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The systematic collection of performance evaluation data by this method calls for objective reporting and minimizes subjective judgment. It can be utilized for many personnel functions such as the counseling, promotion, and reassignment of personnel; the determination of training needs; and as a criterion for personnel research.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to develop forced-choice performance reports which could be utilized for the dual functions of salary adjustment and promotion, and as a counseling tool for the agents and chairmen of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Two performance reports, each including a level and a profile type of forced-choice scale, were developed. The level sections of the reports were evaluated in terms of the criteria of biasability, reliability, and validity to determine their utility for administrative purposes. The research design included self-ratings as well as supervisory ratings for both agents and chairmen. Additionally the chairmen in each of the county offices described the agents under their direction. The criteria used to validate the reports were peer nominations and supervisory paired comparison ratings.

Background of the Study

The Ohio Extension Guide, a manual of policies, procedures, and regulations of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture and Home Economics, The Ohio State University, outlines basic factors involved in Extension organization. Among those listed, the following relate to the personnel program:

1. A systematic method of recruiting and selecting prospective candidates for extension positions is desirable.
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PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS

Name of Agent___________________________ District____________ Date______
Name of Describer_____________________ Title________________

The Professional Performance Report for County Extension Agents utilizes a new approach in which emphasis is placed on describing rather than evaluating performance. The Report is applicable only to county Extension agents and many of the members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service contributed greatly to the research required for its development.

The principle involved in completing the Report is that the Describer, based on observation and knowledge of the agent, selects from the sets of descriptive phrases provided in order to appraise the agent's over-all performance. In a similar way, the agent's relative assets in two major performance areas are determined.

The Performance Report contains two sections as follows:

Section I consisting of 30 sets of 4 descriptive phrases or statements each.

Section II consisting of 15 sets of 2 descriptive phrases or statements each.

Specific directions are provided in each section.

I. Descriptive Level Section

The purpose of this section is to appraise the over-all performance of the County Extension Agent by means of your choosing, in each of the 30 sets of 4 statements, the 2 phrases which are most like or best describe the agent.

Indicate your choices by circling the letters preceding the 2 phrases selected. All the phrases in any given set are applicable in some degree to the agent. Hence, select in each of the 30 sets the 2 phrases best describing the agent.

Illustrative Set of 4 Phrases

a. Believes the Extension job is important.

b. Gives high priority to monthly reports.

c. Has developed a procedure for program evaluation.

d. Source of encouragement to other agents.
Although all 4 phrases in the illustrative set well apply, "a" and "d" have been circled because the phrases, "Believes the Extension job is important" and "Source of encouragement to other agents" are considered as most like or best describing the agent.

There are listed below 30 sets of 4 phrases each. In accordance with the above instructions, circle the letters preceding the 2 phrases in each set, which best describe the agent you are considering.

1

a. Has patience in trying situations.
b. Never puts a person off in securing information on a particular problem.
c. Maintains high standards of performance.
d. Plans county programs to meet future needs.

2

a. Feels a real obligation to the people in the county.
b. Has time for visitors in the office.
c. Participates in a professional organization for county Extension agents.
d. Takes pride in the county.

3

a. Attends in-service training meetings in accordance with job knowledge needs.
b. Never criticizes co-workers to other people.
c. Takes part in civic committees as time and energy allows.
d. Uses specialists as resource persons for meetings as needed.

4

a. Announces dates of events well in advance.
b. Conducts educational programs with help of committees.
c. Provides lay people the opportunity to develop leadership.
d. Well informed of the latest research findings in the fields of agriculture and home economics.

5

a. Deeply interested in people.
b. Gives credit to others for their progress.
c. Has a keen interest in keeping abreast of the times.
d. Loyal to co-workers.
a. Organizes committees with the help of good local leaders.
b. Personal problems can be expressed to county agent in confidence.
c. Provides information to the public on results accomplished.
d. Teaching based on present and future needs of families of the county.

7
a. Aware of what is happening in civic affairs of the county.
b. Even tempered in most situations.
c. Is acquainted with school officials in the county.
d. Willing to see others get credit for results.

8
a. A "team" member rather than a "star player".
b. Considerate of all members of the county staff.
c. Plans an effective variety of activities through committees.
d. Presentations at meetings are well planned.

9
a. Always has time to talk over a problem.
b. Has a sense of humor.
c. Stands by own convictions.
d. Uses terminology appropriate to the particular audience.

10
a. Builds friendships for Extension across the county.
b. Explains things clearly to clientele.
c. Never shows any outward sign of "flying off the handle".
d. Not concerned about getting major share of credit for activities.

11
a. A truly cooperative Extension person.
b. Carries through on program responsibilities.
c. Possesses wide interests.
d. Tries to be well informed on all phases of the Extension program.

12
a. Has confidence in the people of the county.
b. Has respect for other people's feelings.
c. Keeps current in subject matter knowledge.
d. Professional in conduct.
a. Does not become discouraged easily.
b. Informs secretary as to location when out of office.
c. Makes a written plan of work annually which describes the problems in the county.
d. Uses democratic leadership unless situation demands deviation from it.

14

a. Able to adjust programs to the needs of the clientele.
b. Offers opinions only after getting all the details of the situation.
c. Uses recommendations of advisory committee to put new programs into effect.
d. Utilizers appropriate methods in educational programs for each particular audience involved.

15

a. Active in community activities.
b. Has a planned calendar of activities.
c. Is dependable in all phases of work.
d. Uses tact when teaching.

16

a. Concepts of program development are broad and flexible.
b. Does an excellent job of observing and reporting progress toward stated program goals.
c. Has an appreciation for the ability of others.
d. Skillful in meeting demands of pressure groups.

17

a. Has a workable knowledge of technical subject matter.
b. Has positive attitude toward serving the people.
c. Is a conscientious worker.
d. Thoroughly interested in the work.

18

a. Has continuous desire to do the best possible job.
b. Never breaks an appointment unless absolutely necessary.
c. Stands firmly on the principle of a professional code.
d. Well liked by non-professional people.

19

a. Explains the reasons when giving recommendations on various practices.
b. Has an excellent vocabulary.
c. Interested in improving own professional ability.
d. Plans meeting dates on a scheduled basis.
20
a. Develops Extension activities with special interest groups.
b. Maintains a good disposition even under adverse conditions.
c. Thoroughly familiar with the major problems existing in the communities.
d. Works well with lay groups.

21
a. Able to "show how" without belittling the intelligence of others.
b. Can apply technical knowledge to practical situations.
c. Has an appreciation for the rights of others.
d. Well thought of by most people in the county.

22
a. Always expresses a friendly greeting upon meeting someone.
b. Believes in the philosophy and objectives of Extension.
c. Enjoys working with people.
d. Has a high degree of integrity.

23
a. Has the respect of the people in the community.
b. Makes people feel at ease.
c. Tries to find solution to problems if not known.
d. Willing to work overtime when necessary.

24
a. Can be counted on to offer suggestions on things that might work.
b. Has a long range view of Extension program needs.
c. Is aggressive when the need arises.
d. Programs are well publicized.

25
a. Does not consider self above clientele.
b. Does not give out false or misleading information.
c. Interested in others as persons.
d. Never intentionally embarrasses people.

26
a. Emphasizes public relations with county officials.
b. Gets cooperation because he cooperates.
c. Respected in the county as a leader in the field.
d. Willing to assist associates when it is needed.
a. Accepts constructive criticism of the program.
b. Follows good teaching practices.
c. Has opinions backed by research and current trends.
d. Has a sound philosophy of life that applies to every situation.

a. Does an excellent job in stimulating group discussion.
b. Has a well organized program.
c. Knows needs and problems of the people in the county.
d. Makes points well understood without lengthy elaboration.

a. Able to talk with every one regardless of their position.
b. Encourages young people to take advantage of additional educational opportunities.
c. Is a genial person with a ready smile.
d. Possesses knowledge in subject matter areas appropriate to assignment.

a. Manages always to be cheerful.
b. Sufficiently reserved in approach to gain the respect of all.
c. Supports other organizations in the county.
d. Tolerant of other person's point of view.

Now that you have completed the above sets of phrases, please review them to be sure that you have circled 2 and only 2 letters in each of the 30 sets.
II. Descriptive Ranking Section

The purpose of this section is to appraise the agent's relative performance in two areas.

It is composed of 15 sets of two phrases each. For each set, rank each statement "1" or "2" by circling the appropriate number following the phrase. Circle the "1" for the phrase which first best describes and the "2" for the phrase which second best describes the agent. Each set of phrases is independent of the others and hence consider only the 2 phrases in each set for ranking purposes.

Illustrative Set of 2 Phrases

a. Able to organize effective committees. 1 2

b. Maintains good relations with personnel of other agencies. 1 2

In the illustrative set, the phrase, "Maintains good relations with personnel of other agencies" is considered as first best describing the agent and hence the "1" is circled. The "2" is circled for the phrase, "Able to organize effective committees" because it second best describes the agent.

There are listed below 15 sets of 2 phrases each. Considering each set of phrases independently, circle the "1" for the phrase which first best describes the agent and the "2" for the phrase which second best describes the agent.

1

a. Does own critical thinking. 1 2
b. Uses tact in dealing with people 1 2

2

a. Discusses problems with co-workers. 1 2
b. Does not become bogged down in unnecessary details. 1 2

3

a. Demonstrates analytical ability in solving problems. 1 2
b. Seeks counsel and guidance of co-workers. 1 2

4

a. Makes deliberate decisions based upon facts and the situation. 1 2
b. Well thought of by co-workers. 1 2

5

a. Has ability to teach technical knowledge. 1 2
b. Values other people's experience or views on alternative solutions. 1 2
a. Able to work cooperatively with all types of clientele.  
   b. Well informed of available resources on many different subjects.

7
a. Has a good understanding of human relations.  
   b. Uses a variety of visual aids in teaching.

8
a. Has an effective way of making technical information apply to the job at hand.  
   b. Respects others opinions concerning improvements.

9
a. Applies the problem solving method to program development.  
   b. Informs co-workers of what he is doing.

10
a. Has an educational program designed to meet the needs of all people.  
   b. Is the kind of person you could go to with problems.

11
a. Maintains good relations with county officials.  
   b. Uses demonstrations as one method of teaching.

12
a. Adjusts teaching methods to the group.  
   b. Gives an individual a sense of confidence.

13
a. Considers other people's ideas before arriving at a decision.  
   b. Keeps people informed through newspaper and other mass media.

14
a. Cooperates with co-workers.  
   b. Never plans more than can be done effectively.

15
a. Helps other staff members with problems.  
   b. Possess ability in summarizing group consensus to reach conclusions.

Now that you have completed the above sets of phrases, please review them to be sure that you have included a "1" and a "2" in each of the 15 sets.
The Professional Performance Report for County Extension Agent, Chairmen utilizes a new approach in which emphasis is placed on describing rather than evaluating performance. The Report is applicable only to Chairmen and many of the members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service contributed greatly to the research required for its development.

The principle involved in completing the report is that the Describer, based on his observation and knowledge of the Chairman, selects from the sets of descriptive phrases provided in order to appraise the over-all chairmanship performance. In a similar way, the Chairman's relative assets in three major performance areas are determined.

The Performance Report contains two sections as follows:

Section I consisting of 25 sets of 4 descriptive phrases each.

Section II consisting of 12 sets of 3 descriptive phrases each.

Specific directions are provided in each section.

I. Descriptive Level Section

The purpose of this section is to appraise the over-all performance of the chairman by means of your choosing, in each of the 25 sets of 4 statements, the 2 phrases which are most like and best describe the chairman.

Indicate your choices by circling the letters preceding the 2 phrases selected. All the phrases in any given set are applicable in some degree to the chairman. Hence, select in each of the 25 sets, the 2 phrases best describing the chairman.

Illustrative Set of 4 Phrases

(a) Allows co-workers to be in the "know" on administrative matters.

(b) Holds county Extension office conferences with staff on a weekly basis.

(c) Offers assistance and suggestions as needed to other agents.

(d) Takes time to orient and train new agents.
Although all 4 phrases in the illustrative set apply, "a" and "c" have been circled because the phrase "Allows co-workers to be in the know on administrative matters" and "Offers assistance and suggestions as needed to the agents" are considered as most like or best describing the chairman.

There are listed below 25 sets of 4 phrases each. In accordance with the above instructions, circle the 2 phrases in each set, which best describe the chairman you are considering.

1
   a. Accepts the responsibility for all the programs evolving from the county Extension office.
   b. Provides opportunities for other staff members to express their views.
   c. Schedules periodic meetings with the Extension Advisory Committee.
   d. Uses only constructive criticism.

2
   b. Requests sufficient funds to provide for adequate office equipment.
   c. Sees that the office has necessary equipment and supplies.
   d. Works cooperatively with state staff members.

3
   a. Able to get along well with co-workers.
   b. Presents budget to the County Extension Advisory Committee for approval.
   c. Sets an example as an efficient worker.
   d. Takes the leadership in developing activities in cooperation with private business and other agencies.

4
   a. Always conducts himself in a manner that creates a favorable impression of the Extension Service.
   b. Discusses problems, which cannot be handled locally, with the district supervisor.
   c. Holds county Extension office conferences with staff at least once a week.
   d. Supports the philosophy of the use of lay leaders in developing and carrying out the county program.

5
   a. Acts as a purchasing agent.
   b. Confers with the district Extension supervisor regarding personnel changes.
   c. Knows population and employment trends of the county.
   d. Understands the interrelationships between the Extension Service and related agencies.
2. A systematic method of placement of extension personnel is desirable.

3. A uniform and fair system of evaluation of personnel is desirable.

4. An adequate pattern for formal professional improvement of extension is desirable (52).

The Ohio Extension Service has used some type of performance evaluation form for the past fifteen years or more. The initial form was a trait-intensity scale developed for counseling purposes only and included items relating to the broad areas of program development, working relations, and personal qualifications. In 1952 the form was modified slightly in that the intensity scale for each item was changed from a ten to a six point scale. Additionally, an over-all numerical score was obtained and used as one of the criteria for salary adjustment. When the form was utilized for the dual purposes of salary adjustment and counseling, its usefulness as a counseling tool was considerably decreased. Moreover a study by Capener (7) in 1957 showed that the form was highly subject to the effects of rater leniency in that a disproportionately high percentage of the personnel were rated at the high end of the scale. In addition, neither the reliability of the form nor its validity with an external criterion had ever been established.

In 1960 the Department Director, Mr. W. B. Wood; Assistant Director, Personnel, Mr. E. L. Kirby, and Assistant Director, Research and Training, Dr. Robert W. McCormick, requested the consulting services of Professor Robert J. Wherry, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University, in order to decide whether to revise this form (Appendix A) or to develop a new evaluation approach. Dr. Wherry served as a resource
6
a. Does a good job of relating the total county program to the needs and interests of the people.
b. Is personally aware of the status of all county Extension programs.
c. Keeps the general public informed of Extension programs by all available means.
d. Maintains a schedule of county agent and secretarial vacation plans.

7
a. Evaluates the results of educational programs and activities.
b. Inspires cooperative working relationships among all staff members.
c. Integrates the total Extension program for the county.
d. Reviews reports of progress in all program areas.

8
a. Makes decisions on a democratic basis.
b. Develops total County Extension program in keeping with the policies of the Cooperative Extension Service.
c. Has positive attitude toward program planning and development process.
d. Presents facts and situation as to the future trends or needs of Extension for the county.

9
a. Cooperates with Chamber of Commerce and other civic groups in planning county improvement.
b. Permits each agent to operate with freedom of action.
c. Respected by both professional and lay persons.
d. Works with the County Extension Advisory Committee in determining the county Extension policies.

10
a. Does not show partiality to any phase of the total county Extension program.
b. Keeps the district supervisor informed about the progress of the county program.
c. Takes the lead in program planning at the county Extension level.
d. Works cooperatively with county staff members.

11
a. Distributes secretarial workload so as to have effective office operations.
b. Encourages co-workers to take advantage of study opportunities.
c. Involves other staff members in decision making on policy matters.
d. Provides a climate for the mutual exchange of information by county staff members in program matters.
a. Keeps district supervisor informed as to the development of the budget request.
b. Maintains good relations with other state agencies.
c. Maintains proper working relationships with other agencies and organizations.
d. Makes needed contacts for local support on state and national Extension budgets.

13

a. Coordinates the total Extension program in the county.
b. Encourages the increased professional improvement of other county agents.
c. Keeps problems program centered rather than people centered.
d. Keeps the County Extension Advisory Committee adequately informed regarding appropriate matters.

14

a. Maintains good channels of communication with the lay people in the county.
b. Provides for and maintains a business-like office.
c. Requests sufficient funds to provide for adequate demonstrational materials for all phases of the program.
d. Responsible for developing the budget but also involves co-workers - County Extension Advisory Committee.

15

a. Discusses personnel problems with the district supervisor.
b. Effectively presents budget request to the Board of County Commissioners.
c. Knows the socio-economic conditions in the county.
d. Maintains good public relations.

16

a. Acquaints the people of the county with the role of the Extension Service as a part of The Ohio State University.
b. Assumes responsibility for over-all leadership of the county staff.
c. Maintains effective relations with the church groups in the county.
d. Participates in Farm City Week activities.

17

a. Assumes leadership for the orientation and training of incoming secretarial staff.
b. Has an understanding of all phases of the Extension program.
c. Is a leader rather than a driver.
d. Makes recommendations for appointments and promotions of the Extension agents in the county.
a. Attends meetings of county officials when invited.
b. Is continually conscious of Extension prestige or goodwill.
c. Is personally acquainted with the state and national legislators who reside in the county.
d. Maintains good relations with members of the supervisory staff.

19

a. Extremely interested in developing a unified county Extension program.
b. Establishes personal and professional standards other county Extension agents should follow.
c. Establishes regular routine for efficient office management.
d. Keeps the district supervisor informed of the contributions of the individual staff members.

20

a. Develops effective educational programs.
b. Is diplomatic in giving criticism.
c. Keeps other agents informed on policy matters.
d. Uses Extension specialists as resource persons in developing a total integrated county program.

21

a. Assumes over-all leadership for all phases of the county Extension program.
b. Assumes responsibility for the training of new agents with the cooperation of the other agents.
c. Prepares reports in a professional manner.
d. Sets an example in working with people.

22

a. Calls staff conferences regularly.
b. Has an effective procedure for receiving office telephone calls.
c. Permits co-workers to express themselves fully.
d. Secures sufficient county budget to operate an efficient office.

23

a. Develops and maintains an effective County Extension Advisory Committee which meets regularly.
b. Plans for the evaluation of county Extension programs.
c. Takes initiative for finding satisfactory solutions for problems that develop with programs of staff members.
d. Uses full talents of the county staff in planning and putting into effect the total program.
a. Coordinates public relations activities of other county staff members.
b. Determines objectives for the Extension educational program in the county with the County Extension Advisory Committee and other staff members.
c. Maintains a balanced Extension program.
d. Provides by means of office conferences a way of evaluating completed activities.

25

a. Directs the secretarial staff.
b. Encourages other county staff members to participate in public relations activities.
c. Is willing to counsel on personnel matters within the county Extension office.
d. Provides for best physical office arrangement within space provided.

Now that you have completed the above sets of phrases, please review them to be sure that you have circled 2 and only 2 letters in each of the 25 sets.
II. Descriptive Ranking Section

The purpose of this section is to appraise the chairmen's relative performance in three areas.

It is composed of 12 sets of 3 phrases each. For each set, rank each statement "1" or "2" or "3" by circling the appropriate number following the phrase. Circle the "1" for the phrase which best describes or is most like the chairman, the "2" for the phrase which is second most like him and the "3" for the phrase third most like him. Each set of phrases is independent of the others and hence consider only the 3 phrases in each set for ranking purposes.

Illustrative Set of 3 Phrases

a. Assists other agents in setting objectives and establishing programs. 1 2 3
b. Has an effective filing system for all phases of the program. 1 2 3
c. Makes fullest possible use of lay leaders in carrying out the Extension program. 1 2 3

In the illustrative set the phrase, "Makes fullest possible use of lay leaders in carrying out the County Extension program" was considered as most like the chairman and hence the "1" is circled. The "2" is circled for the phrase, "Assists other agents in setting objectives and establishing programs" because it is second most like him and the statement "Has an effective filing system for all phases of the program" has the "3" circled following it because it is third most like him.

There are listed below 12 sets of 3 phrases each. Considering each set of phrases independently, circle the "1" for the phrase which best describes the chairman, the "2" for the phrase which second best describes him and the "3" for the phrase which third best describes him.

1

a. Counsels with other staff members as the need arises. 1 2 3
b. Develops and maintains an efficient office with pleasant working relations. 1 2 3
c. Works with The County Extension Advisory Committee to develop long-time objectives for the county Extension program. 1 2 3

2

a. Keeps a complete accounting record of expenditures of county budget funds. 1 2 3
b. Sees that all staff members receive proper recognition for their work. 1 2 3
c. Submits a digest of the annual report of results to county commissioners and state legislative representatives. 1 2 3
3

a. Encourages other agents to participate in decisions affecting the total county Extension program. 1 2 3
b. Evidences administrative ability in directing the affairs of the Extension office. 1 2 3
c. Makes effective use of Extension resources in the county. 1 2 3

4

a. Assists other county Extension agents with special events in their respective program areas. 1 2 3
b. Keeps up-to-date on business procedures. 1 2 3
c. Uses tours and exhibits to acquaint the public with the Extension Service. 1 2 3

5

a. Has in operation effective office procedures. 1 2 3
b. Keeps the district supervisor adequately informed concerning appropriate county Extension matters. 1 2 3
c. Spends time in establishing public relations with other organizations. 1 2 3

6

a. Maintains good working relationships with all organized groups. 1 2 3
b. Recognizes the professional capabilities of co-workers. 1 2 3
c. Takes the leadership in organizing work on reports. 1 2 3

7

a. Has effective procedures for receiving office visitors. 1 2 3
b. Interested in the personal and professional welfare of the county staff. 1 2 3
c. Is proficient in public relations for the county Extension program. 1 2 3

8

a. Assumes leadership with the County Extension Advisory Committee yet involves other agents. 1 2 3
b. Has an adequate understanding of office management. 1 2 3
c. Urges lay leaders to accept responsibility for program planning and development. 1 2 3
9
a. Makes a point of complimenting co-workers for a job well done.  
   1 2 3
b. Provides for and maintains a business-like office.  
   1 2 3
c. Uses every opportunity to interpret Extension to the public.  
   1 2 3

10
a. Believes in informal administrative procedure.  
   1 2 3
b. Procures optimum office space for effective operations.  
   1 2 3
c. Represents the Extension Service at most county events.  
   1 2 3

11
a. Assumes primary responsibility for the public relations program in the county.  
   1 2 3
b. Keeps adequate financial records of non-appropriated funds.  
   1 2 3
c. Sometimes attends 4-H and Home Economics meetings.  
   1 2 3

12
a. Applies accepted management principles in his role as office manager.  
   1 2 3
b. Assumes responsibility for the orientation and training of new Extension agents in the county.  
   1 2 3
c. Has developed a strong representative County Extension Advisory Committee.  
   1 2 3

Now that you have completed the above sets of phrases, please review them to be sure that you have circled a "1," a "2" and a "3" in each of the 12 sets.
APPENDIX C

Requests for Essays Regarding
Agents and Chairmen
May 5, 1960

To: All County Extension Agents

Subject: Revision of Professional Performance Evaluation and Development Procedure

Dear Extension Agents:

The Ohio Extension Service for a number of years has been recognized by other state extension services as having one of the best systems for evaluation of staff members. An organization of our size needs a forward-looking constructive system to objectively evaluate the performance of staff members.

Our present system of evaluation has many commendable features, and at the same time, has its shortcomings. The possibility of the presence of conscious or unconscious bias on the part of the evaluators, and the need to have uniformity of rating throughout the state are two current problems, we are told.

The Administrative and Supervisory Staff, and a committee including county and specialists staff representatives have recently participated in a series of four seminars. Dr. R. J. Wherry, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, served as resource person for the seminars. They reviewed the possibilities of different kinds of personnel evaluation methods and procedures in these seminars.

Much has been written on the subject of personnel evaluation, but none of the writers attempt to tell, "What is a Good County Extension Agent." If we are to make any changes in our present system of evaluation, we need your ideas and cooperation. The county Extension Agents can render a real service in assisting our committee to build a fair and just scale in an evaluation system. Please review the following two pages and forward your suggestions to us as suggested.

Very truly yours,

W. B. Wood, Director
WHAT IS A GOOD COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT?

We all have an image or concept of what we think a good County Extension Agent should be like. We want you to think about the BEST County Extension Agent you have ever known. Now that you have an agent in mind, think how you might describe in a couple paragraphs the things he or she did that made him or the BEST.

The following example is, in part, what a member of the County Extension Staff might have said when asked to describe the best teacher he or she ever had in school.

Example:

The teacher that was best was a real good guy and was well liked by students, fellow teachers, and parents — he talked and explained things so that you could understand him — he did a good job of teaching. He treated everyone equal — he had regular office hours and you felt free to discuss your problems and gripes with him. He never lost his temper but he didn't take any 'back-talk' or undue criticism from anybody. He didn't talk down to us. His lessons always appeared to be well planned — he encouraged us to seek higher educational levels beyond high school — he was thoroughly interested in his work -- etc., etc.

Now that you have an idea of the thing we want, please write on the following page at least two paragraphs about the Best County Extension Agent you have ever known and describe his behavior that made him best. Tell specifically what he did and how he performed his job.

It is necessary that every possible detail concerning this person be included. You can feel free to use any kind of description items you want. Don't try to develop an opinion as to the "Ideal", but describe this agent you have known at one time or another. DO NOT NAME THE EXTENSION AGENT BEING DESCRIBED.

Your description is not to be reviewed with anyone.

Your description report will be destroyed as soon as the Committee has no further use for them.
person for a series of four seminars for the administrative and supervisory staff, and representatives of the county and specialist staffs. The seminars focused on different kinds of personnel evaluation methods and procedures. Following the seminars, the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service personnel chose the forced-choice methodology for future organizational performance evaluation reports and decided to initially develop reports for the position of county Extension agent and the function of county Extension agent, chairman.

**Nature and Structure of the Organization**

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is an educational governmental agency which functions as an integral part of The Ohio State University as well as being an extension on the state level of the United States Department of Agriculture. The primary aim of the Cooperative Extension Service as stated in the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 is "to aid in diffusing among people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage application of the same" (52).

The philosophy of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is "to develop an educational program in agriculture and home economics that contributes to the general welfare of urban and rural people in Ohio" (52). The Ohio Extension Guide lists the contributions that are being made as follows:

1. Interpret the findings of research and encourage the application of those findings in agriculture, homemaking, and with youth.
I would describe the **BEST** County Extension Agent I have ever known as follows:

(PLEASE RETURN by June 10, as indicated above)
To: County Extension Agent, Chairmen and Members of the Administrative and Supervisory Staff.

Subject: Development of Forced-Choice Performance Reports.

Dear Co-Workers:

Mr. Archie Hudson is now working with us as a research associate to develop forced-choice performance reports. The essays you submitted describing "the best county Extension agent ever known" are greatly appreciated and vital to the research. Many phrases describing the job behaviors of agents have been abstracted from the essays. However there are very few phrases that describe the administrative and program responsibilities of chairmen.

Since we plan to develop a forced-choice performance report specifically for the chairman function as well as the agent position, we need an additional set of essays from which phrases pertinent to the chairman function can be secured.

Will you please send us, on the attached form, a short essay describing the behaviors of "the best County Extension Agent, Chairman you have known in terms of his administrative and total program responsibilities?" Please do not attach your signature to the essay or provide the name of the chairman you are describing.

We would appreciate receiving your essay as soon as possible, preferably by August 15th at the latest, so that we can start the development of the chairman performance report.

Sincerely yours,

Robert W. McCormick
Assistant Director

RWM:jp

Enclosure
(Do Not Sign Your Name)

Please return this descriptive report to:

W. B. Wood
Director
Cooperative Extension Service
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus 10, Ohio

Return this form by August 15th.

I would describe the behavior of the BEST County Extension Agent, Chairman I have known (in terms of his administrative and total program responsibilities) as follows:
APPENDIX D

Agent and Chairman

Descriptive Check Lists
To: All Administrative and Supervisory Personnel
Attention:

At every phase of the research required for the development of the new Professional Evaluation Report, the personnel of the Cooperative Extension Service, and, particularly your group, have made important contributions. The assistance of the administrative and supervisory staff is needed in this part of the project to determine the relationships of the phrases to job performance.

Enclosed in the folder with this letter are the following:

(a) Four identical checklists of descriptive phrases relating to the county Extension agent position irrespective of area of responsibility.
(b) Two identical checklists of descriptive phrases relating to the county Extension agent, Chairman role.
(c) Four 3 x 5 cards appropriately titled and numbered.

The following steps are suggested for your participation in this part of the study.

First - Please think of a most competent and most effective County Extension Agent and also a least competent and least effective County Extension Agent. Although it is not necessary to submit their names, you will find it helpful to write their names or initials on the cards. Place the name or initials of the most competent agent on card #1, and the name or initials of the least competent agent on card #2.

Secondly - In reference to the 20 point County Extension Agent Scale immediately below, place the numbers 1 and 2, representing these two agents, in the boxes to indicate where you would rank them in terms of overall competency and effectiveness.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Low | Average | High |

County Extension Agent Scale *

* Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, should be shown in these boxes at end of rankings.
Thirdly - Now think of a County Extension Agent, Chairman whom you would consider as a most competent and most effective one regardless of his performance in the position of County Extension Agent, Agriculture and place his name or initials on card #3. On card #4, place the name or initials of a County Extension Agent, Chairman whom you consider as a least competent and least effective one regardless of his performance in the position of County Extension Agent, Agriculture.

Fourthly - In reference to the 20 point County Extension Chairman Role Scale below, place the numbers 3 and 4, representing the two chairmen, in the boxes to indicate where you would rank them in terms of overall competency or effectiveness as chairmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Extension Chairman Role Scale**

** Numbers 3 and 4 only should be shown in these boxes.

Fifthly - Individuals #3 and #4 also function as County Extension Agents; Agriculture and hence need to be ranked in the County Extension Agent Scale as well (first scale). Hence, place #3 and #4 in the boxes you wish to use to rank their performance as County Agents, not considering their performance in the chairmanship role.

The next part of this procedure relates to your comparing each of the four individuals you have ranked with the individual descriptive phrases on the checklists. The instructions pertaining to this part are on the checklists. Please retain the 3 x 5 cards because they are matched with the code numbers on the checklists.

This letter and the descriptive phrases checklists will need to be returned to the undersigned for statistical analysis. Your name appears on the materials in order to be sure that we have complete data from each member of the administrative and supervisory staff. The names of the county Extension agents, with whom you compared the phrases, are not needed.

It is recognized that this phase of the research places great demands on your time. However, it is believed that only members of the administrative and supervisory staff have the knowledge and perspective required.

Your continued cooperation is again appreciated.

Cordially,

Arch Hudson
Research Associate

AR:bl
Enclosures
COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT DESCRIPTIVE PHRASES CHECKLIST

On the following pages, you will find descriptive phrases related to the position of county Extension agent irrespective of area of responsibility.

Since it is very important that you think of only one agent at a time while scaling the individual phrases on the checklist, it is suggested that you place the name on card #1 in front of you while you compare the phrases with this person. Please do the same for the individual whose name appears on card #2, #3, #4. Also please note that the code in the upper right hand corner of this page, County Extension Agent, #1, #2, #3 or #4 should coincide with the card number.

Each phrase or item will be rated on a five point scale, (5 being high and 1 being low) depending on how you view the pertinency of the statement to the person with whom it is being compared. Remember that it is rare that a most competent person is uniformly high in all specific behaviors, or conversely, that a least competent person is uniformly low in all.

For each phrase ask yourself this question:

This phrase describes the person I am considering to a(n) ___ extent?

fill in adjective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Limited</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each phrase, please circle the appropriate number in the series 1 through 5 which precedes each of the numbered phrases on the following pages.

Many of the phrases are quite specific and you may not have previously observed or thought about some of them in regard to the individual being considered. In these instances, estimate how you think it applies to the person rather than not assign a value to it.
1 2 3 4 5 (1) Participates in a professional organization for county Extension agents.

1 2 3 4 5 (2) Personal problems can be expressed to county agent in confidence.

1 2 3 4 5 (3) Does own critical thinking.

1 2 3 4 5 (4) Does job with enthusiasm.

1 2 3 4 5 (5) Devoted to helping people to help themselves.

1 2 3 4 5 (6) Has respect for the ability of lay people.

1 2 3 4 5 (7) Has excellent working relationship with other staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (8) Has confidence in the people of the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (9) Acknowledges letters promptly.

1 2 3 4 5 (10) Has continuous desire to do the best possible job.

1 2 3 4 5 (11) Has a sense of humor.

1 2 3 4 5 (12) Follows through on a plan when it is approved.

1 2 3 4 5 (13) Good understanding of human relations.

1 2 3 4 5 (14) Gives everyone request adequate attention.

1 2 3 4 5 (15) Develops programs which are truly the people's programs.

1 2 3 4 5 (16) Able to adapt to groups.

1 2 3 4 5 (17) Makes people feel at ease.

1 2 3 4 5 (18) Maintains good relations with personnel of other agricultural agencies.

1 2 3 4 5 (19) Regularly submits complete monthly reports of results.

1 2 3 4 5 (20) Willing to work overtime when necessary.

1 2 3 4 5 (21) Shows consideration for individuals.

1 2 3 4 5 (22) Seeks counsel and guidance of co-workers.

1 2 3 4 5 (23) Makes a written plan of work annually which describes the problems in the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (24) Never intentionally embarrasses people.

1 2 3 4 5 (25) Never fails to compliment others for their accomplishments.
1 2 3 4 5 (26) Speaks loud enough in group meeting for everyone to hear.
1 2 3 4 5 (27) Maintains good relations with county officials.
1 2 3 4 5 (28) Maintains cooperative relationships with leaders in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (29) Makes points well understood without lengthy elaboration.
1 2 3 4 5 (30) Works well with the people in the County.
1 2 3 4 5 (31) Personal life is above reproach.
1 2 3 4 5 (32) Person of high religious standards.
1 2 3 4 5 (33) Never criticizes co-workers to other people.
1 2 3 4 5 (34) Has developed a procedure for program evaluation.
1 2 3 4 5 (35) Has developed a good evaluation system.
1 2 3 4 5 (36) Able to organize effective committees.
1 2 3 4 5 (37) Carries out the philosophy and objectives of Extension.
1 2 3 4 5 (38) Knows the social-economic conditions in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (39) Knows the employment trends of the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (40) Knows needs and problems of the people in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (41) Keeps current in subject matter knowledge.
1 2 3 4 5 (42) Cooperates with co-workers.
1 2 3 4 5 (43) Makes a written plan of work annually which contains a concise statement of the general situation in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (44) Keeps finger on the "pulse" of the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (45) Prompt in getting to meetings.
1 2 3 4 5 (46) Inform secretary as to location when out of office.
1 2 3 4 5 (47) Is acquainted with school officials in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (48) Possesses wide interests.
1 2 3 4 5 (49) Is thoughtful of own families needs.
1 2 3 4 5 (50) Thoroughly interested in work.
Interested in improving own professional ability.

Informs co-workers of what he is doing.

Considerate of all members of the county staff.

Arrives at best alternative decision for all parties concerned.

Takes pride in the county.

Interested in others as persons.

Works well with lay groups.

Works well with Extension supervisory personnel.

Person of high moral standards.

Applies the problem solving method to program development.

Anticipates trends in Extension programs.

Knows when to make a suggestion.

Accepts constructive criticism of the program.

Inspires people in the community to assume leadership.

Willing to assist associates when it is needed.

Sufficiently reserved in approach to gain the respect of all.

Manages always to be cheerful.

Has a definite plan for evaluation included in the plan of work.

Source of encouragement to other agents.

Skillful in meeting demands of pressure groups.

Maintains high standards of performance.

Stands by own convictions.

Maintains high professional ethics.

Will spend a great deal of time with persons willing to exert enough effort to help themselves.

Well thought of by most people in the county.
2. Assist people in solving their problems through group action. It shall be the policy of Extension to assist people in organizing improvement associations and discussion groups for the promotion of health, schools, recreational facilities and others. Through meetings and other media Extension will assist people in the solution of their problems relative to marketing, public policy, and other areas of consumer concern.

3. Promote understanding of economic and social changes affecting Ohio people. Rapid changes taking place in Ohio agricultural and industrial development focus attention on this important area.

4. Encourage improvement of family living, rural housing, and family diets. These areas are given emphasis through the Home Economics phase of the Extension program and by cooperation of the entire staff in promotion of farm and home development.

5. Develop a program of technical information, recreation, citizenship training, leadership, and community living with the youth of Ohio through 4-H and older youth organizations. Advisory groups help Extension agents to develop these policies and programs with Ohio youth.

6. Counsel with farmers and homemakers on farm and home problems. The county Extension offices are local branch offices of the United States Department of Agriculture and of The Ohio State University College of Agriculture and Home Economics. As such, faculties of these two institutions are readily available to farmers and homemakers as sources of information and assistance in the solution of their many problems. It is the policy of Extension to do individual on-the-farm and in-the-home counseling with people insofar as time will permit. In addition, county offices serve people through telephone calls, visits to the office, group meetings, and by other means.

7. Mobilize rural people to meet emergencies. Two wars and a major depression, droughts, floods, fires, and insect and disease outbreaks have proved the effectiveness of Extension operation in such emergencies. It is the policy of Extension to give assistance under such conditions.

8. Cooperate with federal, state, and county governments. Extension's program is financed by appropriations from local county, state, and federal governments. Extension demonstrates the importance of such a cooperative agreement in promotion of a mutually beneficial educational program.

9. Aid in the esthetic and cultural growth of farm people. Extension, through community development, by community institutes, advice on housing, home beautification, camping, recreational development, music, and by other means contributes to general improvement in these areas.
Maintains a good disposition even under adverse conditions.

Monthly reports show status of work toward attainment of objectives and results accomplished.

Provides information to the public on results accomplished.

Teaching based on present and future needs of families of this county.

Tolerant of other person's point of view.

Is an effective leader.

Takes part in civic committees as time and energy allows.

Treats all segments of the population with the same respect.

Considers suggestions of the various county committees in carrying out the program.

Considers other peoples' ideas before arriving at a decision.

Conducts educational program with help of committees.

Kind of person you could go to with problems.

Carries through on program responsibilities.

Concepts of program development are broad and flexible.

Keeps personal information confidential.

Has a cooperative attitude.

Is punctual in all work activities.

Has a well organized program.

Able to adjust programs to the needs of the clientele.

A person whose leadership ability is an asset to the community.

Asks penetrating questions that make you think.

Adjusts teaching methods to the group.

A truly cooperative Extension person.
1 2 3 4 5 (99) Has respect for other people's feelings.
1 2 3 4 5 (100) A "team" member rather than a "star player".
1 2 3 4 5 (101) Doesn't make an issue of your mistakes.
1 2 3 4 5 (102) Doesn't consider self above clientele.
1 2 3 4 5 (103) Discusses problems with co-workers.
1 2 3 4 5 (104) Uses specialists as resource persons for meetings as needed.
1 2 3 4 5 (105) Uses a variety of visual aids in teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 (106) Makes a written plan of work annually which includes the over-all objectives.
1 2 3 4 5 (107) Uses demonstrations as one method teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 (108) Has ability to teach technical knowledge.
1 2 3 4 5 (109) Has a workable knowledge of technical subject matter.
1 2 3 4 5 (110) Able to "show how" without belittling the intelligence of others.
1 2 3 4 5 (111) Has unusual proficiency in working with people.
1 2 3 4 5 (112) Has time for visitors in the office.
1 2 3 4 5 (113) Encourages young people to take advantage of additional educational opportunities.
1 2 3 4 5 (114) Emphasizes public relations with the county officials.
1 2 3 4 5 (115) Has an appreciation for the ability of others.
1 2 3 4 5 (116) Has patience in trying situations.
1 2 3 4 5 (117) Deeply interested in people.
1 2 3 4 5 (118) Doesn't become bogged down in unnecessary details.
1 2 3 4 5 (119) Possesses ability to get everyone to express their ideas in committee meetings.
1 2 3 4 5 (120) Presentations at meetings are well planned.
1 2 3 4 5 (121) Has the respect of the people in the community.
1 2 3 4 5 (122) Doesn't allow schedule to become too full.
1 2 3 4 5 (123) Uses tact in dealing with people.
1 2 3 4 5 (124) Offers opinions only after getting all the details of the situation.

1 2 3 4 5 (125) Believes in the philosophy and objectives of Extension.

1 2 3 4 5 (126) Aware of what is happening in civic affairs of the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (127) Has a high degree of integrity.

1 2 3 4 5 (128) Has a good deal of personal composure.

1 2 3 4 5 (129) Knows philosophy of the Cooperative Extension Service.

1 2 3 4 5 (130) Helps people understand the "why" of doing things.

1 2 3 4 5 (131) Helps people understand the "how" of doing things.

1 2 3 4 5 (132) Helps people to think through their problems.

1 2 3 4 5 (133) Can be counted on to offer suggestions on things that might work.

1 2 3 4 5 (134) Builds friendships for Extension across the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (135) Believes the Extension job is important.

1 2 3 4 5 (136) Friendly with people in all walks of life.

1 2 3 4 5 (137) Attends in-service training meetings in accordance with job knowledge needs.

1 2 3 4 5 (138) Always has time to talk over a problem.

1 2 3 4 5 (139) Able to work cooperatively with all types of clientele.

1 2 3 4 5 (140) Has imagination.

1 2 3 4 5 (141) Able to talk with everyone regardless of their position.

1 2 3 4 5 (142) Is a conscientious worker.

1 2 3 4 5 (143) Has positive attitude toward serving the people.

1 2 3 4 5 (144) Has positive attitude toward professional improvement.

1 2 3 4 5 (145) Constantly striving to help people to understand the problem solving approach.

1 2 3 4 5 (146) Uses democratic leadership unless situation demands deviation from it.
1 2 3 4 5 (147) Uses a variety of methods to get increased participation in programs.

1 2 3 4 5 (148) Uses terminology appropriate to the particular audience.

1 2 3 4 5 (149) Uses recommendations of advisory committee to put new programs into effect.

1 2 3 4 5 (150) Has an effective way of making technical information apply to the job at hand.

1 2 3 4 5 (151) Has a keen interest in keeping abreast of the times.

1 2 3 4 5 (152) Explains things clearly to clientele.

1 2 3 4 5 (153) Available in case of an emergency.

1 2 3 4 5 (154) An emotionally well adjusted person.

1 2 3 4 5 (155) Always on time for appointments.

1 2 3 4 5 (156) Has positive attitude and philosophy toward Extension work.

1 2 3 4 5 (157) Keeps well informed on Extension procedures.

1 2 3 4 5 (158) Tries to be well informed on all phases of the Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (159) Has an appreciation for the rights of others.

1 2 3 4 5 (160) Explains the reasons when giving recommendations on various practices.

1 2 3 4 5 (161) Knows how to work with different age groups.

1 2 3 4 5 (162) Prepares well organized speeches.

1 2 3 4 5 (163) Exhibits enthusiasm concerning work.

1 2 3 4 5 (164) Even tempered in most situations.

1 2 3 4 5 (165) Respected by other professional leaders.

1 2 3 4 5 (166) Always expresses a friendly greeting upon meeting someone.

1 2 3 4 5 (167) Does not try to avoid problems.

1 2 3 4 5 (168) Does not become discouraged easily.

1 2 3 4 5 (169) Possess ability in summarizing group consensus to reach conclusions.
Respects others opinions concerning improvements.
Respected by people of all ages in the county.
Respected in the county as a leader in the field.
Keeps people informed through newspaper and other mass media.
Allows time for office work.
Plans teaching activities well.
Alert to the needs and problems of the clientele.
Has hobbies off the job.
Assists in the development and writing of the county annual plan of work.
Has firm convictions but is not an inflexible person.
Always aware of things that should be done in the future.
Attains annual program goals.
Always courteous to everyone.
Attends meetings sponsored by other agricultural organizations when deemed necessary or desirable.
Assumes responsibility in other groups in the county.
Always mindful of representing the Cooperative Extension Service.
Provides lay people the opportunity to develop leadership.
Possesses knowledge in subject matter areas appropriate to assignment.
Knows where to find answers to specific problems.
Does an excellent job of observing and reporting progress toward stated program goals.
Has sound philosophy of life that applies to every situation.
Does right thing at the right time.
Has an educational program designed to meet the needs of all people.
1 2 3 4 5 (193)  Has a planned calendar of activities.
1 2 3 4 5 (194)  Can apply technical knowledge to practical situations.
1 2 3 4 5 (195)  Knows basic objectives of the Cooperative Extension Service.
1 2 3 4 5 (196)  Loyal to the Cooperative Extension Service.
1 2 3 4 5 (197)  Never breaks an appointment unless absolutely necessary.
1 2 3 4 5 (198)  Never shows any outward sign of "flying off the handle".
1 2 3 4 5 (199)  Never plans more than can be done effectively.
1 2 3 4 5 (200)  Sets example of an ideal public worker in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (201)  Has initiative.
1 2 3 4 5 (202)  Follows good teaching practices.
1 2 3 4 5 (203)  Has opinions backed by research and current trends.
1 2 3 4 5 (204)  Is honest in all personal and professional dealings.
1 2 3 4 5 (205)  Is dependable in all phases of work.
1 2 3 4 5 (206)  Has a long range view of Extension program needs.
1 2 3 4 5 (207)  Is aggressive when the need arises.
1 2 3 4 5 (208)  Makes Extension work a profession.
1 2 3 4 5 (209)  Never too busy to talk to clientele about their problems.
1 2 3 4 5 (210)  Determines units of work with working objectives for each unit.
1 2 3 4 5 (211)  Demonstrates practical judgment in all phases of Extension.
1 2 3 4 5 (212)  Develops Extension activities with special interest groups.
1 2 3 4 5 (213)  Gives credit to others for their progress.
1 2 3 4 5 (214)  Gives an individual a sense of confidence.
1 2 3 4 5 (215)  Well thought of by co-workers.
1 2 3 4 5 (216)  Has ability to inspire enthusiasm in others for the task at hand.
1 2 3 4 5 (217) Has a good working relationship with lay people involved in the programs.
1 2 3 4 5 (218) Feels a real obligation to the people in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (219) Well liked by non-professional people.
1 2 3 4 5 (220) Programs are well publicized.
1 2 3 4 5 (221) Plans meeting dates on a scheduled basis.
1 2 3 4 5 (222) Plans county programs to meet future needs.
1 2 3 4 5 (223) Plans an effective variety of activities through committees.
1 2 3 4 5 (224) Enjoys working with people.
1 2 3 4 5 (225) Tries to find solution to problems if not known.
1 2 3 4 5 (226) Helps other staff members with problems.
1 2 3 4 5 (227) Dresses appropriately for the occasion.
1 2 3 4 5 (228) Guides planning committees in the decisions.
1 2 3 4 5 (229) Writes effectively.
1 2 3 4 5 (230) Supports the Cooperative Extension Policies.
1 2 3 4 5 (231) Not concerned about getting major share of credit for activities.
1 2 3 4 5 (232) Gives high priority to monthly reports.
1 2 3 4 5 (233) Supports other organizations in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (234) Has a pleasant personality.
1 2 3 4 5 (235) Stands firmly on the principle of a professional code.
1 2 3 4 5 (236) Values other people's experience or views on alternative solutions.
1 2 3 4 5 (237) Uses good illustrations or visual aids in talks.
1 2 3 4 5 (238) Utilizes appropriate methods in educational programs for each particular audience involved.
1 2 3 4 5 (239) Never puts person off in securing information on a particular problem.
1 2 3 4 5 (240) Has complete knowledge of the work and responsibilities.
1 2 3 4 5 (241) Does not give out false or misleading information.
1 2 3 4 5 (242) Does excellent job in stimulating group discussion.
1 2 3 4 5 (243) Is a genial person with a ready smile.
1 2 3 4 5 (244) Gets cooperation because he cooperates.
1 2 3 4 5 (245) Willing to see others get credit for results.
1 2 3 4 5 (246) Develops a program that covers a wide variety of essential subjects.
1 2 3 4 5 (247) Exercises good judgment in the planning and execution of all phases of the program.
1 2 3 4 5 (248) Exemplifies sound democratic procedure in developing programs with leaders.
1 2 3 4 5 (249) Does things with professional ease and flair.
1 2 3 4 5 (250) Dedicated to County Extension Agent position.
1 2 3 4 5 (251) Well informed of the latest research findings in the fields of agriculture or home economics.
1 2 3 4 5 (252) Well informed of available resources of many different subjects.
1 2 3 4 5 (253) Organizes committees with the help of good local leaders.
1 2 3 4 5 (254) Shows kindness for the individual.
1 2 3 4 5 (255) Recognizes a responsibility to the University as a staff member.
1 2 3 4 5 (256) Thoroughly familiar with the major problems existing in the community.
1 2 3 4 5 (257) Uses tact when teaching.
1 2 3 4 5 (258) Makes effective use of Extension resources in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (259) Makes deliberate decisions based upon facts and the situation.
1 2 3 4 5 (260) Loyal to co-workers.
1 2 3 4 5 (261) Actions promote objectives of the Cooperative Extension Service.
1 2 3 4 5 (262) Actions promote philosophy of the Cooperative Extension Service.
1 2 3 4 5 (263) Active in community activities.
1 2 3 4 5 (264) Demonstrates analytical ability in solving problems.
1 2 3 4 5 (265) Decisions always seem to be based on sound thinking.
1 2 3 4 5 (266) Announces dates of events well in advance.
1 2 3 4 5 (267) Has an excellent vocabulary.
1 2 3 4 5 (268) A well-groomed person.
1 2 3 4 5 (269) A modest person.
1 2 3 4 5 (270) Directs discussion for full understanding by group members.
1 2 3 4 5 (271) Loyal to the Cooperative Extension Service.
1 2 3 4 5 (272) Professional in conduct.
COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT, CHAIRMAN DESCRIPTIVE PHRASES CHECKLIST

On the following pages, you will find descriptive phrases relating to the County Extension Agent, Chairman role.

Since it is very important that you think of only one individual at a time while scaling the individual phrases on the checklist, it is suggested that you place the name on card #3 in front of you while you compare the phrases with this person. Please do the same for the individual whose name appears on card #4. Also please note that the code in the upper right hand corner of this page, County Extension Agent, Chairman #3 or 4, should coincide with the card number.

Each phrase or item will be rated on a 5 point scale (5 being high and 1 being low) depending on how you view the pertinency of the statement to the person with whom it is being compared. Remember it is rare that a most competent person is uniformly high in all specific behaviors, or conversely, that an least competent person is uniformly low in all.

For each phrase ask yourself this question:

This phrase describes the person I am considering to a(n) extent?

(fill in adjective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Limited</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each phrase, please circle the appropriate number in the series 1 through 5 which precedes each of the numbered phrases on the following pages.

Many of the phrases are quite specific and you may not have previously observed or thought about some of them in regard to the individual being considered. In these instances, estimate how you think it applies to the person rather than not assign a value to it.
10. Contribute to urban life. With urban population now an extremely large segment of Ohio's total population, work with urban groups become more and more important. It is the policy of Extension, through its market information for consumers program and its work with urban homemakers in nutrition and clothing, to assist all of Ohio's people as requested.

11. Develop rural leadership. One of the greatest contributions of Extension has been its development of rural leadership. Extension's major objective is to help people help themselves. Because of this responsibility, Extension is willing to step aside as soon as a group is sufficiently trained to assume its own leadership (52).

The integral nature of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service with The Ohio State University is well indicated in its organizational structure. The Director of the Service is responsible to the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics and maintains liaison relationships with the department chairmen of the College as well as the Federal Extension Service. Reporting to the Director are the agriculture editor and three assistant directors, one in charge of programming, another in charge of personnel and finance, and the third who is responsible for training and research. These personnel and the state leaders for the various phases of each of these three major divisions constitute the administrative staff. In addition there is a supervisory team for each of the four districts, (southwest, northwest, southeast, and northeast). The district supervisor is the leader of the supervisory team and reports to the Director. The two other supervisory team members are the 4-H supervisor and the home economics supervisor.

The supervisory team members direct the activities of the field personnel of their respective district. Each district includes 22 counties with a field office in each county. The staff complement of each field office usually includes a county Extension agent, agriculture,
1 2 3 4 5 (1) Understands the interrelationships between the Extension Service and related agencies.

1 2 3 4 5 (2) Uses Extension Specialists as resource persons in developing a total integrated county program.

1 2 3 4 5 (3) Believes in informal administrative procedure.

1 2 3 4 5 (4) Serves on community charity drive committees.

1 2 3 4 5 (5) Always conducts himself in a manner that creates a favorable impression of the Extension Service.

1 2 3 4 5 (6) Solicits suggestions for agenda for office conference from all members of the county staff.

1 2 3 4 5 (7) Has effective procedures for receiving office visitors.

1 2 3 4 5 (8) Acts as a purchasing agent.

1 2 3 4 5 (9) Makes needed contacts for local support on state and national Extension Budgets.

1 2 3 4 5 (10) Acquaints public officials with agriculture and its related problems.

1 2 3 4 5 (11) Secures best public relations possible.

1 2 3 4 5 (12) Uses a variety of methods to get increased participation in the county program.

1 2 3 4 5 (13) Provides opportunities for other staff members to express their views.

1 2 3 4 5 (14) Encourages co-workers to take advantage of study opportunities.

1 2 3 4 5 (15) Sometimes attends 4-H and Home Economics meetings.

1 2 3 4 5 (16) Evaluates the results of educational programs and activities.

1 2 3 4 5 (17) Holds office conferences whenever there is something that needs attention of all agents.

1 2 3 4 5 (18) Able to sense and prevent personality conflicts arising among county staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (19) Assumes responsibility for the proper functioning of the total county Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (20) Is a leader rather than a driver.

1 2 3 4 5 (21) Consults with total staff on decisions when appropriate to do so.
1 2 3 4 5 (22) Follows necessary procedures in submitting bills and requisitions.
1 2 3 4 5 (23) Sees that the office is open to the public on a regular schedule.
1 2 3 4 5 (24) Is continually conscious of Extension prestige or goodwill.
1 2 3 4 5 (25) Works cooperatively with county staff members.
1 2 3 4 5 (26) Knows strengths and weaknesses of county agents and secretarial staff.
1 2 3 4 5 (27) Extremely interested in developing a unified county Extension program.
1 2 3 4 5 (28) Consults with other county staff members in the expenditure of the budget.
1 2 3 4 5 (29) Requests sufficient funds to provide for adequate demonstrational materials for all phases of the program.
1 2 3 4 5 (30) Encourages other agents to participate in decisions affecting the total county Extension program.
1 2 3 4 5 (31) Presents budget to the county advisory committee for approval.
1 2 3 4 5 (32) Accepts opportunities to appear before or participate in the activities of other groups.
1 2 3 4 5 (33) Checks on program activities in all phases of the county program as needed.
1 2 3 4 5 (34) Knows the socio-economic conditions in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (35) Takes the lead in program planning at the county Extension level.
1 2 3 4 5 (36) Works cooperatively with state staff members.
1 2 3 4 5 (37) Makes recommendations for appointments and promotions of the Extension agents in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (38) Keeps district supervisor adequately informed concerning appropriate county Extension matters.
1 2 3 4 5 (39) Makes effective use of Extension resources in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (40) Involves other staff members in decision making on policy matters.
1 2 3 4 5 (41) Has confidence in co-workers.
1 2 3 4 5 (42) Urges lay leaders to accept responsibility for program planning and development.
1 2 3 4 5 (43) Makes fullest possible use of lay leaders in carrying out the county Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (44) Oversees expenditure of funds.

1 2 3 4 5 (45) Is personally aware of the status of all county Extension programs.

1 2 3 4 5 (46) Prepares reports in a professional manner.

1 2 3 4 5 (47) Keeps the district supervisor informed of the contributions of the individual staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (48) Keeps the district supervisor informed about the progress of the county program.

1 2 3 4 5 (49) Maintains a balanced Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (50) Demonstrates capacity to counsel effectively with co-workers.

1 2 3 4 5 (51) Uses only constructive criticism.

1 2 3 4 5 (52) Takes initiative for finding satisfactory solutions for problems that develop with programs or staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (53) Works with other county agents to develop long time objectives for the county Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (54) Makes decisions on a democratic basis.

1 2 3 4 5 (55) Handles any misunderstandings arising among members of the county Extension staff.

1 2 3 4 5 (56) Inspires cooperative working relationships among all staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (57) Uses labor saving office equipment to the best advantage.

1 2 3 4 5 (58) Has provided for best possible physical facilities in accordance with circumstances.

1 2 3 4 5 (59) Sees that the office has necessary equipment and supplies.

1 2 3 4 5 (60) Requests sufficient funds to provide for adequate office equipment.

1 2 3 4 5 (61) Keeps up-to-date on business procedures.

1 2 3 4 5 (62) Has an annual audit made of non-appropriated funds.

1 2 3 4 5 (63) Secures sufficient county budget to operate an efficient office.
Handles problems arising concerning the total program by consensus agreement with the county team.

Permits co-workers to express themselves fully.

Is diplomatic in giving criticism.

Has good relations with the County Fair Board.

Distributes available informational bulletins to the public and school libraries in the county.

Sollicits the opinion of staff members before hiring secretarial help.

Tireless in his efforts to see that planned programs provide education and service to Extension's clientele.

Determines objectives for the Extension educational program in the county with the County Extension Advisory Committee and other staff members.

Helps to interpret responsibilities of Home Economics, 4-H and other agents in county in accordance with their job descriptions.

Has a sincere interest in the development of the total County Extension program.

Is aware of personalities and interests of the county staff members.

Participates in Farm City Week activities.

Uses tours and exhibits to acquaint the public with the Extension Service.

Takes the leadership in developing activities in cooperation with private business and other agencies.

Uses effective methods for reaching county Extension objectives.

Uses full talents of the county staff in planning and putting into effect the total program.

Assists other agents in setting objectives and establishing programs.

Assists other County Extension agents with special events in their respective programming areas.

Plans for the evaluation of county Extension programs.

Gives over-all guidance to the county Extension personnel.
12345 (84) Takes time to counsel with co-workers on program problems and offers suggestions for improvement or change.

12345 (85) Provides by means of office conferences a way of evaluating completed activities.

12345 (86) Involves appropriate local leaders in developing an annual plan of work for the county.

12345 (87) Submits a digest of the annual report of results to county commissioners and state legislative representative.

12345 (88) Spends time in establishing public relations with other organizations.

12345 (89) Maintains proper working relationships with other agencies and organizations.

12345 (90) Maintains good working relationships with all organized groups.

12345 (91) Acquaints the people of the county with the role of the Extension Service as a part of the Ohio State University.

12345 (92) Uses every opportunity to interpret Extension for the public.

12345 (93) Assumes leadership for the orientation and training of incoming secretarial staff.

12345 (94) Keeps adequate financial records of non-appropriated funds.

12345 (95) Has an effective filing system for all phases of the program.

12345 (96) Always sees that reports of all staff members in the county office are made and submitted on time.

12345 (97) Develops effective educational programs.

12345 (98) Takes the leadership in organizing work on reports.

12345 (99) Takes time to orient and train new agents.

12345 (100) Is willing to try and solve matters of grievance between county staff members.

12345 (101) Assumes leadership with county Extension Advisory Committee yet involves other agents.

12345 (102) Interested in the personal and professional welfare of the county staff.
Assumes overall leadership for all phases of the county Extension program.

Responsible for developing the budget but also involves co-workers and Extension Advisory Committee.

Has an effective procedure for receiving office telephone calls.

Evidence administrative ability in directing the affairs of the Extension office.

Accepts primary responsibility for public relations in the county.

Represents the Extension Service at most county events.

Prepares annual county Extension budget in cooperation with other agents.

Maintains good relations with county staff members.

Serves as chairman impartially and objectively.

Promotes teamwork, cooperation and harmony among county staff members.

Provides agendas for staff conferences.

Uses weekly staff conferences to evaluate the past week's programs and activities.

Does a good job of initiating and guiding program development in the county.

Sets an example in working with people.

Keeps informed on all events and programs connected with the total county program.

Gives suggestions regarding Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H and other programs in the county.

Knows population and employment trends of the county.

Provides for best physical office arrangement within space provided.

Keeps county commissioners informed of budget needs and expenditures.

Integrates the total Extension program for the county.

Assists newly assigned county Extension agents in becoming acquainted in the county.
1 2 3 4 5 (124) Keeps abreast of new developments in the Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (125) Encourages the increased professional improvement of other county agents.

1 2 3 4 5 (126) Establishes personal and professional standards other county Extension agents should follow.

1 2 3 4 5 (127) Allows co-workers to be in the "know" on administrative matters.

1 2 3 4 5 (128) Uses weekly staff conferences to announce and schedule future programs and related activity dates.

1 2 3 4 5 (129) Recognizes the professional capabilities of co-workers.

1 2 3 4 5 (130) Sees that the Extension Advisory Committee is functioning for the development of the over-all program.

1 2 3 4 5 (131) Maintains a close working relationship with the county Extension Advisory Committee.

1 2 3 4 5 (132) Sets an example in personal grooming.

1 2 3 4 5 (133) Holds county Extension office conferences with staff at least once a week.

1 2 3 4 5 (134) Provides a climate for the mutual exchange of information by county staff members in program matters.

1 2 3 4 5 (135) Encourages other county staff members to participate in public relations activities.

1 2 3 4 5 (136) Maintains good public relations with the press, radio and/or television personnel.

1 2 3 4 5 (137) Sees that all staff members receive proper recognition for their work.

1 2 3 4 5 (138) Maintains good relations with other state agencies.

1 2 3 4 5 (139) Maintains good public relations.

1 2 3 4 5 (140) Maintains good channels of communication with the lay people in the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (141) Shows leadership and tact in coordinating total county program.

1 2 3 4 5 (142) Assumes responsibility for the orientation and training of new Extension agents in the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (143) Assumes responsibility for the training of new agents with the cooperation of the other agents.
12345 (144) Procures optimum office space for effective operations.

12345 (145) Maintains effective relations with the church groups in the county.

12345 (146) Maintains effective relations with representatives in the county of Federal agencies.

12345 (147) Attends meetings of county officials when invited.

12345 (148) Maintains a schedule of county agent and secretarial vacation plans.

12345 (149) Maintains effective relations with other public agencies.

12345 (150) Directs the secretarial staff.

12345 (151) Appreciates the importance of a coordinated total Extension program.

12345 (152) Coordinates total program through weekly office conferences.

12345 (153) Respected by both professional and lay persons.

12345 (154) Keeps the general public informed of Extension programs by all available means.

12345 (155) Is proficient in public relations for the county Extension program.

12345 (156) Coordinates work of professional and secretarial staff in the county office.

12345 (157) Cooperates with Chambers of Commerce and other civic groups in planning county improvement.

12345 (158) Assumes primary responsibility for the public relations program in the county.

12345 (159) Conducts interesting and meaningful office conferences.

12345 (160) Permits each agent to operate with freedom of action.

12345 (161) Usually serves as chairman of county office staff conferences.

12345 (162) Has in operation effective office procedures.

12345 (163) Develops and maintains an efficient office with pleasant working relations.
12345 (164) Develops annual county Extension budget request.
12345 (165) Is personally acquainted with the state and national legislators who reside in the county.
12345 (166) Calls staff conferences regularly.
12345 (167) Assists newly assigned county Extension agents in finding a place to live.
12345 (168) Maintains good relations with members of the supervisory staff.
12345 (169) Confers with district Extension supervisor regarding personnel changes.
12345 (170) Discusses personnel problems with district supervisor.
12345 (171) Assumes responsibility for overall leadership of the county staff.
12345 (172) Able to get along well with co-workers.
12345 (173) Is an active member of a civic service club in the county.
12345 (174) Provides adequate storage for supplies and equipment.
12345 (175) Provides for and maintains a business-like office.
12345 (176) Effectively presents budget request to the Board of County Commissioners.
12345 (177) Makes a point of complimenting co-workers for a job well done.
12345 (178) Discusses problems, which cannot be handled locally, with the District supervisor.
12345 (179) Adjusts responsibilities of agents so as to best utilize their talents and skills.
12345 (180) Has an understanding of all phases of the Extension program.
12345 (181) Takes time to become familiar with Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H and other phases of the total program.
12345 (182) Works with advisory committee to developing time objectives for the county Extension program.
12345 (183) Keeps the county Extension Advisory Committee adequately informed regarding appropriate matters.
1 2 3 4 5 (184) Keeps County Extension Advisory Committee currently informed on major activities.

1 2 3 4 5 (185) Keeps district supervisor informed as to the development of the budget request.

1 2 3 4 5 (186) Works with the County Extension Advisory Committee in determining the county Extension policies.

1 2 3 4 5 (187) Develops and maintains an effective evaluation of program in cooperation with other agents.

1 2 3 4 5 (188) Concerned with the evaluation of the effectiveness of the total program.

1 2 3 4 5 (189) Reviews reports of progress in all program areas.

1 2 3 4 5 (190) Has a good understanding of activities being carried out in each of the major areas of Extension in the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (191) Sets an example as an efficient worker.

1 2 3 4 5 (192) Is willing to counsel on personnel matters within the county Extension office.

1 2 3 4 5 (193) Effectively counsels with co-workers in their respective phase of the total program.

1 2 3 4 5 (194) Keeps problems program centered rather than people centered.

1 2 3 4 5 (195) Has developed a strong representative county Extension Advisory committee.

1 2 3 4 5 (196) Offers assistance and suggestions as needed to the other agents.

1 2 3 4 5 (197) Sees that each phase of the county Extension program receives proper emphasis.

1 2 3 4 5 (198) Develops and maintains an effective County Extension Advisory Committee which meets regularly.

1 2 3 4 5 (199) Schedules periodic meetings with the Extension Advisory Committee.

1 2 3 4 5 (200) Has positive attitude toward program planning and development process.

1 2 3 4 5 (201) Presents facts and situation as to the future trends or needs of Extension for the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (202) Accepts the responsibility for all the programs evolving from the county Extension office.
who also functions as chairman or local Extension administrator; a county Extension agent, 4-H and a county Extension agent, home economics. The forced-choice performance evaluation reports were developed for use with these field personnel.

Review of the Literature

Although the forced-choice methodology is relatively recent in origin, it has gained wide acceptance and has been applied in diverse areas of research. The innovators of the forced-choice approach were Paul Horst and Robert J. Wherry when they each were working on the development of personality scales prior to World War II (37).

As a new approach to performance evaluation, the forced-choice methodology has been utilized with varied and diverse occupations including retail store managers (38), canteen servicemen (45), state highway patrolmen (25), city policemen (32), salesmen (39), clerical personnel (26), industrial supervisors (27), military officers (31), medical personnel (24), and student dormitory counselors (33).

Likewise the methodology has been adapted as a means of measuring workers' perceptions of supervisory expectations (16), to evaluate supervisors' human relations attitudes and techniques (29), to develop self-administering personality tests (10, 14), and to detect college students who are over-and-under achievers (43).

The procedural steps in building descriptive choice of level forced-choice performance scale have been enumerated by Sisson (31), Richardson (21), Guilford (15), Berkshire and Highland (5), Lanman and Remmers (21), and Wherry (45). The descriptive ranking or profile type
1 2 3 4 5 (203) Applies the problem solving method to program development.

1 2 3 4 5 (204) Does not show partiality to any phase of the total county Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (205) Counsels with other staff members as the need arises.

1 2 3 4 5 (206) Involves co-workers in making decisions regarding office personnel and procedures.

1 2 3 4 5 (207) Has knowledge of activities of other county agents at all times.

1 2 3 4 5 (208) Has an adequate understanding of office management.

1 2 3 4 5 (209) Reviews periodically the entire county Extension program.

1 2 3 4 5 (210) Coordinates public relations activities of other county staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (211) Initiates procedures to secure complete understanding of the responsibilities of all members of the county staff.

1 2 3 4 5 (212) Always designates another staff member to take over the chairman role in his absence.

1 2 3 4 5 (213) Seeks cooperation of other agents.

1 2 3 4 5 (214) Develops total Extension program in keeping with the policies of the Cooperative Extension Service.

1 2 3 4 5 (215) Interprets the Extension Service to the various "publics" in the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (216) Establishes regular routine for efficient office management.

1 2 3 4 5 (217) Consults with other county agents on the expenditure of non-appropriated funds.

1 2 3 4 5 (218) Keeps a complete accounting record of expenditures of county budget funds.

1 2 3 4 5 (219) Supports the philosophy of the use of lay leaders in developing and carrying out the county program.

1 2 3 4 5 (220) Keeps other agents informed on policy matters.

1 2 3 4 5 (221) Does a good job of relating the total county program to local conditions.
1 2 3 4 5 (222) Does a good job of relating the total county program to the needs and interests of the people.

1 2 3 4 5 (223) Distributes secretarial workload so as to have effective office operations.

1 2 3 4 5 (224) Applies accepted management principles in role as office manager.

1 2 3 4 5 (225) Always keeps county commissioners informed of expenditure of monies appropriated by the county.

1 2 3 4 5 (226) Approves new agents before they are assigned to the county staff.

1 2 3 4 5 (227) Interprets matters of policy to county staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (228) Creates a climate of mutual confidence and understanding among county staff members.

1 2 3 4 5 (229) Coordinates the total Extension program in the county.
APPENDIX E

Item Numbers on Agent and Chairman Check
Lists Included in a priori Categories
ITEM NUMBERS ON THE AGENT CHECK LIST THAT WERE INCLUDED IN THE FIVE A PRIORI CATEGORIES OF AGENT PERFORMANCE

I. Acceptance of Responsibilities


II. Interpersonal Relations


III. Programming Activities

12, 15, 19, 23, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 43, 44, 54, 60, 61, 63, 68, 77, 78, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 93, 94, 118, 122, 124, 133, 145, 149, 174, 176, 178, 180, 181, 189, 192, 193, 199, 206, 210, 211, 212, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 228, 236, 246, 247, 248, 253, 256, 259, 261, 264, 265, 266.

IV. Personal Attributes and Values


V. Extension Teaching Methods

ITEM NUMBERS ON THE CHAIRMAN CHECK LIST THAT WERE INCLUDED IN
THE FOUR A PRIORI CATEGORIES OF CHAIRMAN PERFORMANCE

I. Integrated Total Program

II. Extension Staff Relations

III. Business Operations
7, 8, 9, 22, 23, 28, 29, 31, 44, 46, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 104, 105, 106, 109, 120, 121, 144, 145, 150, 156, 162, 163, 164, 174, 175, 176, 206, 216, 217, 218, 223, 224, 225.

IV. Public Relations
APPENDIX F

Requests for Peer Nominations from
Agents and Chairmen
September 22, 1960

To: Selected County Extension Agents

At every phase of the research needed for the development of the new Professional Evaluation Report, the personnel of the Cooperative Extension Service have made important contributions.

You may have participated in the first phase by writing an essay about the "best" County Extension Agent you have ever known. If you are a County Extension Agent, Chairman, you probably made an additional contribution by submitting an essay about your role as chairman. Once again your assistance is needed in a vital phase of the research.

This request is addressed to "selected" County Extension Agents, which means that you have been working as an agriculture, 4-H, home economics or marketing information for consumers agent in your present location or in the same geographical workgroup area for at least the last twelve months. This factor is significant because it is believed that this is the minimum period of time needed to gain the necessary "know-how" in the position and to have had sufficient opportunity for professional contacts with your colleagues in the work group.

It has been shown in research studies, similar to this one, that co-workers are competent evaluators of each others work. The procedure used for accomplishing this is referred to as "peer nominations." In the case of this project, it involves your judgments regarding the job performance of the other County Extension Agents, who like yourself, have had at least twelve months of service in the same workgroup.

It is recognized that all County Extension Agents are doing a high level professional job and the exclusion of the name of any agent from your workgroup does not denote otherwise. Moreover in any group, there are usually a few members who are performing somewhat better or not quite as well as the majority of the group.

Your peer nominations are needed to help provide a "measuring stick" by which to evaluate the new Professional Evaluation Report which is presently being developed. The nominations you make will not be used for any administrative purpose nor will any list of nominations be shown in any kind of report. They will instead be converted to a numerical code and used only for statistical purposes. You are not required to sign your name but it is vitally important that you submit your nominations.
The procedure by which you make your nominations are as follows:

1. Review the enclosed list of County Extension Agents who are assigned in your geographical work group.

   Please note (a) only those agents who have been functioning in that work group for at least twelve months are included. (b) The title designations as well as names are included to indicate program functioning. (c) In the case of the County Extension Agent, Agriculture, the additional title designation of chairman is purposely not included because in this set of peer nominations you should consider his functioning as an agriculture agent only. (If you are a chairman, please be advised that another set of peer nominations regarding the chairman role will soon be requested.)

2. From the list select the 3 agents excluding yourself (if there are 14 names or less) or 4 agents excluding yourself (if there are 15 names or more) who in your opinion have done a somewhat better job than the majority of the group in furthering the philosophy and objectives of the Cooperative Extension Service during the past 12 months. Please indicate your nominations by placing a capital "H" in front of the names selected.

3. Also select from the list the 3 agents excluding yourself (if there are 14 names or less) or the 4 agents excluding yourself (if there are 15 names or more) who in your opinion have not done quite as well as the majority of the group in furthering the philosophy and objectives of the Cooperative Extension Service during the past 12 months. Please indicate your nominations by placing a capital "L" in front of the names selected.

4. Many County Extension Agents have done a high level professional job over a period of years and some have done the same for only a year or two. However do not take the total period of service into account. Instead base your judgments on what the agent has done during the past twelve months only. Also please make your nominations individually without consideration with others.

Again it should be emphasized that these peer nominations are for research only. The individuals selected will neither be benefited nor hampered in any way but the data is needed to validate the performance report.

Please return the list with your nominations but without your signature to Arch Hudson, Research Associate, Room 109, Agricultural Administration Building by September 30, 1960.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

W. B. Wood
Director
Cooperative Extension Work
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF OHIO

Columbus 10, Ohio

2120 Fyffe Road
October 19, 1960

To: Selected County Extension Agent, Chairman

At every phase of the research needed for the development of the new Professional Evaluation Report, the personnel of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service has made important contributions. We are delighted with progress made to date.

You may have participated in the first phase by writing one or two essays from which descriptive phrases were collected for the development of the performance report. In addition you may have submitted peer nominations as a county agent in your workgroup. Now a second set of peer nominations are needed and these are equally as vital to the research as the first set.

Before explaining about the procedure involved, you may desire to know about the returns on the first set of nominations. There were some comments indicating that this was an unusual request and that it was difficult to make the selections. This request was made only for research purposes and is not to be considered a regular personnel evaluation procedure. The returns reflected the sincere efforts of the agents in making the best possible nomination selections. Dr. Robert McCormick tells me the response was gratifying in that a large majority, actually 177 of 225 or 78%, of the agents submitted nominations. Moreover the extent of agreement, as determined statistically, among the nominations for all workgroups combined was remarkably high. A split-half reliability correlation coefficient of .76 (1.00 being perfect agreement) was obtained.

On the basis of the results for the agent peer nominations, it is deemed feasible by the project team to secure similar nominations on the county Extension chairman role to be used as possible criterion data for validating the new performance report.

The term "selected" refers to the fact that you have been functioning as a county Extension agent, chairman for at least a year in your present geographical district. It is recognized that all county Extension agent, chairmen are performing at a high professional level in their chairmanship roles and the exclusion of the name of any chairman merely denotes that he has not functioned as a chairman in the particular district for at least 12 months.

Your second set of peer nominations are needed to help provide a "measuring stick" by which to evaluate the chairman role portion of the new Professional Evaluation Report which is being developed. As before, the nominations will not be used for any administrative purpose nor will any list of nominations be shown in any kind of report. Instead they will be converted into a numerical code and used only for statistical purposes. You are not required to sign your name but it is vitally important that you submit your nominations.
To: Selected County Extension Agent, Chairmen  
October 19, 1960

The procedures by which you make your nominations are as follows:

1. Review the enclosed list of County Extension Agent, Chairmen who are assigned in your geographical district.
   Please note (a) only those agents who have been functioning as chairmen in the district for at least twelve months are included, (b) no reference is made to the title designation as agricultural agent because you should consider only the chairmanship role.

2. From this list select 4 chairmen, excluding yourself, who in your opinion have done a somewhat better job than the majority of the group through their chairmanship role to further the philosophy, objectives and program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service during the past twelve months. Please indicate your nominations by placing a capital "H" in front of the names selected.

3. Also select from the list the 4 chairmen, excluding yourself, who in your opinion have not done quite as well as the majority of the group through their chairmanship role to further the philosophy, objectives, and program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service during the past twelve months. Please indicate your nominations by placing a capital "L" in front of the names selected.

4. The County Extension Agent, Chairmen have done a high level professional job for a varying number of years. However, base your judgments on the chairmanship role performed during the past twelve months only. Also please make your nominations individually without consultation with others.

Again it should be emphasized that these peer nominations are for research only. The individuals selected will neither be benefited nor hampered in any way but the data is needed for validation purposes.

Please return the list with your nominations but without your signature to Arch Hudson, Research Associate, Room 109, by December 1, 1960. A self-addressed stamped envelope has been provided for this purpose.

We know we can depend on your cooperation in this matter. This is a high level carefully planned research project being tested by you as a member of our staff. It has great potential, in our opinion, for our staff and program.

Very truly yours,

W. B. Wood, Director
of forced-choice performance scale is a new development evolved by Wherry, and Florence (12) and has been applied by Peres (25), Stander (32), Cosgrove (9) and Wherry (45).

A number of variations in the format of the level forced-choice performance scale have been used; e.g. Sisson (31), Staugas and McQuitty (33) used tetrads of two favorable and two unfavorable statements; Taylor, Schneider and Clay (38), Peres (25) employed all favorable statements in tetrads; Stander (32) had sets of five statements one of which is neutral, and two favorable and unfavorable statements; and Wherry (45) used paired statements or dyads.

A methodological study to compare the relative merits of different forced-choice formats was conducted by Berkshire and Highland (5). They obtained rating data from instructors on army trainees using six designs for the forced-choice scales. The formats or designs were as follows:

1. Two statements in each forced-choice set, both of which are favorable or unfavorable; the rater selects the more descriptive statement in the favorable pair, the less descriptive in the unfavorable pair.

2. Three statements in each set, all favorable or unfavorable; the rater selects the most or least descriptive statement.

3. Four favorable statements in each set; the rater selects the two most descriptive statements.

4. Four favorable statements in each set; the rater selects the most and least descriptive statements.

5. Four statements in each set, two favorable and two unfavorable; the rater selects the most and least descriptive statements.

6. Five statements in each set, two favorable, and one neutral; the rater selects the most and least descriptive statements.

These investigators found that all six of the formats were susceptible to rater leniency effect in that the mean scores were higher and
APPENDIX G

Forward and Backward Doolittle Solutions

for Agent and Chairman Data
FORWARD AND BACKWARD DOOLITTLE SOLUTIONS FOR AGENT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>-.950</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>-.894</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.941</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.799</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>-.458</td>
<td>-1.393</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORWARD AND BACKWARD DOOLITTLE SOLUTIONS FOR CHAIRMAN DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>-.951</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>-.916</td>
<td>-.934</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>-.963</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.839</td>
<td>-.856</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>-.559</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>-1.764</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.982</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.872</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>-1.679</td>
<td>-1.923</td>
<td>2.436</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>-.825</td>
<td>-1.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.714</td>
<td>2.740</td>
<td>-1.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-1.027</td>
<td>-1.362</td>
<td>2.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Decile Norms for Agents

and Chairmen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Section</th>
<th>Profile Section</th>
<th>Sub-Area A</th>
<th>Sub-Area B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Deciles</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Deciles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.0-50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.0-30.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0-24.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.0-17.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-area A: Interpersonal Relations

Sub-area B: Program Development and Execution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area A: Extension Staff Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-area B: Business Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-area C: Relations with Extension Publics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Illustrative Profiles for
Agents and Chairmen
## Agriculture Agent Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deciles</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sub-area A**

**Sub-area B**

Decile of Level Section Score: 1st

**Legend**

- Sub-area A: Interpersonal Relations
- Sub-area B: Program Development and Execution

--- Supervisory Descriptions

----- Self-Descriptions
Agriculture Agent Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deciles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-area A

Sub-area B

Decile of Level Section Score: 10th

Legend

- Sub-area A: Interpersonal Relations
- Sub-area B: Program Development and Execution

Supervisory Descriptions

Self-Descriptions
4-H Agent Profile

Decile of Level Section Score: 7th

Legend
- Sub-area A: Interpersonal Relations
- B: Program Development and Execution
- Supervisory Descriptions
- Self-Descriptions
- Chairman Descriptions
standard deviations smaller when the raters were instructed to bias the ratings in contrast to a non-biasing set of instructions. However of the six formats, design 3 was the most desirable in that it had the greatest resistance to leniency effect, tended to give the highest validity coefficients, and was one of the two most popular formats with the raters.

Another aspect of the forced-choice methodology studied by Berkshire and Highland (5) was that of the statistical indices utilized in the matching of phrases into sets. The preference index had been used in earlier AGO studies as a basis of matching items within sets so that all phrases would have equal "appeal" to the raters, i.e., a rater would be equally willing to apply any one of the phrases in a set to the ratee. If all the phrases in each set did not have this characteristic to the same extent, the raters might be drawn to certain phrases rather than others even though they didn't best describe the ratee. In addition to the preference index, Berkshire and Highland utilized a favorability index to match phrases. It was obtained by asking the raters to judge the favorability of each phrase when applied to a rater. They concluded that the favorability index is preferable to the preference index.

However a more recent study by Wherry (47), in which he factor analyzed data for 19 different indices on 300 descriptive phrases, showed that the preference index had a slightly higher loading on a "positive emotional tone" factor than an index of a favorability type. Bartlett (1) compared favorability and preference indices and concluded that if only one index is used for matching, the preference index appears to be the best one to use. Uhrbrock (42) found that preference indices are
Home Economics Agent Profile

Decile of Level Section Score: 1st

Legend

Sub-Area A: Interpersonal Relations
B: Program Development and Execution

Supervisory Descriptions
Self-Descriptions
Chairmen Descriptions
Chairman Profile

Decile of Level Section Score: 6th

Legend
- Sub-area A: Extension Staff Relations
- B: Business Objectives
- C: Relations with Extension Publics

Supervisory Descriptions

Self-Descriptions
Chairman Profile

Deciles

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Sub-area A

Sub-area B

Sub-area C

Decile of Level Section Score: 2nd

Legend
Sub-area A: Extension Staff Relations
B: Business Objectives
C: Relations with Extension Publics

Supervisory Descriptions

Self-Descriptions
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highly reliable even when the index is gathered from different populations of raters. Ross (28) found that a forced-choice scale built by matching on the basis of a mean applicability or preference index and one built on the basis of a face validity index had approximately the same validity.

Another statistical index used in grouping phrases into sets in the evaluative forced-choice performance scale is the discrimination index. This is a measure of the relationship between applicability values assigned to each of the descriptive phrases and the degree of competency of persons in the job for which the scale is developed. More specifically it indicates the extent to which a specific type of behavior (descriptive statement or behaviorgram) is related to successful job performance as determined by the raters of the check list containing the descriptive phrases. Berkshire and Highland (5) indicated that the amount of difference between the "high" and "low" discrimination index phrases is an arbitrary one and their study did not provide an empirical answer. However they speculated that although increasing the difference between the "high" and "low" phrases on this index probably increases the validity of the item, it may also tend to increase the biasability of the item.

There are various methods by which the discrimination index can be computed. Stander (32) and Wherry (45) used biserial correlations and Sisson (31), Peres (25) used an approximation of biserial correlations as the discrimination indices for their items. Other computational methods that have been suggested include mean differences, per cent of overlap, chi-square, and t-tests. However Lanman and Remmers (21)
indicate that all methods yield approximately the same result, i.e., the different methods measure the extent to which the item discriminates among different degrees of criterion performance.

The three main criteria utilized to evaluate a performance evaluation scale are (1) biasability, (2) reliability, and (3) validity. Many studies (6, 11, 23, 25, 31, 40) have shown that conventional rating scales are subject to biasability and related faults such as halo effect, tendency toward central tendency, and different rating sets such as "hard" and "easy."

The high degree of biasability of a graphic rating scale used for army officers prior to World War II led to the first application of forced-choice methodology to the field of performance evaluation. According to Sisson (31) of the Personnel Research Section of the Adjutant General's Office, the army wanted to promote five per cent of the full colonels to the rank of brigadier general and it was found that 2000 of the 4000 colonels had the highest possible ranking on a graphic type rating scale. However after developing and applying a forced-choice scale for army officers of all grades, Sisson summarized the results as follows:

The new method is superior to all other methods examined. It produces a better distribution of ratings relatively free from the usual pile-up at the top of the scale. It is less subject to influence by the rank of the officer being rated. It is quickly and objectively scored by machine, and above all, it produces ratings which are more valid indices of real worth (31).

Taylor and Wherry (40) compared forced-choice and graphic rating scales under experimental and operational conditions. Ratings on each of the two types of forms were obtained both when the raters knew the
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results were intended only for research purposes and from these same raters when they were informed that they would be used for administrative purposes. The results showed that, although the mean scores increased for both forms in the "for keeps" situation over the research situation, the increase was greater with the graphic scale. Moreover the shape of the rating score distributions was more greatly altered for the graphic than for the forced-choice scale under the change from the research to the "for keeps" situation. The distribution of the graphic scores was much steeper at the high extreme, making discriminations in that area much cruder in the "for keeps" than in the research situation.

Reliability is another primary criterion used to evaluate a rating scale. The three methods by which reliability is determined are (1) an initial rating followed by a time interval and then a second rating on the same person by the same rater--test-retest method; (2) subdividing the rating scale into two equal parts either on the basis of odd and even items or first half with the second half--split half method; and (3) developing two comparable rating scales--alternate forms methods.

Berkshire and Highland (5) utilized all three methods for the six different formats of the forced-choice scale. For the preferred design, the one with tetrads of all positive statements, they found a corrected split-half reliability of .90; a test-retest reliability of .72, and an inter-form reliability of .60. Also based on the data for all six formats, they found that in the split-half method the magnitude of the reliability coefficients is closely related to the length of the form.

The last but not least important yardstick by which to evaluate the adequacy of a performance rating scale is validity. To determine
validity, it is necessary to compare the rating scale results with some independent measure of the performance of the ratees. The relationship between the predictor and criterion data expressed as a correlation is a measure of the validity of the scale.

Berkshire and Highland (5) found that the forced-choice rating scale of design 3, consisting of tetrads of all favorable statements, correlated .69 under experimental conditions with supervisory rankings of the ratees as the criterion, and .58 under operational conditions with the same criterion.

Clarke (8) found that two forced-choice rating scales had higher validity than their graphic counterparts when the latter were not preceded by a forced-choice form. However the validity of the graphic scales improved when the raters completed forced-choice scales prior to the graphic scales.

Taylor, Schneider and Clay (38) developed a forced-choice scale for retail store managers which correlated .60 with an adjusted objective criterion. Taylor, Schneider, and Symons (39) constructed a forced-choice scale for optical salesmen which correlated .43 with a cross validation sample. Peres (25) obtained a correlation of .53 for a forced-choice scale for highway patrolmen with a peer nomination criterion. Stander (32) built a forced-choice scale for city policemen which correlated .39 with a composite correlation of supervisory ratings and peer nominations. Ray (26) obtained a correlation of .53 for a forced-choice rating scale for clerical personnel with the same type of composite criterion.
This chapter has presented a statement of the problem and its setting both in regard to the organization in which the study was made and the literature pertinent to it. The next chapter presents the methodology involved in the development of the forced-choice reports and the criteria employed for validating them. Chapter 3 presents an analysis of the data collected for each of the reports and suggested modifications. The last chapter presents the summary and conclusions of the study.
CHAPTER II

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the methodology involved in the various phases of the study. The major phases included: (1) the development of the two forced-choice performance reports, each containing a level and a profile section; (2) the establishment and reliability, for validating the performance reports; and (3) the administration and scoring of the performance reports.

Description of the Developed Forced-Choice Reports

The performance reports (Appendix B) are entitled "The Professional Performance Report for County Extension Agent" and "The Professional Performance Report for County Extension Agent, Chairman." Each report contains both a descriptive choice or level section, and a descriptive ranking or profile section. The level section of each report provides a measure for inter-individual comparison based on over-all performance; whereas, the profile section of each report provides measures for intra-individual comparison based on the specific factors pertinent to over-all performance.

The level section of the Agent Report contains 30 tetrads, or sets of four statements each; and the Chairman Report includes 25 tetrads for the same section. The instructions to the describer, or rater, completing
this section of either report provide for his designating the two phrases, in each set of four, which are most descriptive of the ratee. For the profile section of the Agent Report, there are 15 dyads, or sets of two descriptive phrases each; and for the Chairman Report, there are 12 triads, or sets of three statements each. The instructions for this section of each of the reports provide for the describer to rank order the phrases in each set in accordance with the extent or degree of their applicability to the ratee.

Development of the Forced-Choice Reports

The methodological steps required in developing each of the forced-choice performance reports were identical. Hence the discussion of this major phase will be presented by first stating the specific procedure involved followed by the particulars relating to the development of the separate reports.

Procedure 1. Procurement of essays from appropriate personnel of the organization regarding a highly competent incumbent of the position for which the report is designed.

A letter was sent by Director Wood, in May 1960, to all agents in the state, and to the administrative and supervisory personnel of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service requesting that they submit essays regarding "The Best County Extension Agent Ever Known" (Appendix C). A total of ninety-five essays were received. These essays described the job behaviors of individuals functioning in the position of agent. They were pertinent for the acquisition of descriptive statements regarding agents but not for chairmen as well. Therefore a second letter
(Appendix C) was forwarded to the administrative and supervisory personnel, and to only those county agent personnel who fulfilled the chairman function. The request was made in August 1960 and asked for essays regarding "The Best County Extension Agent, Chairman in Terms of his Administrative and Total Program Responsibilities." A total of seventy-five essays were received with twenty per cent of them from the administrative and supervisory personnel, and eighty per cent from the chairmen.

Procedure 2. Selection of descriptive phrases or behaviorgrams from the essays, editing of them, and placement on separate 3x5 plain white cards.

The agent essays yielded 364 descriptive phrases and 297 behaviorgrams were abstracted from the chairman essays. Each of the phrases were typed on plain white 3x5 cards and were then edited for duplication of ideas, correction of spelling, and the addition of an action verb if none was included. However, great care was taken to maintain the essential wording and meaning of the statements as they were abstracted from the essays.

Procedure 3. Two sortings by personnel of the organization of the 3x5 cards containing the behaviorgrams. The first sorting was for the purpose of obtaining categories into which the total "packs" of cards could be subdivided. The subsequent sorting was to determine the reliability of each of the phrases in relation to its most appropriate category.

For the first sorting of each total pack of 3x5 cards, two groups of eight administrative and supervisory personnel participated. One group was involved in the sorting of phrases descriptive of the agents and the other group sorted the chairman phrases. Each sorter was personally contacted and provided with instructions regarding the sorting task.
In the case of the agent phrases, he was requested to first review the total pack of descriptive phrases in order to ascertain whether each of the phrases would apply to all agents irrespective of agent grouping. This was necessary for the agent phrases because of the agent specialities of agriculture, 4-H, and home economics, but was not required for the chairman phrases. Any phrase that did not so apply was removed. Additionally in the case of both the agent and chairman phrases, the initial sorters were asked to modify the phrase wording if they deemed it necessary to do so. The only appreciable modification was the elimination of the adjectives "all" and "never" on some of the phrases. Following this review of the phrases, the judges were asked to sort the phrases into groupings or categories which best reflected the contents of the phrases. The only restriction placed on the sorting process was that any sub-group should be sufficiently broad to include a minimum of thirty phrases, if possible.

Five categories or sub-groupings resulted from the sorting consensus of the agent phrases. These sub-groupings were entitled "acceptance of responsibilities," "interpersonal relations," "programming activities," "personal attributes and values," and "Extension teaching methods." In the second sorting of the agent phrases, eight different administrative and supervisory personnel were instructed to place each of the 3x5 cards into one of these five categories. The following descriptions of each of these categories were provided to the sorters.

Acceptance of Responsibilities

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) the varied roles and responsibilities of, and their fulfillment by, the county Extension agent; (b) that the county agent is a
member and representative of the Cooperative Extension Service and hence assimilates and promulgates the philosophy and objectives of the organization; (c) that the county agent is highly trained and has responsibilities as a professional person; (d) that the county agent is an individual with personal and family responsibilities; (e) that the county agent has civic responsibilities in each of the communities in the county; (f) that the county agent has responsibilities to the clientele, i.e., to the individual families, or members thereof, in the county.

Interpersonal Relations

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) the numerous and varied types of human relationships in which the county Extension agent is involved; (b) that the exercise of effective human relations skills, and the results of their fulfillment, further the Cooperative Extension Service activities; (c) that the county agent's relationships are with individuals and groups, directly or indirectly involved in Extension services.

Programming Activities

The descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) the numerous and large variety of activities in which the county Extension agent participates in programming; (b) a group of activities relate to the determination of program needs; (c) a group of them relate to the planning, organizing, and coordination activities required for setting up the programs; (d) that the county agent needs analytical and decision making abilities in handling daily problems that arise; (e) that the county agent completes reports relating to programmed activities; (f) that the county agent follows-up and evaluates the programmed activities.

Personal Attributes and Values

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) that the county Extension agent is an individual as well as an official performer in a position; (b) that the county agent as an individual has personal activities, a personal dress and manner, and personality characteristics; (c) that the county agent as an individual has personal values, beliefs, and opinions.

Extension Teaching Methods

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) that the county Extension agent has a role as an educational leader in the field of agriculture or home economics; (b) that
fulfillment of this role depends in part on the county agent's technical competence in one of these subject matter fields; (c) that the fulfillment of this role also depends on teaching knowledges and skills acquired by the county agent to impart the subject matter to the clientele on an individual or group basis; (d) that the exercise of leadership qualities are a vital part of the educator role; (e) that the county agent achieves recognition for the adequate fulfillment of the educational leadership role.

The consensus of the initial sortings of the chairman phrases resulted in four categories which were entitled "integrated total program," "Extension staff relations," "business operations," and "public relations." As with the agent phrases, the second group of sorters of the chairman phrases were asked to place each of the cards into one of these four groupings. Descriptions of each of these categories were provided for the sorters as follows:

Integrated Total Program

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) that the county Extension chairman has responsibility for accomplishing an integrated total program at the county level; (b) that he has an appreciation for and acceptance of the importance of each program area; (c) that he is responsible for the planning and evaluation of the total program; (d) that he consults with and keep informed of the activities and programs of the other county agents in order to do an effective job of coordination; (e) that he provides programming assistance to the other agents and occasionally attends their program activities; (f) that he establishes and maintains an effective County Extension Advisory Committee to consult with on the planning and carrying out of the total program at the county level; (g) that he coordinates the selection and use of lay leaders in the total program.

Extension Staff Relations

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) that the chairman has the responsibility for building an effective county Extension team; (b) that as a team leader he uses various methods and approaches to maintain harmonious relations among staff members; (c) that he holds and conducts office conferences for a variety of purposes; (d) that he fosters
the development of staff members; (e) that he counsels and consults with the staff about various matters; (f) that he is responsible for personnel and training affairs relating to the county staff; (g) that he as a leader establishes a pattern of professional standards; (h) that he has relations with district and state staff members.

Business Operations

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) that the chairman takes care of activities connected with office management, reports, budget and expenditures; (b) that he is responsible for procuring and maintaining adequate physical facilities and the needed equipment and supplies; (c) that he directs and coordinates the work of the secretarial staff; (d) that he is responsible for the collection of necessary information and data for written reports; (e) that he is responsible for securing an adequate budget and the efficient expenditure of it.

Public Relations

Descriptive phrases related to this factor reflect: (a) that the chairman assumes the responsibility for effective public relations at the county level; (b) that he uses mass communication media to keep the public informed; (c) that he has contacts with private organizations and other public agencies and their individual members to promote good public relations; (d) that in all his relations with the people in the county have influence on the public's acceptance of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

The extent of rater agreement in the second sortings for each of the sets of phrases determined which of the phrases were sufficiently reliable as to category grouping for retention and subsequent placement on the check lists. The requirement of at least 75 per cent rater agreement, or the placement of a given phrase by at least six of the eight judges, was arbitrarily established as the criterion for retaining a given phrase. There were 272 agent phrases and 229 chairman phrases which met this criterion.
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Table 1 presents the breakdown of the retained agent phrases in relation to extent of sorter agreement by category, and Table 2 provides the same data for the chairman phrases.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Per Cent Agreement on Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Responsibilities</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming Activities</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attributes and Values</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Teaching Methods</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Per Cent Agreement on Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Total Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Staff Relations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of these tables reveals a higher level of sorter-agreement by category for chairman phrases than for agent phrases. It is likely that this occurred because the chairman categories were more
homogeneous and definitive; whereas, there appeared to be some blending and overlapping of the agent categories. This seemed particularly so in regard to the agent categories entitled "interpersonal relations" and "personal attributes and values."

Procedure 4. Include the high percentage agreement phrases on a check list to be completed by organizational personnel by comparing each of the phrases on a 5 point applicability scale with the known job behaviors of specific high and low performing incumbents of the position for which the forced-choice performance report is designed.

For the agent check list, the 272 descriptive phrases were arranged in random order, and in similar manner the 229 phrases were arrayed on the chairman check list (Appendix D). The specific procedures followed by each administrative and supervisory staff member in completing the check lists were as follows:

1. The staff member thinks of two county Extension agents - one of whom is a most competent and most effective agent and another who is a least competent and least effective agent. (Throughout this entire procedure the names of the individuals are known only to the staff members. This procedure relates to the differentiating potential of the descriptive phrases rather than an evaluation of the individuals and hence names are not required.) The staff members were asked to select other than agricultural agents in order to insure adequate representation of the different types of agents.

2. The staff member rates each of these two agents on a 20 point scale (1-being low, 10-average, 20-high) representing their over-all competency and effectiveness as county Extension agents.

3. The staff member next thinks of two county Extension agent, chairman - one who is a most competent and most effective chairman and the other who is a least competent and least effective chairman - irrespective of the quality of their performance in the position of county Extension agent, agriculture.

4. The staff member then rates each of those two chairmen on a 20 point scale representing their over-all competency and effectiveness as county Extension agent, chairman.
5. Inasmuch as the two chairmen function in addition as county Extension agent, agriculture, the staff member also rates them on the 20 point county Extension agent scale as well.

The purposes of the above procedures are to insure that the staff member has specific agents and chairmen in mind when comparing the phrases to job performance and also to have a quantitative determination of the location of the selected agents and chairmen on a continuum of job performance.

6. The staff person then with the particular agent or chairman in mind compares each phrase of the appropriate group of phrases, with that person. The comparison of the person with each of the phrases is accomplished by means of the staff member asking himself or herself the following question for each phrase. "This phrase describes the person I am considering to a(n) __________ extent?" In the blank space should be placed one of 5 adjectives which are as follows: (1) very limited (2) below average (3) average (4) above average (5) very high.

Each administrative and supervisory staff member participating circled a number (1 to 5) for the appropriate adjective for each of the phrases on four identical sets of 272 descriptive phrases relating to the agent position and on two identical sets of 229 descriptive phrases relating to the chairman function. The scaled values for each phrase provided the data for statistical analysis.

Procedure 5. Statistical analysis, including factor analysis, of the check list data to determine the preference and discrimination indices as well as the general and specific factor loading for each of the phrases.

The preference index (P.I.) is determined for each phrase by computing its mean applicability value. It is a measure of "acceptability" of certain job behaviors in the agent position or chairman function as perceivec by the administrative and supervisory staff members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The discrimination index (D.I.) is a
measure of the degree to which a specific behavior contributes to success in the performance of the agent position or chairman function. More specifically it is a measure of the difference between the most and least competent agents or chairman on each phrase.

Figure 1 provides hypothetical data to illustrate the method of computing the preference and discrimination indices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Group</th>
<th>Applicability Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group Frequency (f)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group Frequency (f)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - Low Group Frequency (/H-L/)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ P.I. = \frac{\sum fw}{n} = \frac{280}{100} = 2.80 \]
\[ D.I. = \frac{\sum |H-L|}{2n} = 46 \]

Fig. 1. Computation of hypothetical preference and discrimination indices.

This procedural step includes also a separate factor analysis of the applicability values assigned to the descriptive statements on each of the check lists in order to determine the empirical clustering of items. Inasmuch as it was not feasible to factor directly matrices of 272 by 272 and 229 by 229 items, the method for factoring large numbers of items developed by Wherry and Winer (47) was utilized. This method takes into account the intercorrelations of groups of items rather than the intercorrelations of the individual items. Item groupings were earlier determined in the sorting process (Procedure 3) when the judges placed each of the descriptive phrases into one of the category phrase groupings.
The groupings of items by the judges are akin to the item clusters which are determined in the multiple-group factor method by examining the intercorrelations among the variables in the correlation matrix. For the agent phrases, there were five a priori sub-groups of items and four of the sub-groups had slightly excess of fifty items. The limit of the IBM 650 programs were fifty items to a sub-group. Hence those items in excess of fifty for the four sub-groups composed an additional sub-test. Similarly, in the case of the chairman descriptive phrases, there were four a priori sub-groups with two of them exceeding fifty items and these items constituted a fifth sub-test. The items included in the various sub-tests for the agent and chairman phrases are shown in Appendix E.

To facilitate the analysis, the data were processed on an IBM 650 digital computer utilizing a Wherry-Winer factor analysis program written by Goode (13). This program includes obtaining sub-test totals, the correlation of each item with its own sub-test as well as with the other sub-tests, and the intercorrelations of the sub-tests. Tables 3 and 4 show the intercorrelation matrices of the sub-tests of the agent and chairman phrases.

In the case of both of these matrices, the sub-test correlations are considered to define oblique vectors analogous to the centroids of groups which would be extracted in the multiple-group method. In the multiple-group method, a necessary condition is that the groups be linearly independent. To determine linear independence of sub-tests in the Wherry-Winer method, the $z$ portion of the Wherry test selection method (34) was used. The first sub-test entered, for the separate agent and chairman correlation
matrices, was that with the lowest average intercorrelation with all the others. This was followed by progressively adding categories whose variance indicated least overlap with those already selected. Only two of the agent sub-tests and three of the chairman sub-tests met the criterion of orthogonality.

**TABLE 3**

INTERCORRELATIONS OF SUB-TESTS OF AGENT PHRASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VIa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>.978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VIa Included phrases in excess of fifty from sub-tests II, III, IV, V.

**TABLE 4**

INTERCORRELATIONS OF SUB-TESTS OF CHAIRMAN PHRASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Va</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va</td>
<td></td>
<td>.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Va Included phrases in excess of fifty from sub-tests I and II.*
The intercorrelation matrices of the orthogonal agent and chairman sub-tests were then factored by the method of hierarchical factor solution without rotation developed by Wherry (48). For the agent phrases, a general factor and two specific factors resulted. These factor loadings are presented in Table 5.

### TABLE 5
FACTOR LOADINGS OF AGENT PHRASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Test</th>
<th>General Factor</th>
<th>Specific Factors</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hierarchical factor analysis of the chairman intercorrelation matrix produced a general factor and three specific factors. Table 6 shows these factor loadings.

### TABLE 6
FACTOR LOADINGS OF CHAIRMAN PHRASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Test</th>
<th>General Factor</th>
<th>Specific Factors</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the Doolittle-method, using the sub-test correlations with unity in the diagonals and the general and specific factor loadings as criteria, was used to obtain beta weights. The beta weights, which are actually maximized validity coefficients of the predictive ability of
the categories, were used to transform the item sub-test correlations into orthogonal factor loadings by post-multiplying the $r_{it}$ matrix. This was performed on the IBM 650. The resulting loadings are maximized orthogonal loadings for the phrases as predictors of sub-areas.

The forward and backward Doolittle solutions are presented in Appendix G.

Procedure 6. Descriptive statements are assigned to tetrads for the level section in accordance with the statistical criteria of preference and discrimination indices and "g" factor loadings. For the profile section, the size of the statement sets is governed by the number of specific factors extracted in the factor analysis and the three statistical criteria are employed to assign phrases to sets.

The statistical analyses of the check lists provided the required data for each of the individual descriptive phrases so as to construct the two forced-choice performance reports. Each report contained two forced-choice sections. The first section of each was a level type of forced-choice scale which was for the purpose of inter-individual comparison i.e., to measure the over-all job performance of agents or chairmen and to determine the individual employee's relative standing in relation to the total group. The second section was a profile type of forced-choice scale for the purpose of inter-individual comparison i.e., to measure the relative strengths or weaknesses of a given agent or chairman in relation to the specific factors derived from the factor analysis.

In order to assemble the level section of each report, all items included on the respective check lists served as a pool from which to draw statements for matching to make tetrads. The tetrads for each
level section were composed of phrases or items in accordance with the three statistical criteria of preference index, discrimination index and general factor loading. With regard to the preference index, each of the four phrases in a set was selected so as to have approximately the same preference index. Additionally one of the pairs of statements in each tetrad had about the same "high" discrimination index and general factor loading while the other pair had about the same "low" discrimination and general factor loading. The four statements in each tetrad were arranged alphabetically so as to randomize the phrases with respect to the statistical criteria.

Figures 2 and 3 present illustrative, rather than actually used, tetrads for the Agent and Chairman Reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Phrase</th>
<th>P.I.</th>
<th>D.I.</th>
<th>G Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devoted to helping people to help themselves</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a planned calendar of activities</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps people informed through newspapers and other mass media</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains cooperative relationships with leaders in the county</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Sample tetrad illustrative of the level section of the Agent Report.
Descriptive Phrase | P.I. | D.I. | G Loading |
-------------------|------|------|-----------|
Makes effective use of Extension resources in the county | 3.37 | 56 | .911 |
Gets an example in working with people | 3.36 | 56 | .912 |
Takes the leadership in organizing work on reports | 3.34 | 40 | .844 |
Uses only constructive criticism | 3.34 | 42 | .775 |

Fig. 3. Sample tetrad illustrative of the level section of the Chairman Report.

The two items in each of the two sample tetrads which would receive scoring credits are the ones with the higher discrimination indices and general factor loadings. The items in the tetrads of the actual performance reports do not include the statistical data. The mean values of the preference and discrimination indices and general factor loadings of the level section of the Agent Report are presented in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Items</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Means of Indices</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P.I.)</td>
<td>(D.I.)</td>
<td>(G Loading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Credit</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means of the preference and discrimination indices and general factor loadings of the credit and non-credit items of the level section of the Chairman Report are presented in Table 8.
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In order to assemble the profile section of each report, all items included on the respective check lists served as a pool from which to draw statements to be matched in sets. The number of items to be included in a set in the profile section is determined by the number of specific factors resulting from the factor analysis of the check list data. For the agent data, there were two specific factors extracted and hence the items on the profile section of the Agent Report were in sets of two or dyads. In the case of the factor analysis of the chairman check list data, there were three specific factors obtained and hence the profile section of the Chairman Report consists of sets of three statements or triads.

The dyadic and triadic statements of the agent and chairman profile sections were matched so that within each set all statements had about the same preference and discrimination indices, and general factor loadings. Additionally each statement within the set was highly loaded on one specific factor but negligibly loaded on the other specific factors.

Figures 4 and 5 provide sample sets of items for the two reports with the data regarding the statistical indices inserted after the statements. These data were not included in the actual reports.
Fig. 4. Sample dyad illustrative of the profile section of the Agent Report.

Fig. 5. Sample triad illustrative of the profile section of the Chairman Report.

The means of the indices for the statements included in the profile section of the Agent Report are shown in Table 9.

| TABLE 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **MEANS OF INDICES OF ITEMS IN PROFILE SECTION OF AGENT REPORT** |
| **Sub-areas** | **Means** | **Loading on own specific** | **Loading on other specific** |
| 1 | 3.26 | 52.67 | .844 | .289 | -.028 |
| 2 | 3.28 | 54.00 | .818 | .312 | .000 |
Table 10 presents the means of the indices for the statements included in the profile section of the Chairman Report.

### TABLE 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-areas</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Loading on own specific</th>
<th>Loading on other specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.I.</td>
<td>D.I.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>47.83</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The titles of the sub-areas or specific factors for the profile section of Agent Report and the descriptive statements representing these factors are as follows:

**Factor A: Interpersonal Relations**

- Uses tact in dealing with people.
- Discusses problems with co-workers.
- Seeks counsel and guidance of co-workers.
- Well thought of by co-workers.
- Values other people's experiences or views on alternative solutions.
- Able to work cooperatively with all types of clientele.
- Has a good understanding of human relations.
- Respects others' opinions concerning improvements.
- Informs co-workers of what he is doing.
- Is the kind of person you can go to with problems.
- Maintains good relations with county officials.
- Gives an individual a sense of confidence.
Considers other people's ideas before arriving at a decision.

Cooperates with co-workers.

Helps other staff members with problems.

Factor B: Program Development and Execution

Does own critical thinking.

Does not become bogged down in unnecessary details.

Demonstrates analytical ability in solving problems.

Makes deliberate decisions based upon facts and the situation.

Has ability to teach technical knowledge.

Keeps well informed of available resources of many different subjects.

Uses a variety of visual aids in teaching.

Has an effective way of making technical information apply to the job at hand.

Applies the problem solving method of program development.

Has an educational program designed to meet the needs of all people.

Uses demonstrations as one method of teaching.

Adjusts teaching methods to the group.

Keeps people informed through newspapers and other mass media.

Never plans more than can be done effectively.

Possesses ability in summarizing group consensus to reach conclusions.
The titles of the sub-areas or specific factors for the profile section of the Chairman Report and the statements representing these factors are as follows:

**Factor A: Extension Staff Relations**

Counsels with other staff members as the need arises.

Sees that all staff members receive proper recognition for their work.

Encourages other agents to participate in decisions.

Assists other county Extension agents with special events in their respective program areas.

Keeps the district supervisor adequately informed concerning appropriate county Extension matters.

Recognizes the professional capabilities of co-workers.

Interested in the personal and professional welfare of the county staff.

Assumes leadership with the County Extension Advisory Committee yet involves other agents.

Makes a point of complimenting co-workers for a job well done.

Believes in informal administrative procedure.

Sometimes attends 4-H and home economics meetings.

Assumes responsibility for the orientation and training of new Extension agents in the county.

**Factor B: Business Operations**

Develops and maintains an efficient office with pleasant working relations.

Keeps a complete accounting record of expenditures of county budget funds.

Evidences administrative ability in directing the affairs of the Extension office.

Keeps up-to-date on business procedures.
Has in operation effective office procedures.

Takes the leadership in organizing work on reports.

Has effective procedures for receiving office visitors.

Has an adequate understanding of office management.

Provides for and maintains a business-like office.

Procures optimum office space for effective operations.

Keeps adequate financial records of non-appropriated funds.

Applies accepted management principles in his role as office manager.

Factor C: Relations with Extensions' Publics

Works with the County Extension Advisory Committee to develop long-time objectives for the county Extension program.

Submits a digest of the annual report of results to county commissioners and state legislative representatives.

Makes effective use of Extension resources in the county.

Uses tours and exhibits to acquaint the public with the Extension Service.

Spends time in establishing public relations with other organizations.

Maintains good working relationships with all organized groups.

Is proficient in public relations for the county Extension program.

Urges lay leaders to accept responsibility for program planning and development.

Uses every opportunity to interpret Extension to the public.

Represents the Extension Service at most county events.
Assumes primary responsibility for the public relations program in the county.

Has developed a strong representative County Extension Advisory Committee.

The External Criteria

Any and every personnel instrument whether it be used for selection or for performance evaluation should be validated. In order to accomplish this a reliable criterion of performance is necessary but usually not easily obtainable. In the industrial and sales fields various criteria that have been used include productivity measures; turnover, absenteeism and accident data; results of standardized tests; customer reactions; and supervisory ratings. For this study, similar types of objective criteria such as annual salary, number of graduate hours completed, statistical and other information contained in monthly and annual reports and research data collected in various studies by the Research and Training Section of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service were considered, but each had weaknesses.

A number of military studies on leadership (17, 49, 51) had shown the value of peer nominations or "buddy ratings" as predictors, and studies by Sisson (31), Peres (25) and Stander (32) had successfully employed peer nominations as an external criterion.

The organizational structure of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and some of its procedures lend themselves to a consideration of peer nominations as a criterion. As described previously, the state is divided into four geographical districts and in addition each of these districts
is further sub-divided into four or five work groups which include five or six counties each. The staff complement of each county office usually includes an agricultural, a 4-H and a home economics agent. The agricultural agent also functions as chairman or the local Extension administrator for the county office. Occasional meetings are held on a work group basis as well as on a state-wide basis. Also agents operating in the adjacent counties have some opportunity for personal contacts. However it was not possible to ascertain whether they had sufficient relevant contacts to observe and be acquainted with the performance of other agents and chairman, to provide adequate criterion data.

Research studies by leading proponents of peer nomination methodology; e.g. Hollander (19) and Wherry and Fryer (49) indicated that reliable and valid nominations were obtainable with a limited amount of personal contact. Hollander in a methodological study on peer nominations made by twenty-three trainee sections at the Naval O.C.S. found that:

1. The corrected split-half reliability of scores from forms administered very early in training, after the groups had been together for four to five days, was a reasonable approximation of the reliability obtained with the same forms and the same group at later points in training.

2. Peer nominations administered at the third week of training yielded information substantially the same as at later points in time (19).

Wherry and Fryer in a similar study with candidates at the Signal Corps O.C.S. found that:

1. Peer nominations measured, as early as the first month of training, the same factors which they measured three months later.

2. What peer nominations measured in the first month is the same as that rater by superiors, rating after a four months period of operation.
3. It was not until the fourth month that superiors' ratings reflected the leadership factor which fellow students identified in their first month rating (49).

These investigators also provide the rationale for the success of peer nominations as predictors. They indicate that although individual ratings tend to be unreliable a way of overcoming this deficiency is to secure a large number of independent raters and the average of their ratings may provide a stable measure relatively free of bias.

Another study by Hollander (17) conducted with 268 naval aviation cadets reveals the uncanny ability of peers even when they have no opportunity to evaluate the type of behavior reflected in the criterion. In this case, peer nominations were made in each of the nine sections, each with about thirty cadets who had completed about three months of pre-flight training. The nominations were in terms of which cadets in each section were best or least qualified for a military leadership position. It was found that the peer nominations on leadership predicted the pass-fail criterion in flight training as well as the cadets' final pre-flight average.

Although peer nominations have been shown empirically to be reliable and valid, a question has been raised about the influence of friendships on the nominations. A study directed to this issue by Hollander showed that friends do receive a somewhat larger number of "high" nominations than their actual proportion would indicate but that friendship does not operate as an adversely biasing or invalidating factor (18). Furthermore a study by Hollander and Webb showed that "There is nowhere near a one-to-one relationship between choice as a friend and nominations as
'high' on a peer evaluation" and "...that a differing number of friends are nominated 'high' on the average, depending upon the characteristic set for evaluation" (20).

In view of the findings of these research studies, it was decided to try out peer nominations as a possible criterion for both the Agent and Chairman Reports.

The Peer Nomination Criterion

The methodology involved in gathering the peer nomination data for criterion purposes was comparable for both the Agent and Chairman Reports and hence will be discussed together.

The initial step was that of the compilation of lists of "eligible" peers. With regard to the agent group, an eligible peer was defined as "an agent who had been employed for at least a period of a year in his or her assigned work group at the time of the study." Similarly, an eligible peer chairman was "one who fulfilled this function for the same time period in the geographical district in which he was located at the time of the study."

Each eligible peer agent and peer chairman was sent an explanatory letter (Appendix E) regarding the reason for the request for peer nominations with an attached list of all eligible peers on a work group basis for agents and on a district basis for chairmen. The instructions in the agents' covering letter provided for the selection of three or four agents, depending on the number of eligible peers included, who in the respondent's opinion had done a better job and the three or four agents who had not
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done quite as well as the majority of the group "in furthering the philosophy and objectives of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service during the past 12 months." In like manner, the instructions in the covering letter for the chairmen provided for the selection of four chairmen who had done a somewhat better job and the four chairmen who had not done quite as well as the majority of the group through their chairmanship function "to further the philosophy, objectives and program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service during the past 12 months."

Basic to the determination of the peer nomination criterion score for an individual agent or chairman was the number of high and/or low nominations received. The nominations for each agent within a work group and for each chairman within a district were tallied. For each person, the number of low nominations was subtracted from the number of high nominations received. These raw scores for each individual were first converted into standard scores and secondly into "T" scores by the formula \(10z + 50\). The "T" scores became the criterion data.

Reliability Analysis of the Peer Nomination Criterion Data

As the peer nomination lists were received, they were date stamped and maintained in chronological sequence. After it was reasonably certain that the maximum number of returns were in, they were separated into their respective groups--work groups for agents and districts for chairmen. The lists for each group were then numbered from 1 to the number of lists in its respective group. If there was an even number of returns, the total number of returns was subdivided into halves on the basis of odd and even numbered returns. However if the total number of
returns was an odd number, a table of random numbers was used to eliminate one of the returns prior to subdividing the total group into equal halves on an odd-even basis. The nominations for each of the sub-groups, i.e., work group for agents and district for chairmen were then tallied to secure the number of high and low nominations for each individual. The basic data for further statistical analysis was the score obtained by subtracting the number of low nominations from high nominations and dividing by the total number of nominations for the sub-group. Then Pearson product moment correlations were computed between the two halves of each of the sub-groups.

The corrected split-half reliability correlations for the agent and chairman peer nomination criteria are presented in Table 11.

**TABLE 11**

**CORRECTED SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY CORRELATIONS OF PEER AGENT AND PEER CHAIRMAN NOMINATION CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Peer Agent</th>
<th>Peer Chairman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Paired Comparison Criterion**

A second criterion with which to validate the Agent and Chairman Reports was deemed desirable inasmuch as the peer nomination procedure
was not fully consistent with organizational procedures and policy. Moreover it was considered judicious to obtain criterion data from the supervisory team members because of the nature of their district supervisory responsibilities to the agent and chairmen. The paired comparison technique was considered the most feasible method for collecting criterion data from the supervisory personnel.

Because of the lengthy intervening time period between the collection of the two types of criterion data, there was not a one-to-one correspondence in either the peer agent nomination and paired agent comparison or the peer chairman nomination and paired chairman comparison criterion groups. The lists of eligible agents and chairmen for the paired comparison criterion data included those employed for at least a period of a year as of August 1, 1961; whereas, the date for the same length of service requirement for the peer nomination criterion data was September 1, 1960. During the elapsed time some of the agents and chairmen had terminated their employment and others who were not eligible originally had a sufficiently long period of employment by August 1961 to be included in the paired comparison criterion groups.

The procedures followed in collecting the paired comparison criterion data was similar for agents and chairmen. First lists of eligible agents and chairmen by districts were compiled. Eligibility for inclusion rested solely on the individual's being employed as an agent or chairman for a year in the geographical district in which he was functioning as of August 1, 1961. In the case of agents, they were sub-grouped according
to their area of specialization i.e., agriculture, 4-H, and home economics for each of the districts; however, no subdivision of chairmen within districts was needed.

Secondly, slips containing pairs of agents and chairmen were typed for distribution to the supervisors. For any given group, the number of paired comparisons was \( \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \). In order to avoid any name positional response set, each name was placed on the left and right hand sides of the pairs an equal number of times. Moreover prior to distribution, the slips were shuffled so that the same name did not appear consecutively before the rater as he made the paired comparisons. The rater was requested to indicate which agent or chairman was the better over-all employee by placing a check in a space adjacent to the person's name.

Paired comparison criterion data were provided by the district supervisors for each of the three agent groupings, and the 4-H and home economics supervisors provided this criterion data for their counterpart agent groups. For the chairman criterion data, each supervisor made paired comparisons of the chairmen in his district. A raw score for each agent or chairman was based on the number of times he was selected in each of the pairs in which his name appeared. Each agriculture agent had one, each 4-H and home economics agent had two, and each chairman had three raw scores. These raw scores were converted into standard scores and then into "T" scores. The "T" scores became the criterion data.
Reliability Analysis of the Paired Comparison Criterion Data

The reliability of the paired agent and paired chairman comparison criteria was determined by the extent of agreement between the different supervisory ratings. In the case of the agent criterion, the correlations of the district supervisors' ratings with the 4-H and home economics supervisors' ratings for the 4-H and home economics agents, respectively, are shown in Table 12. Only the district supervisor provided paired comparison ratings on the agriculture agents and hence no reliability data was possible on this agent grouping. The extent of agreement between the two pairs of supervisory raters on a district and state-wide basis indicates a relatively high level of reliability of the paired agent criterion data for the 4-H and home economics agent groupings and would suggest that the reliability of this criterion is adequate.

### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>4-H Supervisor</th>
<th>4-H Supervisor Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three supervisors provided paired comparison ratings on the chairmen in their respective districts. Table 13 presents the inter-rater correlations for each of the three pairs of supervisors. These correlations are relatively high and uniform in three of the four districts as well as on a state-wide basis and indicate an acceptable level of reliability for the paired comparison chairman criterion.

**TABLE 13**

**RELIABILITY OF SUPERVISORY PAIRED COMPARISON CHAIRMAN CRITERION AS DETERMINED BY INTER-RATER CORRELATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>4-H Supervisor</th>
<th>Home Economics Supervisor</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The separate peer nomination and supervisory paired comparison criteria for both the agents and the chairmen were found to have an adequate level of reliability. In addition, the separate pairs of criteria correlated positively with each other. Table 14 shows that the peer nominations of agents and the supervisory paired comparisons
of agents were consistently related for each of the districts as were the peer nominations of chairmen and the supervisory paired comparisons of chairmen.

**TABLE 14**

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PEER NOMINATION AND SUPERVISORY PAIRED COMPARISON CRITERIA FOR AGENTS AND FOR CHAIRMEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Agents N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Chairmen N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administration and Scoring of the Reports**

An over-all plan for the administration of the two forced-choice performance reports was drawn-up in consultation with Dr. Robert W. McCormick, Assistant Director of Research and Training, and approved by the administrative cabinet of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

The plan provided for the completion of the Agent Report by the personnel of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as follows:

1. The district supervisor, on each of the district supervisory teams, would complete the reports for all agents assigned to his respective district.

2. The 4-H and home economics supervisors, on each of the district supervisory teams, would complete the reports for their counterpart agent groups assigned to their respective district.
The Agent Report completed by these personnel constitute what is subsequently referred to as the "supervisory described" condition of administration for the Agent Report.

3. All agents in the county offices would complete the Agent Report form as a self-described report or self-rating.

Reports thus completed are later referred to as the "self-described" condition of administration for the Agent Report.

4. The chairmen, or local Extension administrators, in the county offices throughout the State of Ohio would complete the Agent Report for those agents assigned to their respective field offices.

Reports completed in this manner are subsequently referred to as the "chairman-described" condition of administration.

With regard to the Chairman Report, the plan provided for its completion by the personnel of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as follows:

1. The three supervisors for each of the four districts would individually complete the Chairman Report for each of the chairmen assigned to their respective district.

Reports completed by these personnel are later referred to as the "supervisory-described" condition of administration for the Chairman Report.

2. The chairmen in each of the county offices would complete the Chairman Report as a self-described report or self-rating.

Reports completed in this manner are subsequently referred to as the "self-described" condition of administration for the Chairman Report.

Dr. Robert W. McCormick, Assistant Director, Research and Training, and Mr. E. L. Kirby, Assistant Director, Personnel, conducted meetings
with the district supervisory teams and with the county personnel in order to explain the over-all plan for the administration of the reports, to enlist the full support and cooperation of the personnel, to review with them the instructions to be followed in completing the reports, and to distribute the reports as well as making the necessary arrangements for their return. Special emphasis was placed, for all conditions of administration, on the importance of the personnel completing the reports independently.

The mechanics of scoring are relatively simple and can be efficiently performed manually by the use of scoring-keys with the allotted weights or credits for each of the statements. If desired, provision can be made for the raters' responses to be placed on IBM answer sheets and thus be scored by machine.

The scoring system utilized for the level section of each of the reports was to assign a credit of one for each of the two phrases in a tetrad which had the higher discrimination index and general factor loading. The remaining two phrases were assigned zero credits. The level section of the Agent Report contained 30 tetrads and hence the maximum and minimum possible scores were 60 and zero. The upper and lower limits of the possible scores for the level section of the Chairman Report were 50 and zero inasmuch as it included only 25 tetrads.

For the profile section of each report, each phrase received the value of the rank to which it was allocated within the set of statements. In the case of the profile section of the Agent Report, there are two statements in a set and hence each statement received a value of one or two.
Inasmuch as there are 15 dyads with each statement representing one of the two specific factors, the score for either factor can range from 15 to 30, with a combined score for both factors of 45. The profile section of the Chairman Report contained 12 triads with each statement receiving a value of one, two, or three. Each statement in a set represents a different one of the three specific factors. Thus the score for each factor can range from 12 to 36 with a total score for all three factors of 72.

In summary, this chapter has presented the methodological steps involved in the development of the two performance reports each consisting of both a level and a profile type of forced-choice scale. Sample sets of items from each section of the reports were provided for illustrative purposes. Data with regard to the internal structure of the reports were provided in the form of means of the various statistical indices utilized in assembling the reports. In addition the procedures involved in the collection of the criterion data as well as the determination of the reliability of the criteria were presented. The chapter was concluded by a discussion of the conditions of administration and the scoring system employed for each of the reports.
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CHAPTER III
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis and discussion of the data collected for each of the two forced-choice performance reports. The data provided a basis for evaluating the level section of the Agent and Chairman Reports in relation to the criteria of (1) biasability, (2) reliability, and (3) validity. Additionally, the composition of the level section of each of the reports, as completed by the supervisors, was analyzed for individual tetrad predictive efficiency. Thirdly, the data provided by the supervisors on the profile section of each of the reports was analyzed. Fourthly, the results on the level and profile sections of both reports completed by the supervisors were converted into decile norms on a state-wide basis. Lastly, the supervisory descriptions of the chairman-agriculture agent group on the level section of the Agent and Chairman Reports were compared.

Analysis of the Level Section Data of the Reports in Relation to Three Performance Report Criteria

The first criterion for judging the adequacy of the level section for each of the forced-choice performance reports was that of biasability. For this study, biasability was construed as the ability of the rating scale to resist the effects of rater leniency. The mean scores, the standard deviations of the scores, and measures of skewness and kurtosis
of the distributions of scores provided objective measures of this criterion.

For the Agent Report, there were three groups of describers as follows: (1) the three supervisors in each of the four districts, (2) the agents themselves, and (3) the chairmen in each of the county offices.

Table 15 presents the means and standard deviations of the Agent Report for these three conditions of administration. The state-wide mean is approximately the same for each of these conditions. However the dispersion of scores is greater, as would be expected, for the supervisory described condition than for either of the other two conditions. The means and standard deviations are relatively uniform from district to district within each of the three conditions.

**TABLE 15**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF LEVEL SECTION SCORES OF AGENT REPORT UNDER THREE CONDITIONS OF ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Supervisory Described</th>
<th>Self Described</th>
<th>Chairman Described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>32.68</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Represents one report for each agriculture agent and two reports for each 4-H and home economics agent.

*b* Represents reports for only 4-H and home economics agent.
A theoretical normal distribution of scores for the Agent Report would have a mean of 30.00 and a standard deviation of 8.11 (based on plus and minus 3.70 z). Also the normal distribution would have a skewness value of .00 and a kurtosis value of 3.00. Table 16 shows that the empirical distributions obtained under each of the conditions of administration are negatively skewed and platykurtic.

### TABLE 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions of Administration</th>
<th>Agent Report</th>
<th>Chairman Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td>2.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>2.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>2.893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Condition did not apply to Chairman Report.*

Table 17 presents the means and standard deviations of the Chairman Report as completed by the supervisors and the chairman themselves. The state-wide mean obtained under the self-described conditions is significantly greater \(t = 4.089\) at the .01 level than the state-wide mean obtained under the supervisory described condition. The standard deviations of the self-described reports are much smaller than those of the supervisory-described condition, however on a state-wide basis the difference is not statistically significant \(F=1.222\).
TABLE 17

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF LEVEL SECTION SCORES OF CHAIRMAN REPORT UNDER TWO CONDITIONS OF ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Supervisory Described</th>
<th>Self Described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Represents three reports for each chairman.

A theoretical normal distribution of scores for the Chairman Report would have a mean of 25.00 and a standard deviation of 6.76 (based on plus and minus 3.70 z). Table 16 reveals that the distribution of the self-described Chairman Report scores are very slightly positively skewed and slightly platykurtic. On the other hand, the distribution of scores for the supervisory described Chairman Report is slightly negatively skewed and somewhat platykurtic.

The second criterion used to evaluate the level section of the forced-choice performance reports was that of reliability. The split-half method was one of two methods employed to determine the reliability of the reports. Under this method, the scores obtained on the odd and even numbered tetrads were correlated and then corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to adjust for the decreased number of tetrads.
Table 18 shows that the reliability correlations of the Agent Report are fairly consistent and high by districts as well as on a state-wide basis under the supervisory described condition. However the reliability of the Agent Report under the self-described and chairman-described conditions shows marked deviations from district to district and are not adequate on a state-wide basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar pattern occurred with the split-half reliability data for Chairman Report as shown in Table 19. The supervisory descriptions are highly reliable for three of the districts as well as on a state-wide basis. However the reliability of the self-described reports is uneven from district to district and inadequate on a state-wide basis.
TABLE 19
CORRECTED SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITY CORRELATIONS OF LEVEL SECTION OF CHAIRMAN REPORT UNDER TWO CONDITIONS OF ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Supervisory Described</th>
<th>Self Described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second method used to determine the reliability of the level sections of the Agent and Chairman Reports was that of inter-rater agreement. In the case of the Chairman Report, the three supervisors of each district described the chairmen of their respective districts. The intercorrelations of these raters by pairs are shown in Table 20. On a state-wide basis, the inter-rater correlations are consistent and high among the three pairs of raters, and for the individual districts they are relatively consistent and high in three of the four districts.

For the Agent Report, it was possible to pair the district supervisors with the 4-H and home economics supervisors, only. Hence the correlations reflect the supervisory ratings on the majority, but not all, of the agents.
### Table 20

**RELIABILITY OF SUPERVISORY DESCRIPTIONS ON LEVEL SECTION OF CHAIRMAN REPORT AS SHOWN BY INTER-RATER CORRELATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D.S.</th>
<th>4-H</th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 presents the inter-rater correlations. The extent of agreement between raters is uneven on a district basis and the state-wide correlations indicate a fair degree of reliability.
The third criterion used to evaluate the level section of the forced-choice reports was that of validity. The two criteria employed for the assessment of the over-all performance of agents and chairmen were peer nominations and supervisory paired comparisons. The reliabilities of these criteria were presented in Chapter 2. Table 22 shows the correlations of the level section scores of the Agent Report, obtained under three conditions of administration, with the two criteria. All the correlations between the predictor data, at the district and state-wide levels, and each of the criteria are statistically significant for the supervisory-described condition. For the self-described and chairman-described conditions, the correlations for the most part are low and some of them are negative. However, exceptions are the correlations for the southwest district where the chairmen provided descriptions of agents which significantly correlated with both criteria. On a state-wide basis,
the self-descriptions correlated significantly with the peer nomination criterion but in the reverse direction. The chairman descriptions on a state-wide basis correlated significantly with the supervisory paired comparison criterion but the correlations by districts were not consistent.

### Table 22

**Correlations of Level Section Scores of Agent Report (Under Three Conditions of Administration) with Two Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Supervisory Described</th>
<th>Self Described</th>
<th>Chairman Described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>.276&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.688&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=91)</td>
<td>(N=100)</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>-.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=91)</td>
<td>(N=98)</td>
<td>(N=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>-.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=82)</td>
<td>(N=92)</td>
<td>(N=48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=82)</td>
<td>(N=106)</td>
<td>(N=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>-.144&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=346)</td>
<td>(N=396)</td>
<td>(N=201)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>All correlations in this column are significant at the .01 level.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level.

The correlations of the level section scores of the Chairman Report, under two conditions of administration, with the criteria are presented in Table 23. Again the level section completed by the supervisors correlated significantly with each of the criteria and particularly the
paired comparison criterion. However the self-described reports show little or no relationship with either criterion.

### TABLE 23

**CORRELATIONS OF LEVEL SECTION SCORES OF CHAIRMAN REPORT (UNDER TWO CONDITIONS OF ADMINISTRATION) WITH TWO CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Supervisory Described</th>
<th>Self Described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>.405&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.722&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=60)</td>
<td>(N=60)</td>
<td>(N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=60)</td>
<td>(N=60)</td>
<td>(N=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=54)</td>
<td>(N=54)</td>
<td>(N=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=63)</td>
<td>(N=63)</td>
<td>(N=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=237)</td>
<td>(N=237)</td>
<td>(N=77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>All correlations in this column are significant at the .01 level.

The validity correlations for the supervisory described condition of the level sections of the Agent and Chairman Reports in Tables 22 and 23 are based on the individual ratings by each of the supervisors and their separate paired comparison (agent and chairman) criterion data. Bayroff, Haggerty, and Rundquist (3) found that the average of a number of ratings was more valid than a single rating per ratee. Thus the average of the level section scores of the supervisory descriptions were correlated with the average of the paired comparison criterion ratings provided by these supervisors. The correlations for the average predictor and criterion data are shown in Table 24. These correlations are
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substantially greater, on both district and state-wide levels, than the previously obtained correlations based on the individual data.

**Table 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Agent Average Criterion</th>
<th>Chairman Average Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.681*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Average score of two reports for 4-H and home economics agents. Agriculture agents described only by district supervisor. Average score of three descriptions for each chairman.

2. All correlations in this column are significant at the .01 level.

In summary, the level section of both the Agent and Chairman Reports showed some susceptibility to the effects of rater leniency. Bass (2) has suggested the method of discriminate binary scoring as a way of counteracting leniency effect without loss of internal consistency or validity.

With regard to the internal consistency of the reports as determined by the split-half method, the supervisors provided fairly reliable ratings of agents, but neither the agent self-descriptions nor the chairman-descriptions of agents possessed sufficient reliability. Reliabilities as
determined by inter-rater correlations were slightly lower for both the Agent and Chairman Reports than the split-half reliabilities.

The Agent and Chairman Reports correlated significantly with both the peer nomination and paired comparison criteria when completed by the supervisors. However the self-ratings by agents did not correlate significantly with either criterion. The chairman descriptions of agents correlated significantly with the supervisory paired comparison criterion but not with peer nominations.

**Internal Analysis of the Level Sections**

A further consideration with regard to the level section of both the Agent and Chairman Reports was whether each of the tetrads was sufficiently predictive of the criterion to merit being included. In order to determine the predictive efficiency of the tetrads individually in each of the reports, a tetrad analysis was made using the chi square statistic based on the upper and lower 27% paired comparison (agent and chairman) criterion groups. The agent level section contained 30 tetrads and the results of the tetrad analysis are presented in Table 25. The data indicates that there were only four tetrads which did not significantly differentiate between the two extreme criterion groups and the majority of the tetrads, 18 out of 30, differentiated at the .001 level of significance.

Table 26 presents the tetrad analysis data for the Chairman Report. A large majority (20 out of 25) of the tetrads was found to differentiate between the two extreme criterion groups at the .001 level and only three tetrads were ineffective.
**TABLE 25**

TETRAD ANALYSIS DATA FOR SUPERVISORY DESCRIBED LEVEL SECTION OF AGENT REPORT BASED ON UPPER AND LOWER 27% PAIRED COMPARISON AGENT CRITERION GROUPS (N=208)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tetrad Number</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Tetrad Number</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>89.45</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>23.23</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>35.97</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aNot statistically significant.

**TABLE 26**

TETRAD ANALYSIS DATA FOR SUPERVISORY DESCRIBED LEVEL SECTION OF CHAIRMAN REPORT BASED ON UPPER AND LOWER 27% PAIRED COMPARISON CHAIRMAN CRITERION GROUPS (N=128)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tetrad Number</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Tetrad Number</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>52.58</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>48.68</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>45.74</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>39.74</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>36.48</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>44.54</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aNot statistically significant.
Inasmuch as each report contained a small number of ineffective tetrads, the Agent and Chairman Reports completed by the supervisors, were rescoped with these tetrads omitted. The means and standard deviations of these modified level sections are shown in Table 27. A comparison of these data with those of Tables 15 and 17 indicates that the means and standard deviations are accordingly reduced with about the same relative standings by districts.

### TABLE 27

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MODIFIED LEVEL SECTION SCORES OF AGENT AND CHAIRMAN REPORTS COMPLETED BY SUPERVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Modified Agent Report</th>
<th>Modified Chairman Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>27.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>28.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recomputed validity correlations for the modified level section scores of the Agent and Chairman Reports are presented in Table 28. They show a very slight increase for each of the districts and on a state-wide basis over the previous correlations (Tables 22 and 23) based on the full level sections.
TABLE 28

CORRELATIONS OF MODIFIED LEVEL SECTION SCORES OF AGENT AND CHAIRMAN REPORTS COMPLETED BY SUPERVISORS WITH TWO CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>.303a</td>
<td>.680a</td>
<td>.418a</td>
<td>.731a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=90)</td>
<td>(N=100)</td>
<td>(N=60)</td>
<td>(N=60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=92)</td>
<td>(N=98)</td>
<td>(N=60)</td>
<td>(N=60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=83)</td>
<td>(N=92)</td>
<td>(N=54)</td>
<td>(N=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=80)</td>
<td>(N=106)</td>
<td>(N=63)</td>
<td>(N=63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=345)</td>
<td>(N=396)</td>
<td>(N=237)</td>
<td>(N=237)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aAll correlations in this column are significant at the .01 level.

Moreover the split-half reliability of each of the modified level sections, with a reduced number of tetrads, continues about the same for the Agent Report and is even increased for the Chairman Report as shown by the corrected split-half reliability correlations in Table 29. These data suggest that in future administrations of the Reports that the modified rather than the full level sections should be utilized.
Another consideration explored for future administrations was the feasibility of using alternate short forms of the level section of each of the reports. For the Agent Report, the 26 statistically significant tetrads were subdivided into two short forms, each consisting of 13 tetrads. This was accomplished by assigning tetrads to each short form in accordance with numbers drawn from a table of random numbers. In like manner, two short forms of the Chairman Report, each including 11 tetrads, were developed. The validity correlations of the agent and chairman short forms with the appropriate supervisory paired comparison criterion are shown in Table 30. Both forms for each of the reports correlated significantly for each of the districts and on a state-wide basis. A comparison of these correlations with those in Tables 22 and 23 indicate that the short forms are almost as valid as the full level sections of their respective reports.
TABLE 30
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUPERVISORY DESCRIBED LEVEL SECTION SHORT FORMS WITH SUPERVISORY PAIRED COMPARISON CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Agent Short Forms</th>
<th>Chairman Short Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Form A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}All correlations in this column are significant at the .01 level.

Moreover the alternate form reliability as shown in Table 31 for each of these sets of short forms is relatively high considering the small numbers of tetrads included.

TABLE 31
ALTERNATE FORM RELIABILITY OF SUPERVISORY DESCRIBED LEVEL SECTION SHORT FORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Agent Short Forms</th>
<th>Chairman Short Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the internal analysis of the level sections of the Agent and Chairman Reports showed that the majority of the tetrads in each report were effective predictors. Modified agent and chairman level sections resulted from the elimination of four tetrads from the original Agent Report and three tetrads from the original Chairman Report. The modified level sections produced proportionately decreased means and standard deviations, slightly increased validity correlations, and about the same split-half reliabilities as the full level sections of their respective reports. Each of the modified level sections were subdivided into two short forms. Both the agent short forms and the chairman short forms correlated almost as highly with the supervisory paired comparison (agent and chairman) criteria as did the full level sections of the Agent and Chairman Reports. Moreover the alternate form reliability of each set of short forms was relatively high considering the small numbers of tetrads included.

Analysis of Profile Section Data of the Reports

Inasmuch as the agent self-descriptions and the chairman-descriptions of agent on the level section of the Agent Report produced neither adequate reliability nor sufficient validity, the profile section of the Agent Report for these two rating conditions was not analyzed. Therefore Table 32 showing the intercorrelations of the specific factors with each other and with the level section scores are based only on the supervisory descriptions of agents. Because of the reciprocal relationships between the rankings assigned to statements within sets of a diagnostic forced-choice report, the intercorrelations of the specifics should be negative.
There were only two specific factors for the Agent Report and because of this and the reciprocal ranking relationship they are perfectly negatively correlated on a district and state-wide basis.

**TABLE 32**

**INTERCORRELATIONS OF SUPERVISORY DESCRIBED AGENT PROFILE SECTION SPECIFIC FACTORS AND CORRELATIONS OF EACH SPECIFIC FACTOR WITH THE AGENT LEVEL SECTION SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Specific Factors A &amp; B</th>
<th>Specific Factors and Level Section Scores A &amp; LS B &amp; LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-.040 - .019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.046 -.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.177 -.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.166 -.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.118(\text{b}) -.172(\text{a})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a}\) Significant at the .01 level.

\(\text{b}\) Significant at the .05 level.

The specific factor scores are supposed to be independent of the level section scores and in addition because of the reciprocal ranking relationships the correlations should be both positive and negative. Reference to Table 32 shows that the state-wide correlations of the two specific factor scores correlate significantly with the level section scores in different directions. However the specific factors would account for only .044 of the variance of the level section.

For the Chairman Report, there were three specific factors. Table 33 shows each of the three pairs of specific factors intercorrelated
negatively. The correlations of the specific factor scores with the level section scores are significant for most of the districts and for two of the three specifics on a state-wide basis. However the specific factors would account for only .472 of the variance of the level section.

TABLE 33
INTERCORRELATIONS OF SUPERVISORY DESCRIBED CHAIRMAN PROFILE SECTION SPECIFIC FACTORS AND CORRELATIONS OF EACH SPECIFIC FACTOR WITH THE CHAIRMAN LEVEL SECTION SCORES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Specific Factors</th>
<th>Specific Factors and Level Section Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>A &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B &amp; C</td>
<td>A &amp; LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B &amp; LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C &amp; LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.650&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.262&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.495&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.643&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.607&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.267&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.470&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.574&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.285&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.505&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>-.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.539&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.407&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .01 level.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .05 level.

Development of State-wide Norms

The results of the supervisory described Agent and Chairman Reports were utilized to establish decile norms for both the level and profile sections of each of the reports. These decile norms appear in Appendix H.

The decile norms for the level and profile sections of the Chairman Report were based on the average of the scores obtained from the three supervisory descriptions. However the decile norms for the level and
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profile sections of the Agent Report were based on a single rating for
garduage agents and the average of two supervisory ratings for the
4-H and home economics agents.

The level section decile norms provide a basis for comparing, on a
state-wide basis, the agents and chairman, separately, with regard to
their overall performance. The profile section decile norms provide a
basis for making profiles to show the individual agent's or chairman's
relative strengths and weaknesses for each of the specific factors re-
levant to over-all performance. The profiles are useful for counseling
purposes and provide the agent or chairman with a comparison of his self-
profile with that provided by the supervisory personnel. Illustrative
profiles are included in Appendix I.

Supervisory Descriptions of the Chairman-Agent Group

In each of the counties, the chairman or local Extension Adminis-
trator also functions as an agriculture agent. Hence for this group of
individuals, there were two supervisory described level section scores;
one on the Chairman Report and the other on the Agent Report. Thus this
group of individuals provided a "test" of the reports in relation to
their ability to discriminate between the two different types of func-
tioning of the same individuals. It was recognized that not all of these
individuals operated at the same level in both of these functions but
that some performed better as chairmen and others as agents. However it
was expected that there would be a positive correlation between the
ratings.
Table 3 indicates that on a state-wide basis there is a significant positive relationship between the performance of these individuals in the two different types of functions. However it is not so high that it does not differentiate between their functioning as agents and as chairmen. Moreover the wide differences in the correlations on a district basis suggests further that the reports do differentiate well.

**Table 3**  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE LEVEL SECTION SCORES OF THE SUPERVISORY DESCRIBED CHAIRMAN\(^1\) AND AGENT REPORTS FOR CHAIRMAN AGRICULTURE AGENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.729(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.517(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Average level score of the three supervisory descriptions on the Chairman Report.

\(^a\)Significant at the .01 level.

In summary, the data presented in this chapter on the level section of the two forced-choice performance reports supported the use of only the supervisory descriptions of agents and chairmen for administrative purposes. The data regarding the internal analysis of the reports suggested the utilization of the modified rather than the full level section of each of the reports in future administrations. Moreover
subdividing the modified level sections provided reliable and valid alternate short forms for use with both agents and chairmen if they should be needed. The last chapter presents the summary and conclusions of the study, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Problem

The purpose of this research was to develop and validate forced-choice performance reports for the position of county Extension agent and the function of county Extension agent, chairman in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Each of the two developed reports included both an evaluative or level and a descriptive ranking or profile type of forced-choice scale. The level scales were utilized to evaluate the over-all performance of agents and chairmen. The profile scales served as a basis for determining the relative strengths and weaknesses of the individual agent or chairman in relation to the independent dimensions of performance which contributed to over-all agent or chairman proficiency. The level sections or scales of the rating instruments were evaluated in relation to the three criteria of: (1) biasability, (2) reliability, and (3) validity. The external criteria used to validate the level sections were peer nominations by agents and chairmen, and paired comparison ratings by supervisors.
Procedures

The methodological steps utilized in the development and validation of each of the forced-choice performance reports were as follows:

1. Procurement of essays from appropriate personnel of the organization regarding a highly competent incumbent of the position for which the scale was designed.

2. Selection of descriptive phrases or behaviorgrams from the essays, editing of them, and placement on separate 3x5 plain white cards.

3. Two sortings by personnel of the organization of the 3x5 cards containing the behaviorgrams. The first sorting was for the purpose of obtaining categories into which the total "pack" of cards could be subdivided. The subsequent sorting was to determine the reliability of each of the phrases in relation to its most appropriate category grouping.

4. Inclusion of the high per cent agreement phrases on a check list to be completed by organizational personnel by comparing each of the phrases on a five point applicability scale with the known job behaviors of specific high and low performing incumbents of the position for which the report is designed.

5. Statistical analysis, including factor analysis, of the check list data to determine the preference and discrimination indices as well as the general and specific factor loadings for each of the phrases. The Wherry-Winer method for factoring large numbers of items is the preferred factor analytic method.

6. Descriptive statements were assigned to tetrads for the level section in accordance with the statistical criter of preference and discrimination indices and "g" factor loadings. All statements in a
tetrad had approximately the same preference index. Also one pair of the statements in the tetrad were "high" in discrimination index and "g" factor loadings. The other pair of statements had "low" discrimination indices and "g" factor loadings. For the profile section, the size of the statement sets was governed by the number of specific factors extracted in the factor analysis. The statistical criteria of preference and discrimination indices, and "g" factor and specific factor loadings were employed to assign phrases to sets in the profile section. All statements in a set have approximately the same preference and discrimination indices as well as "g" factor loadings. In addition each statement has a high loading on one of the specific factors and negligible loadings on the other specific factors.

7. Administration of the report. For this study, the Chairman Report was administered on a supervisory-described and self-described bases. The Agent Report, in addition to these two conditions of administration, was completed by the chairman.

8. Development of a scoring system. An arbitrary system was employed which involved assigning a credit of one to the two statements, in each tetrad of the level section, which had "high" discrimination indices and "g" factor loadings. The remaining two statements in each tetrad were assigned zero credit. The scoring of the profile section was based on the rank each statement in a set received. The agent profile section was composed of dyads and hence each statement received a rank of one or two. The profile section of the Chairman Report contained triads and thus each statement received a rank of one, two, or three.
9. Validation of the level section of the report. This section of both reports was validated by the use of peer nominations and supervisory paired comparison ratings as external criteria. Peer nominations were collected from both the agents and the chairmen and the reliabilities of each were ascertained by the split-half method. The corrected split-half reliability correlation for the peer agent nominations, on a statewide basis, was found to be .766 and for the chairmen it was .908. Also criterion data was obtained from the supervisory personnel in the form of paired comparison ratings of agents and chairmen. The reliabilities of these ratings were determined by means of inter-rater correlations. The average reliability correlation, on a state-wide basis, for the paired comparison agent criterion was .788 and it was found to be .792 for the chairmen. These data indicated a sufficiently high level of reliability of both types of criteria to validate the reports. The correlations between the peer nominations and the supervisory paired comparison criteria was .549 for agents and .586 for chairmen.

10. Cross validation. The research did not include a cross validation group.

Results

The level sections of the Agent and Chairman Reports fulfilled the three performance report criteria in varying degrees. With regard to the criterion of resistance to rater leniency, the means of the agent level section, under each of three conditions of administration, were slightly greater than the mean of a theoretical normal curve for the agent data and the empirical distributions ranged from slightly to
somewhat negatively skewed. However all three distributions were platykurtic and there was no large amount of "piling-up" of scores at the high end of the distribution.

Similarly the means of the chairman level section scores under the two conditions of administration, were slightly greater than the mean of a theoretical normal curve for the data. The distribution of the scores under the supervisory described condition were slightly negatively skewed and somewhat platykurtic; whereas, the chairman self-described scores were very slightly positively skewed, slightly platykurtic, and bi-modal with peaks on each side of the mean.

The criterion of reliability was evaluated by both the split-half method and by extent of inter-rater agreement. The self-described rating condition for both the Agent and Chairman Reports failed to yield sufficient reliability on an odd vs even tetrad basis. This was found also with the chairman descriptions of agents. However, the supervisory described rating condition for the Agent and Chairman Reports produced reliable results. The corrected split-half reliability of the level section of the Agent Report was .743 and for the Chairman Report it was .859. The average inter-rater correlation for the Agent and Chairman Reports were .582 and .746, respectively.

The third criterion of validity was evaluated in reference to peer nominations and supervisory paired comparison ratings as external criteria for the two reports. Again only the supervisory described rating condition produced consistently valid results on a district as well as a state-wide basis. The supervisors' descriptions of agents correlated
.386 with the peer agent nomination criterion and .690 with the supervisory paired comparison agent criterion. Moreover the supervisors' descriptions of chairmen correlation .449 with the peer chairman nomination criterion and .719 with the supervisory paired comparison chairman criterion. By correlating the average supervisory rating of agents and chairmen with the average supervisory paired comparison rating increased the validity correlations with this criterion to .731 for agents and .815 for chairmen.

An analysis of the composition of each of the level sections showed that only four of the thirty tetrads of the Agent Report and three of the twenty-five tetrads of the Chairman Report failed to differentiate at a statistically significant level between the upper and lower paired comparison criterion groups. Both reports were re-scored with the nondifferentiating tetrads omitted and the resulting modified level sections produced slightly higher reliability and validity correlations than their counterpart full level sections. Hence it was recommended that the modified level sections be utilized in future administrations. Moreover alternate short level section forms were compiled from each report. The two agent and the two chairman short forms produced sufficiently reliable and valid results to warrant consideration for future use, also.

Inasmuch as the self-descriptions by agents and chairmen as well as the chairman descriptions of agents on the level sections of the reports produced neither reliable nor valid results, the data on the profile sections of the reports for these rating conditions were not analyzed. However the profile sections of both reports as completed by the supervisors were utilized. The procedures involved in constructing the profile
section provide that each of the specific factors obtained intercorrelate negatively with each other and each of the factors are independent of the level section as well. The supervisors provided data for the profile sections of both reports produced negative intercorrelations of the specific factors; however, in the case of both reports, each of the specific factors correlated significantly with their counterpart level section rather than displaying independence. This could reduce the utility of the profile sections for counseling purposes however, the agent profile factors would account for only .044 of the variance of the agent level section and chairman profile factors would account for .472 of the variance of the chairman level section.

Conclusions

The main conclusions of the study are as follows:

1. Additional evidence is provided showing that the forced-choice evaluative scale is a media by which reliable and valid ratings of personnel can be obtained.

2. The forced-choice evaluative scale composed of tetrads with all favorable statements is a highly desirable format.

3. Relatively short forced-choice evaluative scale can be used to obtain reliable and valid ratings.

4. The modification of the traditional forced-choice methodology results in a profile type of forced-choice scale which can be used for counseling purposes.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Most present-day organizations whether they are educational, governmental, business or industrial in nature have a formal performance evaluation system as a part of their over-all personnel program.

This has resulted in part from an increased knowledge of personnel policies, practices, and procedures and their application by professional personnel specialists. Moreover there is a greater recognition on the part of organizations that its human assets are equally, if not more, important than the financial and physical assets in maintaining the continuity of the organization.

The evaluation of personnel has always taken place in organizations on an informal, if not formal, basis but many such evaluations have given priority to irrelevant factors and are subject to bias and other rating errors. The forced-choice methodology is well adapted to a formal system because it is "tailor-made" to the organization and the particular position for which it is developed. Moreover its development directly involves the personnel functioning in and closely associated with the position for which the scale is intended; it is couched in the terminology of these personnel; and it reflects the job behaviors which they deem as pertinent and relevant to successful performance.
5. Raters who are in a superordinate position to the ratees provide more reliable and valid ratings on the forced-choice evaluative scale than do the ratees themselves.

6. The average rating of a small number of raters per ratee provide more valid ratings than do the separate ratings from the same raters.

7. The forced-choice methodology for developing performance reports requires fairly extensive research and involvement of the organization personnel.

8. Peer nominations, even though the peers have limited opportunity for observing each other in the work environment, provide reliable criterion data for validating rating instruments.

9. Peers provide reliable evaluations of their own over-all performance which are highly related to supervisors evaluations of their over-all performance.

Suggestions for Further Research

During the early portion of this research, in connection with the review by the administrative and supervisory personnel of the phrases obtained from the essays, there were subtle indications that the philosophy and goals of the field personnel might be different from those of the central office personnel. It was not determined whether in actual fact this was the case; however, if it should be so there is the possibility that applicability values assigned to the phrases on the check lists by field personnel might be different from those assigned by the administrative and supervisory personnel. Inasmuch as the performance reports were constructed utilizing the statistical data based on check
lists completed only by central office personnel, this could be a factor in the low validity correlations obtained with self-ratings. Additional research providing for completions of the check lists by the field personnel and then constructing scales, with statistical indices based on this data, for self-administration purposes is suggested as a way of verifying whether differences in organizational goals and philosophy could be a factor in the low validity self-ratings.

Cross validation studies for the two forced-choice performance reports should be conducted. New agents are being added to the staff at fairly regular intervals and these personnel would provide a cross validation group for the Agent Report. The chairman personnel are a relatively stable group and the addition of new chairmen in this manner would take a number of years. However the Research and Training Division of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is currently collecting research data on the functioning of chairmen which could be correlated with the Chairman Report.

Moreover the performance reports will be administered annually and reliability and validity data should be obtained on each administration as a follow-up of the original study. It should be recognized that as the organization evolves and changes in functioning over time with accompanying modifications of the functions and responsibilities of agents and chairmen that the performance reports will need to be adjusted to incorporate these changes.

Newman, Howell and Harris (24) showed that the forced-choice performance evaluation scale for military officers developed by Sisson (31) produced reliable and valid results when applied to medical personnel in
the U. S. Public Health Service. Further research with the forced-choice performance reports developed in this study with other similar agent and chairman populations in the Extension Services of other states would be desirable to determine to what extent the forced-choice scales may have "transfer" value.

Shartle, Stogdill and associates of the Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, have utilized an approach of contrasting the "ideal" with the "actual" in a number of leadership studies (30, 35, 36). This technique could be utilized with forced-choice performance evaluation scales as an indirect way of determining the biasability of the instruments. Also it could be used to ascertain whether there are differences in the perceptions of super-ordinates and of subordinates in the job behaviors of a given group of incumbents.
APPENDIX A

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service

Trait-Intensity Scale
The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service

Trait-Intensity Scale

DIPLOMAT CLASP No. 55J
SUBSTANCE 32 JUTE FINISH
6 x 2
PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION

The Agricultural Extension Service, The Ohio State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rated by ______________________ Date ____________

(Name or Number)

The purpose of this evaluation form is three-fold: First, to measure the professional performance of each member of the Extension staff; second, to provide a basis for the improvement of the staff member in developing a more effective extension program; and third, to be used as one of the criteria for professional advancement.

Guiding Statements:

1. "The tendency in measurement now, is not so much adding up a score as a look at the profile. You do not total and say he or she is excellent, good, etc., but rather that these ratings indicate the apparent degree of performance in various areas."

2. We must guard against rationalizing when doing this rating. We should have the facts and face them. Decisions should be based upon concrete evidence and considerate judgment.

3. Great care must be taken by the person doing the rating, to consider each item separately and not make the rating fit in with his general impression of the person being rated.

4. This rating scale calls for the rating of performance rather than native ability.

5. The persons doing the evaluating must have worked with the individual to be rated and must be familiar with the program, the methods, and the results.

Definitions:

1. Fair (1-2)—Indicates a rating below the average of what is expected of a staff member in that quality or performance. Items checked under column one (1) indicate qualities not acceptable in the Extension Service.

2. Good (3-4)—Indicates performance is acceptable but the individual is expected to improve.

3. Excellent (5-6)—Indicates outstanding performance at the particular period of rating.

How to indicate rating:

1. Show degree of accomplishment with an 'X' at the appropriate place on the scale.

2. If the evidence is not sufficient to assure a definite rating, use a question mark.

3. For county staff rate only A—C—D. For the State Staff rate only B—C—D.
FOR COUNTY STAFF ONLY

A. Program Development: Reveals application of scientific and democratic procedure for developing the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assembles and uses the pertinent facts on the natural, economic, social and other resources and considers their relationship to the county, state, national and international situations.

2. Counseling groups:
   a. Cooperates in maintaining an active over-all Extension Advisory Committee
   b. Maintains other counseling groups as needed, e.g., 4-H Club Council, Home Demonstration Council and Special Interest Committees.

3. Helps committees to analyze the over-all situation in order to determine people's interest, needs, problem and over-all objectives.

4. Determines, with committee assistance, units of work with working objectives for each unit.

5. Makes a written program and plan of work which:
   a. Contains a concise statement of the general situation, problems, and over-all objectives.
   b. Identifies units of work and, for each unit, indicates a clear cut statement of the situation, problems, and working objectives which are tangible and possible of achievement; includes appropriate teaching content, methods, and procedures for attaining the objectives.
   c. Provides for a systematic plan of evaluating teaching methods and procedures.

6. Provides for wise distribution of time of agents, specialists, leaders, committees and other people.

7. Employs effective teaching devices: teaches with a variety of procedures appropriately selected.

8. Provides for:
   a. Development of leaders.
   b. Participation by leaders.
   c. Widespread participation by general public.


10. Makes reports on time.

11. Reports show the extent to which the program and plan of work was completed in terms of attaining objectives, solving problems, and improving situations.

Comments that will be of additional assistance:
FOR STATE STAFF ONLY

B. Program Development: Reveals application of scientific and democratic procedure for developing the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assembles and uses the pertinent facts on the natural, economic, social and other resources and considers their relationship to the county, state, national and international situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Counseling groups:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Assists agents in developing and maintaining committees and other program planning groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cooperates in maintaining appropriate area or state-wide counseling groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assists agents, committees and other groups to analyze the over-all situation in order to determine people's interests, needs, problems and over-all objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Determines phases of work within the unit with working objectives for each phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Makes a written program and plan of work which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Contains a concise statement of the general situation, problems, and over-all objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identifies units of work and, for each unit, indicates a clear cut statement of the situation, problems, and working objectives which are tangible and possible of achievement; includes appropriate teaching content, methods, and procedures for attaining the objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Provides for a systematic plan of evaluating teaching methods and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provides for wise distribution of time including preparation of material and teaching aids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employs effective teaching devices; teaches with a variety of procedures appropriately selected and trains agents in their use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Development of and participation by agents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Development of and participation by leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Widespread participation by general public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Makes reports on time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Reports show the extent to which the program and plan of work was completed in terms of attaining objectives, solving problems, and improving situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments that will be of additional assistance:
FOR COUNTY AND STATE STAFF

C. Working Relations: Include attitudes and skills necessary for effective performance. Democratic procedure should be obvious.

1. Cooperates with:
   a. Co-workers (state, county and secretarial staff)
   b. Lay Leaders
   c. Other professional leaders and organized groups

2. Contributes to improvement in ability and efficiency of:
   a. Co-workers
   b. Lay Leaders
   c. Professional leaders and organized groups

3. Shares responsibility:
   a. Delegates responsibility to others
   b. Gives amount and kind of assistance needed

4. Maintains effective public relations with:
   a. Individuals
   b. Organized groups and agencies

5. Contributes to the efficient organization and wholesome management of office

6. Shows willingness to take suggestions

D. Personal Qualifications. (In addition to rating each factor please underscore the trait or traits that need to be improved). Includes habits and interests desirable for the profession.

1. Productive work habits:
   Is thorough, accurate, orderly, punctual, productive, manages well

2. Ethical habits:
   Is sincere, dependable, loyal, fair, honest, and has integrity

3. Social habits:
   Is adaptable, friendly, tactful, is successful in maintaining confidence. Enjoys working with people. Does not offend

4. Intellectual habits:
   Practices the scientific approach. Is resourceful, seeks causes and anticipates consequences. Is open-minded

5. Health habits:
   Has good health habits and maintains good physical and mental conditions. Is mentally alert and emotionally stable

6. Personal habits:
   Is neat, appropriately dressed, well-groomed, and observes personal cleanliness

7. Professional leadership:
   Shows capacity for stimulating others. Seeks improved ways of meeting responsibilities; takes lead when necessary; respects high standards of work. Respects opinions of others. Uses good English. Can speak well

8. Professional improvement interest:
   Is thoroughly interested in Extension Education as a profession. Participates in leaves for study, short courses, training conferences and scientific association meetings

Comments that will be of additional assistance:
APPENDIX B

The Developed Forced-Choice Performance

Reports for Agents and Chairmen