serve as a "dumpground" for problem offenders needing more structure and supervision in their parole programs.

The interests and commitments of the Reality House program were not amenable to the needs of the traditional corrections institutions. To qualify for outside funds, Reality House depended on a steady referral flow from the Division of Corrections, the Board of Probation and Parole, and the courts. Yet, in accordance with their organizational commitments to first-time juvenile offenders and the importance of establishing immediate legitimacy in the criminal justice network and the local community, Reality House officials continually attempted to control and define the flow of referrals into the organization to ensure the success of their innovative programs. The Board and Corrections administrators were very critical of the program requirements and selection criteria of Reality House. Reality House administrators were equally critical of the internal operations of these two agencies and continually acted to accentuate the discontinuity between their programs and those of conventional criminal justice institutions and remain independent of the Board of Probation and Parole and the Division of Corrections.

The MMCCJ matching funds and Reality House's commitment for a community-based treatment and rehabilitation facility forged a pattern of tensions and inconsistency with the state-wide Board of Probation and Parole and Division of Corrections. The LEAA matching funds administered by MMCCJ were intended to support the emergence of innovative programs and organizations dealing with criminal justice and rehabilitation with the local community eventually absorbing the financial burden. The MMCCJ funds which supplied 50%
of Reality House's annual budget were provided with the stipulation that Reality House would serve offenders only from Region III of Missouri. This geographical restriction has created substantial tension and strain between the correctional institutions and Reality House from 1970 to the present. The majority of parolees handled by the correctional institutions come from the metropolitan areas with very few deriving from Region III of Missouri. Thus, the organizational commitments of Reality House are inconsistent with the needs and interests of the central and institutional offices of the Board of Probation and Parole and the Division of Corrections not only in their general program parameters for first-time juvenile offenders but also in their geographical limitations.

As revealed in these brief descriptions, the Mid-Missouri criminal justice network is characterized by an overlaid pattern of contradiction in the organizational fabric derived largely from the social production of organizational elite and the political and economic demands from the larger society. From 1970 to the present, organizational elite have attempted to direct and contain certain developments in the criminal justice environment. Their adaptations to these changing and many times conflicting political and economic demands have forged patterns of contradiction within the traditional correctional institutions not only between ongoing programs but also between certain factions and departments entering the organization in different historical contexts. The most significant pattern of structural contradiction in the Mid-Missouri criminal justice network is embedded in the divergent organizational commitments and ongoing programs of Reality House and the Board of Probation and Parole and
the Division of Corrections. The emergence of MMCCJ and other political and economic developments in the criminal justice environment plus the pre-existing complex of interests and commitments of organizational elite helped forge and maintain an overlaid pattern of contradiction onto the pre-existing organizational fabric of the criminal justice network—a pattern of contradiction which has pervaded the unfolding of interorganizational events in the Mid-Missouri criminal justice network from 1970 to the present.
CHAPTER XI
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In conventional interorganizational analysis, the organization and interorganizational network are conceived as emergent entities which form a relatively stable system of action underlying the day to day activities of individual actors. The individual actors in the network are visualized as acquiring the orientations and interests inherent in their organizational positions within the interorganizational field embodying the relatively well-defined domains, ideologies, and technologies of their respective organizations. The formal organization is treated in the systemic imagery as a rational, coherent system of action surrounded by a boundary and existing in an environment. Organizations act in the sense that social action derives from a certain set of social relationships which appear to be independent of sentiments, interests, and general qualities of organizational participants. Thus, in understanding the changing modes of coordination in the network, the systemic researcher acquires an exchange approach and centers on the perceptions and evaluations of organizational participants regarding the domains, ideologies, and work performance of other organizations in the network and patterns of dependency which are inherent in the network division of labor and formal environmental linkages. The conventional interorganizational analyst disregards the unique social historical context and sifts through the morass of social production
sequences of individual participants and isolates and examines abstracted value and sentiment patterns and political and economic structures of the network. In viewing interorganizational reality through the systems transparency, the researcher reveals to himself a relatively stable interorganizational reality reflecting the morphological features of the formal network of organizations.

As expressed in the review of the literature, the systems approach to interorganizational relations poses a decided structural bias which has largely derived from trends in organizational and organization-environment literature. The progression to larger units of analysis including the organization and interorganizational network has been accompanied by an increasing orientation away from the emphasis on the individual and small group producing a discontinuity with the observations and propositions of a multitude of interactionist theorists dealing with the informal and dynamic aspects of organizational life.

In general, the penetration and comprehension of the conventional systems approach to interorganizational relations provided only a fragmentary understanding of the shifting modes of coordination and patterns of power and domination among organizations in the Mid-Missouri criminal justice network. In this analysis, issues of domain consensus and work evaluation reflected to some degree the basic contradiction between Reality House and the Division of Corrections and the Board of Probation and Parole over referral flow. However, the conceptualization and assessment of ideological and technological consensus proved to be a futile exercise and added very little to the understanding of interorganizational events. The resource
dependence approach in systems analysis also provided only a frag-
mentary picture of the criminal justice network. The notions of
centrality and environmental linkages basic to the systems framework
were unable to capture the rich complexity of overlapping memberships
and personal loyalties and friendships which were central to the
evolving power relationships in the network.

The application of a dialectical view to interorganizational
relations poses a significant challenge to the succession of rational
and systemic theories and positivist methods currently dominant
in the field. The dialectical approach to organizational analysis
is an attempt to express the duality of social life and to bridge
the growing discontinuity between the interactionist and structural
traditions by relating the creative potentials of participants with
the organizational structures of their own creation. As with the
interactionist tradition, the dialectical approach is essentially
a processual perspective taking its departure from the production and
reproduction of organizational realities by individual participants.
The dialectical approach is also a frame of reference which reveals
the shifting array of organizational structures constraining and
delimiting individual interactants.

In contrast to the conventional systemic conceptualization,
the brief historical sketches under the four major propositions
revealed the mid-Missouri Criminal Justice network as a heterogeneous
and dynamic field of action. The shifting modes of exchange between
Reality House, the courts, the Division of Corrections, and the
Board of Probation and Parole presented a bewildering mosaic of
individual victories and defeats and ingenious subterranean strategies of elite as they collaborated or broke with other participants and mobilized intricate interpersonal resource networks attempting to protect and enhance themselves and to direct and contain external developments threatening parts of the organizational fabric essential to their interests. The various modes of coordination also reflected a basic underlying structural contradiction over the definition and control of referral flow which was submerged and renewed by inter-organizational participants as they pursued their own interests and organizational commitments. Finally, the patterns of interorganizational interaction were significantly affected by the environmental political and economic developments which penetrated the criminal justice network and provided the raw materials through which participants continually refashioned and renewed the patterns of power and dominance. In all, the dialectical analysis of the mid-Missouri Criminal Justice network revealed the interorganizational network as shifting array of organizational commitments and ongoing programs deriving from past sequences of social production enacted and reconstructed by organizational elites inside and external to the network pursuing their own interests and commitments in an ambiguous and heterogeneous field of action.

The mid-Missouri Criminal Justice network as it was encountered from 1970 to the present presented a certain duality which could only be expressed in dialectical terms juxtaposing the deterministic logic of structural analysis and the creative, interpretive aspects of social life revealed by the interactionists. As expressed in the first three propositions, the interorganizational network to some
degree is an ambiguous and heterogeneous field of action providing an arena for reconstruction and negotiation by organizational elite as they mobilize interpersonal resource networks in the pursuit of their own interests and commitments and in so doing continually reach out for alternative structural arrangements. Yet, as discussed in the fourth proposition, underlying certain reoccurring social production sequences are basic structural contradictions between ongoing programs and complexes of interests and commitments in the field which give rise to certain characteristic tensions and antagonisms occasioning continual mobilization and negotiation. Also certain obdurate realities in the environment present certain dilemmas and divergent demands to organizational participants and delimit and direct the social production of organizational elite in the network.

The dialectical analysis of the Mid-Missouri criminal justice network served to identify five major foci of investigation which were crucial for understanding the unfolding of interorganizational events from 1970 to the present: (1) ambiguity, (2) organizational elite, (3) power and domination, (4) contradiction and social production, and (5) political and economic aspects of the environment. Application of these five concepts and a demonstration of their utility in the present research has significant implications for interorganization theory and research. The present research has demonstrated that the interorganizational reality portrayed in Mid-Missouri criminal justice network is vague, general, and dynamic as opposed to the systems notion of it as well defined and stable and that it lends itself to continual reconstruction
and negotiation. It has exemplified the utility of the concept as a processual view of interorganizational reality. The present research has also demonstrated that the notion of organizational elite has a better analytical leverage in delineating the production and reproduction of interorganizational reality. The present work has shown that the notion of social production by organizational members (the rank and file organizational members) is devoid of that analytical leverage and is contradictory to the notion of asymmetrical relations of power and dominance. It has illustrated that organizational elite who have access to power and resources and who have the potential to mobilize such resources through their interlocking networks of friendships and associations have "the bigger stick" and therefore have "the better chance of imposing" their definitions (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). The present research has further demonstrated that the interorganizational situation is ridden with contradictory interests, paradigm commitments, and sequences of individual acts that render such situations constantly problematic. Thus it has proven the utility of a dialectical perspective and the futility of conventional organization theories in analyzing the interorganizational events.

As revealed in the analysis of the four major propositions, the dialectical analysis of the shifting modes of exchange within the criminal justice network necessitated the historical reconstruction of interorganizational events from 1970 to the present involving the intimate familiarity with the social production of organizational elite accompanied by the penetrance and comprehension of the upward spiral of existential constraints including the organizational
contexts, the interorganizational network, and political and economic structures in the environment.

As implied in the above assessments, interorganizational researchers as well as their organizational predecessors must redefine and reevaluate the systems perspective in organizational analysis and its accompanying comparative-survey methodology which has become virtually paradigmatic in the field. Organizational analysts must reintegrate the wealth of observations and propositions of the interactionist tradition and post industrial theorists, and become mired to a certain degree in the complexities and contingencies of the organizational elite. Organizational theorists as well as general sociologists must commit themselves to the task of articulating the creative potentials of individuals with the existential constraints of social life reflecting the characteristic duality of social organization. The sociological enterprise must again become grounded in the complex interrelationship between man and the institutions of his own creation.
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