)

In regard to speculation about participation in the proposed second PWSN, some support is found in the findings for Context and Credibility Trust. Participants in the original PWSN demonstrate more elements of the preconditions, Context and Credibility Trust. These two elements are based heavily in the infrastructure of the stakeholder organizations and the trust based on past interactions. Inconsistent findings for the Problem Domain element that explores recognition of interdependency among stakeholder organizations does not null the Credibility Trust findings. They simply indicate that further investigation is necessary and, possibly, suggest that recognition of interdependency is necessary for the development of Credibility Trust. The researcher is not yet convinced that the questions used to investigate the Stakeholder Organizations hypothesis were answered in full by the interviewees. As with the Problem Domain questions that many stakeholder organizations refused to answer, it may be possible that they hedged on identifying who might

hinder a collaborative endeavor. Investigation of the Convener element seems to offer the least useful information. It seems that if the other elements are demonstrated by the stakeholder organizations, then a convener would be more readily identified or would "rise to the top".

So, it is with great caution that this researcher suggests a correlation between participation in the original PWSN and participation in the proposed second PWSN. Those stakeholder organizations that participated in the original PWSN demonstrate more precondition elements than those that did not. Therefore, participants in the original PWSN may be more likely than non-participants to be involved in the proposed second Prostituted Women's Support Network.

Limitations

Sampling deficiencies may be one limitation. A non-probability, convenience sample was selected by a nonrandom method of a limited population. A small amount of snowball sampling was used, as well. While the sample can be judged as a fair representation of stakeholder organizations that participated in the Prostituted Women's Support Network, it is not representative of all relevant stakeholder organizations in the City. Additionally, the total number of stakeholder organizations in the study was small: 21 (14 participants and 7 non-participants). Nonetheless, qualitative review of comments made by stakeholder organizations and assessment by comparison of percentages does result in

some meaningful findings. Those stakeholder organizations that had larger budgets and staffs and those that had developed credibility trust through participation in the PWSN seemed more likely to demonstrate those elements of the preconditions to interorganizational collaboration.

Design problems are the next contributing factor to the limitations of the study. The interview format was lengthy, requiring a full hour for completion. Certain terms used in the interview questions (e.g. convener) were ambiguous resulting in some confusion for the stakeholder organizations and lack of clarity in responses. This necessitated qualitative judgment in interpretation of statements and categorizing of comments by the researcher.

One area neglected in the interview questions was that of stakeholder organizations' perceptions about the race/ethnicity of prostituted women. Sadly, this might reflect a prejudice not dissimilar to the City's police department computer software program that offers space to report only black or white for the race of PW. Therefore, the racial/ethnic/cultural sensitivity component remained neglected.

Only one researcher had contact with the stakeholder organizations. Interviews were not tape- or video-recorded, rather, they were hand written and then transcribed to disk. This eliminated the option of validation of the interview process. However, the face-to-face interviews offered opportunity for the

researcher to determine the level of the stakeholder organizations' understanding and to clarify responses. In addition, sufficient control was maintained in regard to the order of the interview items, i.e., to progress the interview from simpler to more complex or invasive items.

Content of the interview was derived from the literature review supported theoretical framework and from conversations with stakeholder organizations in a similar Support Network in a neighboring city. Clarity of the questionnaire items was assessed by the dissertation committee and chair and by stakeholder organizations in the neighboring city. Close-ended questions offered limited options for responses or requested a numerical value from the stakeholder. Stakeholder organizations could respond in their own words to the open-ended questions. Therefore, research findings were based on real-time, researcher hand written records of the verbal reports by the interviewed stakeholder organizations. This could beg the question of accuracy.

It is possible that some stakeholder organizations attempted to create a favorable impression of themselves or their agency/interest group. It is also possible that researcher bias caused the interviewer to unwittingly lead the stakeholder to answer in a certain way. Use of one representative for each stakeholder risks that the data is a reflection of individual opinion and perception and not of the full stakeholder organization.

Theory Limits

The theory did not provide space to separate individual-from stakeholder-level behaviors. The question of individual perception and values are neglected. If the individual representative had any conflict with stakeholder organization mission or program implementation, this could not be investigated. The theory does suggest that the mission and program structure should direct individual behavior within the stakeholder organization. Missions are interpreted as institutionalized values that direct conformity of behavior. However, as was noted in the findings and discussion sections, at times the interviewed representative holds different views and values than the stakeholder organization for which s/he works.

The theory seems to imply the assumption that the nature and importance of interorganizational collaboration is under stakeholder organization control. What is not clearly identified is how the local and regional culture might impact conditions for interorganizational collaboration.

The theory suggests that the precondition elements identify key issues that could assist stakeholder organizations to adapt to uncertainty about ways to deal with the social problem of prostitution and with the uncertainty about whether or not to collaborate. It is possible that the preconditions could be adapted to an assessment-like tool to assist stakeholder organizations to reduce uncertainty enough to make a decision about whether or not to become involved with an interorganizational collaborative. However, such a tool could not be

developed until theory limitations are corrected and weighted or priority importance of the elements is determined. Therefore, it seems that the theory sets out precondition elements while leaving space for substantive theory development so that application to particular phenomena may be more likely. This, in turn, leaves space to track adaptations that don't exactly fit the theory.

Implications

Results of this study cannot be generalized beyond the study population. Judgments that can be made about the study population are very limited and must be undertaken in a careful manner. Nonetheless, as the researcher participates in the development of the second Prostituted Women's Support Network, some of the findings may be useful to assist the group to develop in a healthy manner.

Implications for theory development are important. The proposed theory reflects an integration of the more rational-based theories with the more process-oriented concept of credibility trust; regard for inter-relationships allow investigation of preconditions in ways that go beyond the more structured, static approach. Recommendations for theory development are listed in the next section.

Recommendations for Future Research

Although the findings of this research endeavor were not statistically significant, some recommendations for future directions for research can be made. First,

outcomes from this research suggest that Credibility Trust may carry more weight than the other elements. Therefore, further research to determine if and which elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration carry more relative weight or importance could be useful. Next, this research endeavor did not investigate if the precondition elements tend to occur in a developmental sequence. Therefore, further research to determine if some elements of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration are more important at certain stages or types of groups could be fruitful.

Collaboration is not always effective, not always appropriate and, in some circumstances, may entail more costs than independent efforts. Nonetheless, it does offer a strategic tool in many situations (Mattessich, et al 2001). Comments derived from the reviewed literature as well as from stakeholder organizations and community leaders in the City suggest that the popularity and incidence of collaborative efforts will continue to increase. Therefore, investigating and striving to understand that which makes it work becomes an important and on-going task.

Many additional questions remain to be addressed (more than can be suggested here). In order to further test and develop the proposed theory, future research could investigate similar collaborative efforts in at least two similar cities and include a more representational sample of stakeholder organizations in the city in order to approach better data saturation. Other questions could include:

- What is the relative importance of each element?

- Can a weight be assigned to each element to indicate different levels of attention that each may need?
- Are some elements more important at certain stages of the collaborative or for certain types of groups?
- What other elements might influence whether stakeholder organizations will come together in a collaborative?
- How to investigate the impact of issues relevant to individual stakeholder representatives' lack of full acceptance of stakeholder organization values, missions, and program implementation?
- What might be the impact of outside funding on the initial phase of interorganizational collaboration?
- Would the choice of stakeholder(s) to lead the collaborative impact its initial formative phase? What criteria are important to guide this choice?
- Must the convener be a member of an participating organization or could the convener be an independent facilitator?
- During the precondition phase of an interorganizational collaborative, should all interested and/or relevant stakeholder organizations be encouraged to participate, or should the collaborative membership be limited? What criteria would be important to determine this?

Answers to these questions, and many others, could contribute to the conceptual and practical foundations for understanding preconditions to interorganizational collaboration.

Obviously, there are many directions for future research. Nonetheless, central questions include what is known about the phases of collaborative development, particularly the precondition phase, and how these phases contribute to optimal function as well as the production of desired outcomes. Other questions, which might be useful to explore with potential collaborative members, could include:

- How do we know that interorganizational collaboration is worth the effort?
- How do we ensure all stakeholder organizations affected are invited to participate?
- What is the cost-benefit of investing staff time and resources into a collaborative?
- Under what conditions is interorganizational collaboration the most effective strategy?
- How can collaborative effectiveness be measured?
- Would it be best to begin to assess effectiveness from the preconditions phase?

The overarching question could be: What would be the best method for investigating these questions in such a way as to maximize the benefits and to reduce costs of initiating interorganizational collaboratives?

Contributions of the Dissertation

Contributions of this proposed dissertation research include theoretical, methodological, substantive, and professional/personal. Ideally, this research would serve to validate or refine the Precondition phase of Wood and Gray's Theory of Collaboration with the concept of Credibility Trust included. Methodologically, use of the qualitative method in conjunction with the quantitative method might contribute to validating it as one that results in richer and thicker findings and analysis or, conversely, reveal inherent difficulties in the strategy.

Substantively, at the least, this research could provide documentation of the potential for collaborative effort of some agencies. Findings from the research might serve to enhance the initiation of, continued effort, and/or sustainability of collaborative efforts. Additionally, the validation and/or refinement of the collaborative model could occur such that it might be made useful to other communities with similar social problem solving intentions.

Professionally, completion of this proposed research would fulfill the requirements for completion of the doctorate in Sociology at Michigan State University for the researcher. Even more so, the establishment of relationships

among stakeholder organizations that provide intervention services for prostituted women and with key stakeholder organizations in the City in which the agencies reside could provide opportunity for further research in this area.

APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

To participate in the research project entitled

PRECONDITIONS TO INTERORGANIZATONAL COLLATORATION
AMONG AGENCIES THAT PROVIDE INTERVENTION SERVICES FOR
WOMEN IN PROSTITUTION AND RELATED INTEREST GROUPS

I appreciate your willingness to be interviewed for a study of preconditions to interorganizational collaboration. The purpose of the study is to learn about the issues that can motivate or interfere with the initiation of an interorganizational collaborative effort. This interview will take about one hour.

You are free to discontinue the interview at any time.

During this interview you will be asked to state your agency's perspective, not your personal perspective.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. If you feel that you were assigned to this interview responsibility against your better judgment, you may withdraw from this interview. If you feel that you were assigned to this interview responsibility as a requirement of your position with your agency and would prefer not to be interviewed, you may withdraw from this interview. Withdrawal will be held confidential.

If there are any questions that you would like clarified before beginning, please let me know. You are free, of course, to not answer any questions that are objectionable to you. You may choose not to participate at all; you may refuse to participate in certain parts or answer certain questions. You may discontinue the interview at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

Your responses will be recorded by me on the Interview Form. The completed interview forms and analysis data will be kept in a locked file cabinet in my office.

Your privacy and that of your agency or group will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by the law. Your name will not be used. The name and address of your agency will not be used.

As you may know, I am a member of the local Prostitution Round Table. You may be a member, as well. In all likelihood, we will see each other at the Round Table meetings and may engage in conversation together or with other Round Table members. Please rest assured that confidentiality about this interview will be maintained. I will not disclose to any Prostitution Round Table members or any other person the identity of anyone who participates with this research project. Participants in this research project or agency names will not be identifiable in any report of research findings. However, because this research project is occurring is a mid-size city and because the number of agencies and people involved in intervention services for prostituted women is limited, a possibility does exist that, when a local person reads the final research report, she or he may be able to surmise an agency's or interest group's identity.

I appreciate your cooperation with this project. If you have any additional questions about this project, please contact Gayla Jewell at 616-956-0237.

If you have further questions about your involvement in the human subject research, feel free to contact Ashir Kumar, MD, Chair University Committee of Research Involving Human Subjects, (phone: (517) 355-2180, fax: (517) 432-4503, email : <ucrihs@msu.edu>.", or regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.)

I agree to participate in this project under the conditions described above.

_____ _____

Signature Date

APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW FORM

First, I'd like to ask you some background questions about your agency or group.

1. How many years has your agency offered services in your community?

   _____ years

2. What are your agency's mission and goals? (Please provide a document about the mission and goals of your agency/interest group.)

   Mission:

   Goals:

3. On what specific set of clients or target population does your agency focus?

4. How many people did you serve in 2002?

   _____ number served

5. Are your services
   [Check all that apply]

   a. ____Free?
   b. ____Charged?
   c. ____Sliding scale?

6. What percentage of your clients is prostituted women? (Actual %)

   _____ actual % of clients

7. What specific services or programming does your agency offer for women in prostitution? [Check all that apply]

   a. ____Transition housing
   b. ____Drop-in center
   c. ____Financial assistance
   d. ____Substance abuse treatment
   e. ____Legal services
   f. ____Incarceration
   g. ____Health care
   h. ____Job training
   i. ____Other

8. Do you have a strategic plan for services for women in prostitution?
   Yes____ No____

9. How many people are on your governing body or board of directors?

   _____ number on board

10. What type of input or oversight does the governing body or board have over the agency?

11. What types of organizations, agencies, or communities does your governing body or board members represent? [Check all that apply]

    a. ____Criminal Justice
    b. ____Social Service
    c. ____Public/Community Health
    d. ____Organized Religion
    e. ____Media
    f. ____Neighborhood Associations
    g. ____Local Government
    h. ____Business sector
    i. ____Mental/psych services
    j. ____Hospital emergency departments
    k. ____Women previously in prostitution or women in prostitution
    l. ____Other:_____

12. What is the racial/ethnic breakdown of your governing body or board of directors? [indicate number of members who are:]

    a. ____White
    b. ____Black – African American
    c. ____American Indian/Alaska Native
    d. ____Asian
    e. ____Pacific Islander
    f. ____Two or more races
    g. ____Other_____
    h. ____Hispanic

13. How many people does your agency

    a. ____Employ?
    b. ____Have as volunteers?
    c. ____Independent or Temporary Contract?
    d. Are any of these women who are survivors of prostitution?

    Yes__ No__

14. What is/are your main sources of funding or support? Please indicate all that apply.

    a. ____Individual contributions
    b. ____Allocation from a governmental agency
    c. ____Funds from a religious group
    d. ____Funds from a foundation
    e. ____Special events/fund raising
    f. ____Other:_____

15. Are there any "strings" attached to your funding that place constraints on your programming?
    Yes__ No__
    If yes, please describe.

16. Approximately what is your operating budget for the current year?

    $_____

17. Are you accredited?
    Yes__ No__
    If yes,
    a) by whom?

b) If yes, what quality assurance criteria are required by your accrediting agency?

- ☐ Reviewing practices?
- ☐ Outcome measurements?

The next set of questions asks specifically about women in prostitution.

18. What is your agency's view of prostitution?

19. The following four questions deal with the extent of prostitution in your city.

    a. How large was the prostitution issue in 2002?

    - ____Number of women involved
    - ____Number of customers/johns

    b. In 2002, what percentage of prostitutes worked

    ____% on the streets, in parks
    ____% in brothels, parlors
    ____% as off-site call girls/escorts?

    c. In general, why do you think women enter prostitution? (e.g. $$, history of drugs, incest.) (Probe for the top 3.)

    1.
    2.
    3.

    d. In general, at what age do women enter prostitution?

    _____ years of age

    e. What was the average age of the prostituted woman in 2002?

    _____ average age

20. How does this city handle or respond to the issue of prostitution?

21. What effect has prostitution had on the women who walked through the door of your agency in 2002?

(Data gathered from questions 22-28 is to be recorded on the table at the end of the Interview Form.)

22. In regard to intervention services, with which agencies or departments/programs has yours worked in the past 5 years?
    (Probe to list at least 3 agencies with which interactions have been the most frequent.)

23. To which agencies does your agency refer?
    (Probe to list at least 3 agencies with which interactions have been the most frequent.)
    a. Describe one example of a positive relationship/experience with another agency.

24. To which agencies would yours not refer? Why?
    (Probe to list at least 3 agencies of which the lowest opinion is held.)
    a. Describe or give an example of a negative relationship/experience with another agency.

25. From which agencies would yours receive referrals? Why?
    (Probe to list at least 3 agencies with which interactions have been the most frequent.)

26. With which agency(s) has yours worked in an advisory or consultative capacity? (Probe to list at least 3 agencies with which interactions have been the most frequent.)

27. With which agency(s) has yours worked on a joint program? (Probe to list at least 3 agencies with which interactions have been the most frequent.)

28. On a scale of 1-5*, how do you assess the success of your agency's efforts with the agencies you have listed? (Review each agency previously mentioned)
*(Record on Table: 1-very poor; 2-poor, 3-fair; 4-good; 5-excellent)

29. List the three most common barriers to services for women in prostitution in this city?

1.
2.
3.

30. List the three most common gaps in the services for women in prostitution in this city?

1.
2.
3.

31. Who could fill this gap:

a. ____A single agency?
b. ____Several agencies working independently?
c. ____Several agencies working together?

For the next set of questions, please imagine that several agencies would like to get together to establish a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution in this city.

32. What types of projects would be a priority for your agency to work with other agencies to establish a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution?

33. What types of projects would your agency find difficulties working with other agencies to establish a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution?

34. In regard to your agency's mission and services, what would your agency be willing to do to improve or better coordinate services for women in prostitution?

35. If any one agency could take the lead to pull together a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution, which one should it be?

36. Which agencies might be helpful in establishing a collaborative?

37. Which agencies might hinder the establishment of a collaborative?

38. What role would you see your agency taking in a collaborative?
Please indicate all that apply.

a. ____Leadership
b. ____Planning
c. ____$$ Support
d. ____Coordination
e. ____Approval
f. ____Other_____

39. Would you need the support or approval of decision-makers in your city to establish a collaborative to deal with the social problem of prostitution?

Yes__ No__

If yes, who are these decision-makers?

40. Does your agency have access to and/or influence on decision-makers in the following areas? [Check all that apply]

a. ____Criminal Justice
b. ____Social Service
c. ____Public/Community Health
d. ____Organized Religion
e. ____Media
f. ____Neighborhood Associations
g. ____Local Government
h. ____Business sector
i. ____Mental/psych services
j. ____Hospital emergency departments
k. ____Women previously in prostitution or women in prostitution
l. ____Other_____

41. What should be the three major goals of a collaborative? (What would you want from a collaborative?)

1.

2.

3.

42. Do you know of other efforts to create a collaborative to work on the issue of prostitution?

43. Did your agency participate in the Prostitution Round Table?

Yes__ No__

If so, list three of its strengths and three of its weaknesses?

strengths

1.

2.

3.

weaknesses

1.

2.

3.

44. Finally on a scale of 1-5 where, how strongly does your agency believe that

____Prostitution should be decriminalized?
____Prostitution victimizes women?
____Prostitution requires advocacy

(1 – Strongly Agree, 2 – Agree, 3 – No Opinion, 4 – Disagree, 5 – Strongly Disagree)

Bibliography

Aiken, M. & Hage, J. (1968). Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structure. American Sociological Review, (33), 912-930.

Alexander, P. (1987). Prostitutes are being scapegoated on heterosexual AIDS. In Sex Work: Face to Face, edited by L. Bell. Toronto: Seal Press, 173-178.

Astley, W.G. & Fombrun, C.J. (1987). Organizational communities: an ecological perspective. Research in the Sociology of Organizations, (5), 163-185.

Austin, J.D. (2000). The collaboration challenge: How nonprofits and businesses succeed through strategic alliances. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub.

Author. (1998). Needs assessment report of nonprofit organizations located in Kent and Ottawa Counties. Center for Philanthropy at GVSU. http://www.gvsu.edu/philanthropy/reports/main.htm

Barry, K. (1979). Female Sexual Slavery. New York: Basic Books.

Bell, L. editor. (1987). Good Girls/Bad Girls: Feminists and Sex Trade Workers Face to Face. Seattle, WA: Deal Press.

Brandt, A. (1985). No magic bullet. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brock, B. (1989). Prostitutes are scapegoats in the AIDS panic. Resources of Feminist Research, 18(2), 13-17.

Bullough, V. & Bullough, B. (1978). Prostitution: An Illustrated Social History. New York: Crown.

Chapkis, W. (1997). Live Sex Acts: Women Performing Erotic Labor. New York: Routledge.

CPNL – Needs Assessment Report of Nonprofit Organizations. http://gvsu.edu/philanthropy/reports/main.htm

Cullen, J.B., Johnson, J.L, & Sakano, T. (2000). Success through commitment and trust: the soft side of strategic alliance management. Journal of World Business, 35(3), 223-240,

Delecosta, F. & Alexander P. (1987). Sex Work: Writings by Women in the Sex Industry. Pittsburgh, PA: Cleis Press.

Dworkin, A. (1989). Pornography: Men Possessing Women, NY: Plume Books.

Edwards, S.L., & Stern, R.F. (1998). Building and sustaining community partnerships for teen pregnancy prevention: a working paper. Cornerstone Consulting Group, Inc. http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/teenp/teenpreg/teenpreg.htm

Farley, M, & Barkan, H. (1998). Prostitution, violence against women, and posttraumatic stress disorder. Women & Health, 27(3), pp. 37-49.

Farley, M & Kelley, V. (2000.) Prostitution: a critical review of the medical and social sciences literature. Women & Criminal Justice, 11(4), 29-64.

Fleisher, C.S. (1991). Using an agency-based approach to analyze collaborative federated interorganizational relationships. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, *27(1),* 116-130.

Golich, V.L. (1991). A multilateral negotiations challenge: International Management of the communications commons. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, *27(2),* 228-250.

Goswami, S. (2002). Unlocking options for women: a survey of women in Cook County Jail. Publisher: Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, April.

Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. Human Relations, *38,* 911-936.

Gray, B. (1989). Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, B. & Ariss, S.S. (1985). Politics and strategic change across organizational life cycles. Academy of Management Review, 10(4), 707-723.

Gray, B. and Hay, T. (1986). Political limits to interorganizational consensus and change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 22, 95-112.

Gray, B. & Wood, D.J. (1991). Collaborative alliances: Moving from practice to theory. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(1), 3-22.

Greening, D.W. & Gray, B. (1994). Testing a model of organizational response to social and political issues. Academy of Management Journal, 37(3), 467-488.

Gulati, R., & Gargiulo, M. (1998). Where do inter-organizational networks come from? http://www.si.umich.edu/ICOS/gulati3/html

Hamalaine, R.P., Kettunen, E., & Ehtamo, H. (2001). Evaluating a framework for multi-stakeholder decisions support in water resources management. Group Decision and Negotiation, 10, 331-353.

Hulse-Killacky, D. & Killacky, J. (1997). Making coalitions work: Creating a viable environment. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 21, 509-517.

Huxham, C. & Vangen, S. (1996). Working together: Key themes in the management of relationships between public and non-profit organizations. International Journal of Public Sector Management, *9(7),* 5-17.

Jenness, B. (1993). Making It Work: The Prostitutes' Rights Movement n Perspective. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Johnson-George, C & Swap, W.C. (1982). Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(6), 1306-1317.

King, S. (1990). Prostitutes as pariah in the age of AIDS: a content analysis of coverage of women prostitutes in the New York Times and The Washington Post. September 1985-April 1988. Women & Health, 16(3/4), 155-176.

Labiance, G., Brass. & Gray, B. (1998). Social networks and perceptions of intergroup conflict: the role of negative relationships and third parties. Academy of Management Journal, 41(1), 55-67.

Lester, S.W. (2001). Communication and cooperation within newly formed groups: the role of member's perceptions at inception. http://www.iusb.edu/~mwacad/lester~2htm

Logsdon, J.M. (1991). Interests and interdependence in the formation of social problem-solving collaborations. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(1), 23-37.

Lopez, M. (1999). Components essential to the process of developing a multi-organizational collaborative project: Comparison with the development process of the TEAM Nebraska Program. http://www.unomaha.edu/ ~wwwpa/project/lopez.html

Mattessich, P.W. & Monsey, B.R. (2001). Collaboration: What makes it work – a review of research literature on factors influencing successful collaboration. Saint Paul, Minnesota: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpreting. Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 24-55.

McPhee, R.D. & Zaug, P. (2001). Organizational theory, organizational communication, organizational knowledge, and problematic integration. Journal of communication, September 2001, 51(3), 574-591.

Mendonca, J., & Browning, L. (1998). Uncertainty and interaction in organizational collaborations. http://www.utexas.edu/courses/speclass/intern98/mendoncx.html

Nathan, M.L. & Mitroff, I.I. (1991). The use of negotiated order theory as a tool for the analysis and development of an interorganizational field. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(2), 163-180.

Nissan, L.G. & Burlingame, D F. (undated). Collaboration among institutions: Strategies for nonprofit management education programs. The Center of Philanthropy at Indiana University. Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University.

Nokomis Foundation, The. (March 2002.) We Can Do Better: Helping Prostituted Women and Girls in Grand Rapids Make Healthy Choices: A Prostitution Round Table Report to the Community. Grand Rapids, MI: Publisher.

O'Leary, C & Howard, O. (2001). The Prostitution of Women and Girls in Metropolitan Chicago: a Preliminary Prevalence Report. Chicago, IL: Center for Impact Research.

Overall, C. (1992). What's wrong with prostitution? Evaluating sex work. Signs, summer, 705-724.

Pasquero, J. (1991). Supraorganizational collaboration: The Canadian environmental experiment. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(1), 38-64.

Pateman, C. (1983). Defending prostitution: Charges against Ericson. Ethics, 93 April), 561-565.

Peck, G.P., & Hague, C.E. (_____). Turf issues. Ohio State University Fact Sheet. http://ohioline.osu.edu/bc-fact/0012.html

Perlstadt, H., Jackson-Elmoore, C., Freddolino, P.P., & Reed, C. (1998). An overview of citizen participation in health planning: lessons learned from the literature. National Civic Review, 87(4), 347-367.

Perlstadt, H., Jackson-Elmoore, C., Freddolino, P.P., & Reed, C.S. (1999). Citizen participation in health planning: a case study of changing delivery systems. Research in Sociology of Health Care, 16, 75-98.

Pheterson, G., editor. (1989). A Vindication of the Rights of Whores. WA: Seal Press.

Polit, D.F. & Hungler, B.P. (1999). Nursing Research: Principles and Methods. NY: Lippincott.

Potterat, J.J., Woodhouse, D.E., Muth, J.G., & Muth, S.G. (1990). Estimating the prevalence and career longevity of prostitute women. The Journal of Sex Research, 27(2), 233-243.

Phoenix, J. (1999.) Making Sense of Prostitution. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Rhoede, T., Donoghoe, M., Hunter, G., & Stimson, G.V. (1994). HIV prevalence no higher among female drug injectors also involved in prostitution. AIDS Care, 6(3), 269-276.

Richardson, D. (1987). Women and the AIDS Crisis. London: Pandora.

Ring, P.S. (1999). Processes facilitating reliance on trust in interorganizational networks. In The Formation of Inter-Organizational Networks, ed Mark Ebers. New York: Oxford University Press, pp113-145.

Ring, P.S., & Van de Ven, A. (1994). Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. Academy of Management Review, 19: 90-118.

Rosenberg, M.J. (1988). Prostitution and AIDS: A Health Department Priority? American Journal of Public Health, 78(4), 418-423.

Ross, R.S. & Ross, J.R. (1988). Small Groups in Organizational Settings. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Roberts, N.C. & Bradley, R.T. (1991). Stakeholder collaboration and innovation: A study of public policy initiation at the state level. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(2), 209-227.

Scambler, G. Peswani, R., Renton, A., & Scambler, A. (1990). Women prostitutes in the aids era. Sociology of Health & Illness, 12(3), 261-273.

Schoot, E. & Goswami, S. (2001). Prostitution: a violent reality of homelessness. The Facts Behind the Faces: A Policy Paper from the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless. Winter 2001 http://www.chicagohomeless.org/CCHpolicy.pdf.

Selsky, J.W. (1991). Lessons in community development: An activist approach to stimulating interorganizational collaboration. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(1), 91-115.

Sharfman, M.P., Gray, B., & Yan, A. (1991). The context of interorganizational collaboration in the garment industry: An institutional perspective. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(2), 181-208.

Simons, RL, & Whitbeck, LB. (1991). Sexual abuse as a precursor to prostitution and victimization among adolescent and adult homeless women. Journal of Family Issues, 12(3), 361-379.

Thurmond, V.A. (2001). The point of triangulation. Journal of Nursing Scholarship, *33(3),* 253-258.

U.S. Department of Justice. (2000). NVAA 2000 Text, Chapter 10, Sexual Assault. http://www.ojp.gov/ovc/assist/nvaa2000/academy/J-10-SA.htm

Van Alstyne, M. (1997). The state of networking organizations: a survey of three frameworks. Journal of Organizational Computing, 7(3), 4-47.

Westley, F. & Vredenburg, H. (1991). Strategic Bridging: the collaboration between environmentalists and business in the marketing of green products. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(1), 65-90.

Winer, M. & Ray, K. (1994). 5th printing, 2000. Collaboration handbook: Creating, sustaining, and enjoying the journey. St Paul Minnesota: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

Wood, D.J. & Gray, G. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 2(2), 139-1620.