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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Extension Service is a unique organization whose mission has been to extend lifelong learning and continuing growth opportunities to each member of the community served. Established by the United States Congress in 1914, the Extension Service has been an integral part of the Land-Grant institution network that also included the university campus and research station components.

Extension serves a diverse set of publics in developing a variety of individual skills that encourage personal growth through experiences, aid in attainment and refinement of problem-solving skills, and provide the acquisition of new information to be used in life-enriching activities. Traditional subject matter areas addressed by Extension educational programs have included: agriculture, home economics, 4-H youth, and community and natural resource development (Prawl, Medlin & Gross, 1984).

Lawrence et al. suggested that the success of the Extension Service as an informal educational system and one of its greatest strengths has come from the involvement of people working with people in each step of the learning process. This was best accomplished when the staff offering leadership to community residents has been a well-trained, people-oriented group (1974).

In essence, the most valuable resource that Extension possesses has been its field staff. These men and women have encouraged and involved
people at the grassroots level. In Ohio, the field staff has been comprised of county and district personnel including county agents, county extension associates (formerly assistant agents), program assistants and district specialists (Cunningham, 1985).

Because of the complexity of each of the county positions, the recruitment of the most qualified individuals available has been extremely important, and the maintenance of the staff through personnel development activities and an appropriate, equitable reward system has been imperative. The better the Extension Service has performed these two management tasks, the more continuity Extension programming should have possessed at the county, district and state levels (Smith, 1985).

**Turnover**

As in any organization, the Extension Service personnel management concerns have taken precedence when staffing patterns have become dysfunctional for the organization (Cunningham, 1985). Especially in the case of an educational service organization like Extension, where the bulk of the organizational production system has become concentrated in local staff, management has become extremely concerned when unanticipated staffing changes produced an ineffective system. One of the most severe changes has been when individuals quit. This type of voluntary withdrawal has been most commonly called voluntary turnover (Mooley, 1982b).

When a county staff member quits, both the organization and individual may suffer (Clark, 1981). The disruption of service to clientele, the extra time and money that management spends on recruitment and training of the replacement and the added stress of more
work for the remaining county staff during the interim are just three consequences suffered by the organization when turnover occurs (Mobley, 1982b).

From the perspective of the individual, leaving a job may have caused temporary loss of income and benefits. The family of the employee may have experienced financial difficulties and emotional strain if the result of quitting was unemployment and/or relocation. The individual may have also experienced psychological problems due to the turmoil of the withdrawal process. These negative effects could have indicated that a particular case of turnover was dysfunctional to the organization and also to the individual (Mobley, 1982b).

However, this dysfunctional situation may not always have been the case. Some researchers have suggested that turnover could also have been a functional phenomenon (Dalton & Todor, 1979; Dalton, Todor & Krackhardt, 1982; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Staw, 1980). The most obvious situation where turnover should have been functional for the organization has been when the low performer leaves the organization. The negative effects of turnover could have been outweighed by the positive ones if the low performer was replaced by a high performer. This will have certainly benefited the organization, and the individual who left may have been better served and more successful in an alternate setting as well (Mobley, 1982b).

Thus, turnover can have potential benefits for the organization and for the individual. Mobley (1982a, 1982b) contended that when low performers leave, an organization may have experienced the infusion of new information and knowledge, changes in policies may have occurred,
flexibility of structure and mobility of remaining employees increased, and withdrawal behaviors decreased.

These consequences were certainly not necessarily contingent upon a low performer leaving, but most often were associated with that particular case. Positive consequences of turnover to the leaver included a possible better fit between the individual and the new job, new stimulation within a new environment, increased and enhanced self-concept, personal growth, probably less stress, more appropriate use of skills, and a potential for career advancement. These benefits may be incurred whether the leaver was a high or low performer (Mobley, 1982b).

Traditionally, literature has stressed the negative aspects of turnover rather than highlighting the positive ones (Dalton & Todor, 1979). And, indeed, organizations experiencing voluntary turnover of valued employees suffered great financial costs, inconvenience, and interruption of service. Individuals leaving may have incurred financial difficulties and psychological distress, but most often experienced some very real positive consequences as well (Mobley, 1982a, 1982b).

Even when turnover was functional to the organization and especially when dysfunctional, the importance rested in the ability of the organization to understand the phenomena associated with the withdrawal process and the antecedents to all types of turnover. This understanding could have provided information to help explain how and why turnover occurred in an attempt to better predict when turnover will have occurred and for whom. The organization could have then used this
information to have interceded in the withdrawal process or to have speeded it up, if desired.

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service would have benefitted from a better understanding of turnover and the individual processes involved as well as to have been able to have determined how the process of turnover may have been different for various levels of performers. For, as valued employees left the Extension Service and less productive individuals remained, the quality richness, depth, and diversity of educational programs may have greatly suffered (Smith, 1985).

Statement of the Problem and Need for the Study

Voluntary turnover of county extension agents in Ohio has caused vacancies that, in some cases, have not been filled because of reduced budgets and/or lack of qualified personnel (Clark, 1981). Even when it has been possible to fill an empty position, the process has been very time consuming and expensive. Managerial time involved in recruitment, screening, selection, classification, and training represented a substantial investment. Other costs associated with replacement have all been magnified when a highly valued employee was being replaced (Cascio, 1982).

In Ohio, during the 1979 through 1984 time period, 65 county agents voluntarily left their positions. These were employees who were not encouraged to leave because of poor performance or who retired. Out of this number, 29 were classified as high performers, 29 were classified as low performers, and seven were not classified (Cunningham, 1985). These numbers pointed to the need for research investigating the reasons
for turnover and how these reasons might have differed among levels of performers. Extension cannot afford to continually lose employees categorized as high performers any more than it can afford to have kept performers with low ratings. The fact that nearly 50 percent of the leavers during the past six years were high performers clearly presented a case for the need for research dealing with turnover and performance level (Cunningham, 1985).

Purpose of the Study

Previous research in Extension concerning turnover has not included performance level in the investigation of related variables (Church, 1979; Clark, 1981; Jenkins, 1959; Pettys, 1970; Squire, 1982). This concept, however, has recently been appearing in the literature of other disciplines. Porter and Steers, in a 1973 review of turnover research, suggested that there was a great need to distinguish between effective and ineffective leavers.

More recently, Mobley (1982a) stated a blatant inadequacy in the turnover literature with regard to performance level. He listed the determination of this relationship as a top priority for future research on employee withdrawal. Steers and Mowday (1981) listed nine shortcomings of existing turnover models and high on the list was the lack of a job performance level variable. Thus, performance must be recognized as an important concept to have considered when researching the turnover process.

Following the demand for the development of conceptual and empirical models that included the performance-turnover relationship, authors such
as Dreher (1982), Jackofsky (1984), and Keller (1984), as well as a few earlier researchers, investigated the relationship. The findings have been inconsistent. First of all, some research indicated that there was no relationship and thus there was no difference in performance level of leavers (Martin, Price & Mueller, 1981). Negative relationships were found by Dreher (1982), Farris (1972), and Stumpf and Dawley (1981). These findings indicated that, in these studies, the low performers were leaving more frequently than the high performers. However, the opposite relationship was found by other researchers (Jackofsky, 1984). Some researchers have suggested invalid measurement of performance and differing definitions of turnover as possible explanations for these mixed findings (Mobley, 1982b).

The inconsistent findings accentuated the need for further research on the role of job performance in the turnover process in a variety of organizational settings using valid research designs and accurate measurements. The purpose of this study, then, was to investigate the role of job performance in the turnover process of Ohio Cooperative Extension County Agents.

The study included the following variables:

I. Independent Variables

A. Perceived Desirability of Staying Variables
   1. overall job satisfaction
   2. satisfaction with promotion
   3. satisfaction with pay
   4. satisfaction with the work itself
   5. satisfaction with co-workers
   6. satisfaction with supervision

B. Perceived Ease of Movement Variable

C. Job Performance Variables
1. supervisor rating of job performance
2. self-rating of job performance

D. Job Performance-reward Contingency Variables
1. perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency
2. perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency

E. Demographic Variables
1. age
2. tenure in the job
3. major program responsibility area

II. Dependent Variable

A. Intention to Leave the Job

Objectives of the Study

1. To describe the levels of the following variables among Ohio Cooperative Extension Service County Agents:
   a. Overall job satisfaction
   b. satisfaction with promotion
   c. satisfaction with pay
   d. satisfaction with the work itself
   e. satisfaction with co-workers
   f. satisfaction with supervision
   g. perceived ease of movement
   h. supervisor rating of job performance
   i. self-rating of job performance
   j. perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency
   k. perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency
   l. age
   m. tenure in the job
   n. major program responsibility area
   o. intention to leave the job

2. To determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

3. To test the following hypotheses:
   a. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with supervision) will be negatively related to the dependent variable "intention to leave the job".
b. "Perceived ease of movement" will be positively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

c. "Perceived ease of movement" will moderate the relationship between the "perceived desirability of staying variables" and the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

d. "Age" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

e. "Tenure" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

f. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "age".

g. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "tenure in the job".

h. "Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "age".

i. "Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "tenure in the job".

j. "Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "perceived ease of movement".

k. "Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "tenure in the job".

l. "Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "age".

m. "Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "supervisor rating of job performance".

n. "Program responsibility area" will be related to "perceived desirability of staying variables".

o. "Perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".

p. "Perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".
Definition of Terms

County Extension Agent

A County Extension Agent was a faculty member of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service employed full-time in a county position. Program responsibility areas were indicated by the terms: agriculture, home economics, and 4-H youth. If an agent was designated as having two or more program responsibility areas, that agent was referred to by the one primary responsibility area held.

Turnover

Turnover referred to the voluntary cessation of participation in a particular job in an organization (not including retirement or pressured voluntary withdrawal) by an individual who received monetary compensation from the organization.

Perceived Desirability of Staying Variables

This group of variables included: "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with promotion", "satisfaction with pay", "satisfaction with the work itself", "satisfaction with co-workers", and "satisfaction with supervision". Measures of high satisfaction represented a high desirability of staying in the job.

The operational definition for these variables was as follows: "overall job satisfaction" was the score of an individual on items designed to measure that variable. The five facets of job satisfaction were operationally defined as the scores of an individual on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969).
Perceived Ease of Movement

"Perceived ease of movement" was the perception of an individual as to how easy it would be to find another job and how attractive that alternative was anticipated to be. Operationally defined, "perceived ease of movement" was the score of an individual on items designed to measure alternatives to the present job.

Supervisor Rating of Job Performance

This variable was the performance of an individual in a particular job as perceived and rated by the immediate supervisor of that individual. The operational definition was the score of an individual on the 1984 Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Performance Appraisal Instrument as was determined and recorded by the district supervisor. Scores could range from one to twelve.

Self-rating of Job Performance

This variable was defined as a self-perception of the job performance of that individual. The operational definition was the score of an individual on items designed to measure perceptions of job performance of that individual.

Perception of Performance-extrinsic Reward Contingency

The definition was the perception of an individual as to the extrinsic reward system in place with reference to the contingent/noncontingent characteristics of that system. For example, an individual may have perceived that the reward system was contingent if high performers were being rewarded more than low performers, or that the system was noncontingent if high performers were being rewarded less than or equal to low performers. Operationally defined, this variable
was the score of an individual on items designed to measure perceptions of the performance-extrinsic reward contingency.

**Perception of Job Performance-intrinsic Reward Contingency**

This variable was defined as the perception of an individual as to the job performance-intrinsic reward contingency present within that individual. For example, an individual may have perceived a contingency if that individual felt good when doing a good job. The operational definition was the score of an individual on items designed to measure the job performance-intrinsic reward contingency.

**Age**

This variable was the age of an individual, operationally defined as number of years as self-reported.

**Tenure in the Job**

This variable was defined as the number of years an individual had held a particular job with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The operational definition was the number of year the individual had held the present position as self-reported.

**Major Program Responsibility Area**

The "major program responsibility" area was the area for which a county agent conducted most programming; one of three, agriculture, home economics, or 4-H youth. Operationally defined, this variable was determined by a self-report by the individual as well as a cross-check of personnel records of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. A fourth major program responsibility area, community and natural resource development (CNRD), was included in the category, agriculture, because of the small number of CNRD agents.
Intention to Leave the Job

"Intention to leave the job" was the dependent variable of the study. This variable was defined as the predisposition of an individual to take action to leave the present position. The operational definition was the score of an individual on items designed to measure the "intention to leave the job".

Limitations of the Study

1. Turnover could be both voluntary and involuntary. If individuals chose to leave an organization on their own volition, without any pressure from the organization, this action was voluntary turnover. If individuals chose to leave the organization as a result of organizational pressure or if the organization terminated the employee because of performance, retirement or other reasons, this action was involuntary turnover. Only the voluntary aspect of turnover has been considered in this study.

2. The dependent variable, "intention to leave the job" was used rather than a measure of the actual turnover behavior.

3. Only the county agent has been included in this study. Other Cooperative Extension Service field employees at the county level (extension associates, program assistants) and district level were not included.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A body of knowledge exists that has encompassed withdrawal processes and the turnover phenomenon in organizations. The scope of research findings identified turnover from a variety of perspectives. Models have been developed that include a variety of independent variables, both individual and organizational in nature. Review articles such as Porter and Steers (1973) and Steers and Mowday (1981) served to highlight the better known, conceptually sound theories of turnover.

To better understand the turnover process, many researchers have devised models and empirically tested theories. Even with this wealth of available literature, much remained to be learned concerning individual turnover in organizations.

Definition of Turnover

Early researchers, like March and Simon (1958), investigated organizational turnover and defined the phenomenon. As research continued, specific components of the turnover process and related behaviors were categorized and the definition became very specific (Mobley, 1982b). Inclusion of terms such as voluntary/involuntary and separation/accession has very much been an individual choice as researchers defined the limitations of their studies.

A general definition of employee turnover was offered by Mobley (1982b) as: "the cessation of membership in an organization by an individual who received monetary compensation from the organization."
This definition suggested that turnover could be voluntary or involuntary, but did not include transfer within the organization but only separation from it. In a recent study of turnover, Jackofsky and Peters (1983a) suggested, however, that both intraorganizational and interorganizational mobility together provided a better criterion for testing prediction propositions of turnover. Therefore, both types of turnover have been included. Also indicated was the concept that only paid employees, not volunteers, could leave the organization.

To clarify the definition of turnover even more, the designation of voluntary behavior, distinguished from involuntary behavior by the unsolicited choice of the individual, was imposed. This did not include the retiring employee or the seemingly voluntary behavior of an employee that was leaving because of pressure from the organization. Therefore, an amended definition of turnover was presented: The voluntary cessation of participation in a particular job in an organization, not including retirement or pressured voluntary withdrawal, by an individual who received monetary compensation from the organization (Mobley, 1982b, Jackofsky & Peters, 1983a).

Models of Turnover

One of the earliest discussions on turnover (March & Simon, 1958) has been viewed as containing one of the most sound theories on turnover and served as the basis for many individual-choice models of organizational turnover. The March and Simon model (1958) suggested that two main factors working together influenced individual turnover behavior: 1) the perceived desirability of movement and 2) the
perceived ease of movement from the position or organization. Desirability referred to present work conditions and characteristics, while ease referred to opportunity to leave and possible alternatives. A combination of variables measuring these two factors should have indicated whether the individual will have desired to leave the organization or to have stayed (March & Simon, 1958).

Included in this original model were six variables that led to desirability of movement and six variables that led to ease of movement from the organization. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 illustrated the hypothesized relationships. The theory behind the model suggested that an individual evaluated both factors simultaneously to have arrived at a decision to stay or leave.

Other, more recent models (Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and MeGlino, 1979; Price, 1977; Steers & Mowday, 1981) followed the same proposition as March and Simon (1958) and had the basic concepts in common. Variables may have been placed in different sequences and the models may have varied in content, but they were founded in the original March and Simon theory of two primary factors leading to turnover.

Much of the recent literature on turnover has used the Mobley (1977) "Intermediate Linkages" model (See Figure 2). Based on the March and Simon model (1958), Mobley expanded the model to include what he termed withdrawal conditions. These variables included: "thinking of quitting," "intention to search," and "intention to quit/stay." This last variable, "intention to quit/stay," has been suggested to be the last step in the turnover process before the actual turnover behavior (Michaels & Spector, 1982; Miller, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979; Mobley,
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MOBLEY'S INTERMEDIATE LINKAGES MODEL
1977; Mobley et al., 1979). There has been much research that has supported the Mobley model (Mobley 1982b). The 1977 version of the Mobley model was revised in 1979 by Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino. This comprehensive model of the withdrawal process was much more complicated than previous models as viewed in Figure 3.

The newest development in turnover research and the related conceptual models was that of including job performance as an independent variable. Previously overlooked as a potential related variable, job performance recently has received the attention that it clearly deserved. Authors such as Dreher (1982), Jackofsky (1984), Jackofsky and Peters (1983a), Keller (1984), and Martin, Price, and Mueller (1981) have included a job performance variable in their turnover investigations.

Theorists have called for the inclusion of performance level in turnover research for years (Mobley, 1982b); but, until recently, job performance has generally been overlooked as a potential related variable. Findings were inconsistent, but the importance of job performance as a potential related factor in the turnover process cannot be ignored any longer (Mobley, 1982b).

One conceptual model that included a job performance variable as well as the two basic factors of March and Simon (1958) plus a withdrawal cognition from the Mobley model (1977) was that of Jackofsky (1984). This model was based upon the work of March and Simon (1958) with the addition of the Mobley variable of intention to quit/stay. In essence, Jackofsky took the sound parts of two theories (March and Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977) and then added the job performance variable
AN EXPANDED MODEL OF THE EMPLOYEE TURNOVER PROCESS
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in an attempt to better explain the variance in the dependent variable, turnover.

This particular model of turnover was much more comprehensive than has been described here and included the concept of involuntary turnover as well as voluntary turnover. For a complete picture of the Jackofsky model see Figure 4. Although the model has not been extensively tested, the model appeared to incorporate valid variables that have been suggested by many researchers. Also addressed by the model were four major concerns identified in the literature, as indicated by Jackofsky (1984): (1) the psychological process of withdrawal; 2) refinement of the turnover criterion; 3) an examination of off-quadrant cases in which a satisfied employee leaves or a dissatisfied employee stays; and 4) the consideration of differentially valued employees in relation to withdrawal.

The Jackofsky model has been used as a basis for this study of turnover of county extension agents in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The model was modified, as shown in Figure 5, and included the following variables:

1. Perceived desirability of staying variables: overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with supervision.

2. Perceived ease of movement variable.
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INTEGRATION OF JOB PERFORMANCE IN PROCESS MODEL OF TURNOVER
Figure 5

PROPOSED MODEL OF INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB
5. Demographic variables: age, tenure in the job, and major program responsibility area.

6. Dependent variable: intention to leave the job.

**Dependent Variable**

Literature has suggested that the best indicator of behavior of an individual was the intention of that individual to behave (Locke, 1969). Researchers interested in turnover have found that the best predictor of turnover behavior was "intention to leave" (Mobley et al., 1979; Miller et al., 1979). In a 1978 study of hospital employees, Mobley, Horner, and Hollingworth found that when all the independent variables used were combined together, only "intention to quit" was significantly related to turnover. This indicated that other variables accounted for variance but the "intention to quit" variable encompassed the effects of these other variables.

Research that has been based on the Mobley Intermediate Linkages Model of turnover (1977) has clearly supported the hypothesis that:

...intentions are the best predictors of turnover and that preceding variables, including satisfaction, do not add to the prediction of turnover over and above intentions. (Mobley, 1982b).

This statement was supported in studies conducted by Miller, et al, 1979; Mobley et al., 1978; and Mowday et al., 1984.

In the proposed conceptual model by Jackofsky (1984), "intention to leave" was the immediate precursor to voluntary turnover. For the purpose of this study, the dependent variable used was "intention to leave the job."
Variables Related to Turnover

Through the years, research has produced many valid models from which to examine the turnover process, as has been discussed. Each model had unique characteristics but a thorough investigation of the literature produced several variables that repeatedly appeared. Two of these popular variables were the same two factors that March and Simon proposed in 1958: "perceived desirability of staying," represented in this study by six measures of job satisfaction and "perceived ease of movement." The names of the variables have changed, but the concepts remained the same. Models by Vroom (1964), Porter and Steers (1973), Mobley (1977), Mobley et al. (1979), Steers and Mowday (1981) and most recently Jackofsky (1984) contained these two variables. "Perceived desirability of movement" has been most often referred to as "job satisfaction." "Perceived ease of movement" has been renamed opportunity or perceived alternatives, but whatever name the authors have chosen to use, these two factors have been extremely useful in the understanding of turnover behavior and its precursors.

Perceived Desirability of Staying Variables

A primary factor leading to the desirability of staying has been suggested to be the level of job satisfaction of the individual (March and Simon, 1958). Job satisfaction has been defined by Locke:

The pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values. (Locke, 1969)

Locke goes on to describe dissatisfaction:

Job dissatisfaction is the unpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's job values or as entailing disvalues (Locke, 1969).
Thus, according to Locke:

> Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing. (Locke, 1969)

These definitions implied three basic elements in the appraisal process of job satisfaction: 1) the perception of an aspect of the job, 2) the imposition of a value standard, and 3) the conscious judgment of the relationship between the perception and the standard. The importance, when discussing job satisfaction, was to recognize that satisfaction involved perceptions of the job and its components and not the actual job and components themselves.

Job satisfaction has been generally referred to as an attitude. Attitudes have three characteristics: 1) cognitive—the clear description of something, 2) affective—the feelings of an individual toward something, and 3) behavioral—the intention to act toward something. Researchers, however, have primarily referred to job satisfaction as related to the affective component of an attitude (Dunham & Smith, 1979). Briefly defined by Dunham and Smith: "Job satisfaction included the set of affective reactions (feelings) of employees to the work and work environment" (Dunham & Smith, 1979). The authors continued to expand the definition as they suggested the notion of facets of the job and satisfaction with each: "...the affective component of attitudes is usually complex. Accordingly, job satisfaction consists of a set of specific satisfactions called facets of satisfaction" (Dunham & Smith, 1979).

The overall concept presented here was that of satisfaction as it related to the entire job, overall job satisfaction, and facets of
satisfaction as they related to facets of the job. Typical dimensions or facets measured included: policies; compensation; co-worker relations; physical conditions of the environment; promotional opportunities; supervision; work: amount and demands; and work: characteristics of the work itself (Dunham & Smith, 1979).

Many times the situation has been found wherein a worker can be very satisfied with certain facets of the job and dissatisfied with others. Even though this appeared to be a compensatory model in which certain high facets of the job compensated for other low ones, the original definition of Locke could not have been neglected that stressed the participation of the individual in the assigning of a valence or value standard to each aspect of the job. The suggestion was that some facets of the job were more important to an individual than others, and even these values differed among employees. This concept indicated that measuring facets of satisfaction in addition to overall satisfaction produced a better picture of the individual processes involved when evaluating "perceived desirability of movement" from the organization.

Because satisfaction was affective (emotional) in nature, satisfaction was impossible to directly observe. The best that could be done was to infer satisfaction from statements and behaviors (Dunham & Smith, 1979). Typically, researchers have used a questionnaire developed to measure job satisfaction. Many instruments have been developed, but one of the most valid, reliable, and simple to complete was the Job Descriptive Index (Smith et al., 1969). Complete information on this instrument was provided in Chapter III.
In the Porter and Steers (1973) review of turnover research, a negative relationship was consistently found between job satisfaction and turnover. This relationship meant that the higher the job satisfaction, the lower the measure of turnover. In the fifteen studies listed, all but one study reported a negative relationship. In the same article, nine out of ten studies reported a negative relationship between satisfaction with pay and promotion and turnover. Six out of seven reported negative relationships between supervisor style and turnover, four out of six listed a negative relationship between peer group (co-workers) interaction satisfaction and turnover, and eight out of nine had the relationship between job content satisfaction and turnover as negative.

In a more recent review article, Steers and Mowday (1981) reported the same consistently negative relationships between job satisfaction and turnover. The relationship between satisfaction and turnover was termed consistent and negative. In other words, dissatisfied employees were more likely to leave than more satisfied employees (Mobley, 1982b)

The hypothesis was that each of the five measures of facets concerning satisfaction (pay, promotion, supervisor, co-workers, work itself) as well as an overall measure of job satisfaction, all included in the category of "perceived desirability of staying variables" were negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

**Perceived Ease of Movement Variable**

Even though an individual may be dissatisfied with the present job, that condition of dissatisfaction alone may not be enough to facilitate
the turnover process. Another, extremely important consideration for that individual was that of alternatives (March & Simon, 1958). What was the perceived or projected ease of movement from the situation of dissatisfaction? Another familiar term for "perceived ease of movement" or alternatives was opportunity. Was there opportunity for the individual to leave, if desired?

Two dimensions of alternatives have been most often addressed: 1) availability of alternatives, and 2) attractiveness of alternatives. These worked together to provide an overall indication to the individual of the "perceived ease of movement".

Availability of alternatives could have been determined by a number of variables. March and Simon included such variables as: level of business activity, propensity to search, visibility of individual, number of visible organizations, and personal characteristics, which were all hypothesized to directly or indirectly lead to the number of extraorganizational alternatives perceived, which in turn led to a perceived ease of movement (1958). In this process, however, there must have been an evaluation by the individual to determine not only if there were alternatives, but how desirable or attractive each alternative was.

Mobley et al. (1979) described perceived alternatives as those external alternative work roles that were perceived to have utility. That is, a job that met the important work values of the employee, provided the opportunity for the employee to obtain those values, and also provided a good possibility of obtaining the job would be a job that had utility. If a job provided all three components of utility described, then it would be an alternative.
Price (1977) offered two more suggestions in determining alternatives. First, the job needed to be visible — the individual had to have had knowledge of the job — for it to be an alternative. Secondly, the individual must have been free to pursue the alternative. Price discussed this second condition in terms of a government restriction as imposed in the Soviet Union at one time.

The findings in the literature with regard to the relationship between "perceived ease of movement" (perceived alternatives, opportunity) and "turnover" are not as clear and conclusive as were the research findings on "perceived desirability of movement" (satisfaction) and "turnover".

Korman (1971) noted a lack of research on the effect of perceived alternatives. In reaction to the charge of Korman; Dansereau, Cashman and Graen (1974) conducted a study of office workers and managers and found that the perceived expectancy of finding a comparable job actually moderated the correlation between attitude (satisfaction) and turnover in both samples. This finding suggested that people will generally not leave a present job if there were not perceived alternatives to that job. The hypothesis was that "perceived ease of movement" was positively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job", but that relationship was only an indirect one and "perceived ease of movement" moderated the relationship between "job satisfaction" and "intention to leave the job".

A problem became evident in understanding the role of perceived alternatives when the concept of satisfaction was considered in the process. The March and Simon model (1958) as well as the Jackofsky
model (1984) both suggested that the variables "perceived desirability of movement" and "perceived ease of movement" were evaluated simultaneously when individuals were in the process of making a turnover decision. An example of the concern was: an individual is dissatisfied with a present job but sees no alternatives. Will that individual leave or stay? Comparably, an individual, very satisfied with the present job, perceives many alternatives. Will that individual leave or stay? There was difficulty when attempting to hypothesize the answers to these questions. What clearly evolved was 1) if an individual was dissatisfied with the present job and had many perceived alternatives, there was the likelihood that turnover would occur; and 2) if an individual was satisfied with the present job and had few perceived alternatives, turnover would be unlikely (Mobley, 1982b). Relationships between "perceived ease of movement" and other independent variables have been addressed in the following sections.

**Job Performance Variables - Supervisor Rating and Self-Rating**

A main concept of interest in this study was the role of the job performance of an individual in the intention of the individual to leave the job. The concept of job performance was measured in this study by using two separate variables: 1) supervisor rating of job performance, 2) self-rating of job performance.

A rather new concept as it related to turnover, performance of an individual has been included in studies of turnover by Farris (1971), Jackofsky (1984), Keller (1984), and Martin, Price and Mueller (1981) among others. Keller claimed that the rating of an immediate supervisor had been the most common measure of job performance in turnover studies (1984).
Other measures of job performance included peer assessment, appraisal by subordinates, appraisal by clients, multi-rater approaches, and self-assessments (Cascio, 1982). Literature supported the rating of a supervisor as the method that made the most sense; because, generally, the immediate supervisor had the best information to evaluate individual performance against organizational objectives (Cascio, 1982).

A major problem in using supervisor ratings has been the tendency for a supervisor to rate an individual consistently high or low because of the failure of the supervisor to distinguish among levels of performance on different dimensions. The problem has been called a halo effect and has been commonly reported. Even though efforts can be made to control for supervisor bias, or halo, Cascio suggested that a combination of rating techniques to measure job performance has been most effective (1982). For this reason, this study included two measures of job performance, a supervisor rating and a self-rating.

This study was based on a model of individual choices being made in the process of turnover and dealt with individual perceptions. Therefore, the job performance measure, of the two, that was suggested to have the strongest relationship with other independent variables and the dependent variable was "self-rating of job performance".

As has been previously reported (see Chapter I), findings on performance level of individuals leaving the organization were mixed. A large group of studies concluded that the high performers were the leavers. A comparable group of researchers suggested that low performers were the individuals most likely to leave.
A basic difference in these two groups of studies was the type of organization that was researched. Dreher (1982) stated that the research findings which indicated that high performers left rather than low performers had come from mostly non-business, educational settings. This would have included groups like university and Extension faculty and public school employees.

A possible explanation for this difference was suggested by Dreher and dealt with the idea of performance-contingent reward systems. Educational settings were less likely to provide the performance-reward contingency and therefore were less likely to hold better performers than performance-contingent organizations in business settings (1982). This suggestion implied that further turnover research dealing with performance level might look at the effect of contingent/non-contingent reward systems in place in the organization. This study has included two such variables, "perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency", and "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" which were discussed later in this chapter. When considering the performance level of the individual in the turnover process, Jackofsky (1984) hypothesized that performance had an effect on both major factors of the turnover model, "perceived desirability of movement" and "perceived ease of movement".

The relationship of job performance and satisfaction ("perceived desirability of staying") has been in question for years (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955). In the Jackofsky model (1984), the relationship was hypothesized to be a positive one but was indirect. Two variables, 1) job related stimuli (performance-reward contingency and task structure)
and 2) individual differences (need for achievement, self-esteem) were present and moderated the link between "perceived desirability of movement" and "job performance". This was consistent with Dreher (1982) and Keller (1984) and supported the idea of a performance-reward contingency variable. Thus, the level of job performance should only have had an indirect positive effect on the "perceived desirability of staying variables" and this relationship was hypothesized as such.

The hypothesis was that the variable "self-rating of job performance" would be positively related to each of the six "perceived desirability of staying variables" (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with supervision) only if there were a high "perceived job performance-reward contingencies". Otherwise, there would be no relationship.

This was not the case, however, for the "job performance" and "perceived ease of movement" relationship. Again, Jackofsky supported a positive relationship but insisted that this was a direct link. Based on a 1983 study (Jackofsky & Peters, 1983b) of abilities and alternatives, the suggested direct relationship was a result of the concept that individuals with high abilities will perform better and will believe that they have more alternatives for the present situation. To the extent that this assumption was true, there should have been a direct relationship between performance and alternatives.

The hypothesis was that "self-rating of performance" and "perceived ease of movement" were positively related.
The variable "supervisor rating of job performance" was suggested to be directly related to or correlated with "self-rating of job performance" and was expected to also be related to the demographic variables of "age" and "tenure in the job." These relationships have been addressed in later sections of this chapter.

**Perceived Job Performance-Reward Contingency Variables**

As has been previously stated, an important consideration when proposing a relationship between job performance and desirability of staying (satisfaction) was the existence of a performance-contingent reward system. One model of satisfaction presented by Lawler and Porter (1967) implied that only under performance-contingent reward systems would employee performance be positively related to satisfaction. This model suggested that performance would lead to satisfaction if employees perceived that there was an equitable reward system within the organization and that they were being rewarded equitably.

This model, however, included two types of rewards, intrinsic and extrinsic (See Figure 6). Intrinsic rewards were those that the individual gave to him/herself for good performance. An example was the warm feelings of accomplishment when a job was done well. Extrinsic rewards were those rewards given to the individual by the organization. Examples of an extrinsic reward were pay and promotion. It was suggested that to adequately measure the performance-reward contingency, both types of rewards must have been considered (Lawler & Porter, 1967).

An empirical study by Cherrington, Reitz, and Scott (1971) investigated this contingent/non-contingent question, and findings supported the hypothesis that the nature and magnitude of the
Figure 6

MODEL OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERFORMANCE TO SATISFACTION

Source: Taken from Lawler & Porter, 1967, p. 22.
(Mobley et al., 1979; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Price, 1977). In his research on turnover intentions of Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents, Clark (1981) found a low negative relationship between age and intention to leave.

Clark identified another study of extension agents that found a positive relationship between age and satisfaction (1981). Mobley (1982b) explained this type of relationship in terms of inaccurate expectations of younger employees which produced dissatisfaction and eventually turnover. Mobley added that older employees had, or perceived that they had, less alternatives and, therefore, stayed in the present job (1982b).

The relationship was hypothesized that "age" will be positively related to the "perceived desirability of staying variables" which said that the older an employee was, the higher the satisfaction, therefore the more desirable staying will have been. Also, "age" should have been negatively related to "perceived ease of movement". The relationship between the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job", and "age" should have been negative because older employees should have had less intention to leave the job as was found by Porter & Steers (1973).

The relationship between "age" and job performance was unclear. In the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, as in other organizations, employees may have taken a significant amount of time in the job before actually becoming productive. Because younger employees tended to have less time on the job, younger employees may not have been as productive, or been perceived as being as productive, as older employees (Cunningham, 1985). In the Jackofsky model (1984), age was hypothesized
to have no effect on job performance; in fact, age only entered the model and had an effect on "perceived desirability of staying variables" (satisfaction). Based on this information, a weak positive relationship was hypothesized between "age" and "supervisor rating of job performance".

**Tenure**

Employee tenure, the length of time in the job, has been highly correlated with age, so it follows that findings indicated the same negative relationship between "tenure" and "turnover" as was reported for "age" and "turnover" (Porter & Steers, 1973; Mobley, 1982b). As indicated by Mobley (1982b), one study found that tenure was one of the best predictors of turnover. The Clark study of Extension turnover supported this negative relationship also; however, the Clark study used the dependent variable, "intention to leave" (1981). Suggested reasons for a negative relationship were similar to those posited for age: inadequate match between individual and job; poor early socialization; and the tenure/age interaction (Mobley, 1982b).

Because of the high correlation between age and tenure, the relationship between the six "perceived desirability of staying variables" of job satisfaction and "tenure" should have been positive like that for "age" and was so hypothesized. Also hypothesized (as was the case for "age" and "perceived ease of movement") findings were expected to have supported a positive relationship between "tenure" and "perceived ease of movement".

An unclear relationship for "tenure" and "level of job performance" was present because even though there was little evidence to support any
relationship, there was some question as to how objective ratings by supervisors really were. Personnel of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service have suggested that some supervisors may automatically have rated new employees (less than three years service) differently than more experienced employees. Newer employees may only have been able to achieve a certain performance rating until they have proved themselves (Cunningham, 1985). This particular concern may indicate that there was reason to believe that with this population, "supervisor rating of job performance" may be positively related to "tenure" and was so hypothesized.

Program Responsibility Area

There were three major program responsibility areas for the Ohio Cooperative Extension County Agents: agriculture; home economics; and 4-H youth. Some county agents had two or more responsibility areas but had one of those areas designated as the major one.

In a study of burnout among Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents, Igodan (1984) found that 4-H agents experienced the highest levels of burnout, a factor which was found to be negatively related to job satisfaction. Thus, the "major program responsibility area" may have been related to the six "perceived desirability of staying variables" and was hypothesized as such. Beyond that relationship, no other relationships have been suggested.

Summary

The following independent variables have been determined to be of importance in the research of turnover intentions of Ohio Cooperative Extension County Agents: 1) "perceived desirability of staying
variables" (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, satisfaction with supervision); 2) "perceived ease of movement"; 3) job performance variables ("supervisor rating of job performance", "self-rating of job performance"); 4) job performance-reward contingency variables ("perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency", "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency"); 5) demographic variables ("age", "tenure in the job", "major program responsibility area").

Hypotheses concerning relationships of these independent variables with each other and with the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job" were:

a. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with supervision) will be negatively related to the dependent variable "intention to leave the job".

b. "Perceived ease of movement" will be positively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

c. "Perceived ease of movement" will moderate the relationship between the "perceived desirability of staying variables" and the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

d. "Age" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

e. "Tenure" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

f. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "age".

g. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "tenure in the job"
h. "Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "age".

i. "Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "tenure in the job".

j. "Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "perceived ease of movement".

k. "Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "tenure in the job".

l. "Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "age".

m. "Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "supervisor rating of job performance".

n. "Program responsibility area" will be related to "perceived desirability of staying variables".

o. "Perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".

p. "Perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".

In this Review of Literature, several popular models of turnover in organizations have been presented. In particular, the March and Simon model (1958) has been highlighted and was used as the basis for this study. The model was expanded to include variables related to the concept of job performance and was essentially the same model proposed by Jackofsky (1984) with the exclusion of involuntary turnover. The addition of two "perceived performance-reward contingency" variables and two variables of job performance, "supervision rating of job performance," and "self-rating of job performance" provided a more comprehensive view of possible roles that job performance plays in the turnover process.
The independent variables identified played an important part in the investigation of the turnover process within organizations like the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Each variable has been identified as one that could have enhanced this research and provided a more indepth picture of how and why turnover occurs. The main independent variable of interest, "job performance", elusive as it has been in the past, appeared to be coming of age as one of the most important concepts to examine in turnover research.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter included the following sections: Research Design, Population, Data Collection, Instrumentation, and Data Analysis.

Research Design

This research was a descriptive correlational study designed to collect information on the nature and strength of relationships between variables. The method of data collection was a mail questionnaire. The population included all county Extension agents in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service that were under contract as of March 1, 1985.

Internal Validity

In survey research, the concept of internal validity has dealt with measurement error. Issues of reliability and validity have been addressed in the instrumentation section of this chapter. In an attempt to reduce measurement error, some data were collected using appropriate personnel files of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service rather than from respondents. The instrument was pilot-tested to determine the reliability and was reviewed by a panel of experts (Appendix A) to determine content validity.

External Validity

Four major concerns of external validity of survey research have been considered in this study. Two of these concerns,
non-representative sample and selection error, were not a problem with this research because the entire population was surveyed, not a sample. The third concern, incomplete frame was addressed through the complete review of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service personnel records to obtain the frame. The fourth problem, non-response error, was dealt with in the following manner: as described by Miller and Smith (1983), late respondents (similar to non-respondents) were compared with early respondents. Results of late respondents were statistically compared with results from early respondents using a t-test to determine if there was a significant difference between the two groups on the independent variables. No significant differences were found; however, had the two groups been significantly different, a statistical procedure would have been used to weight the responses. This method has been an accepted technique for dealing with non-response error (Miller & Smith, 1983).

Population

The population for this study consisted of all Ohio Cooperative Extension county agents under contract as of March 1, 1985. There were 94 agriculture agents (including two community and natural resource development agents), 80 home economics agents and 70 4-H youth agents for a total population of 244. The frame used was obtained from the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Office. Each subject in this study was assigned a number for identification purposes. This population was all agents who could possibly be on the job within The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service during this time period.
Data Collection

The main method of data collection was a mail questionnaire (see Appendix B). Some additional data were collected through the examination of personnel records of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

Procedure

The questionnaire was mailed to all subjects on May 3, 1985. Included in the mailing were: a copy of the questionnaire with the identification number of the subject; a cover letter co-signed by the Associate Director of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, Dr. Clarence J. Cunningham (see Appendix C); and a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

A deadline of May 10, 1985 was set as the cut-off date for returning the questionnaire. At that time, with a response rate of 73 percent (n=178) a postcard (Appendix C) reminding non-respondents to complete the questionnaire was sent. One week after the postcard, a second packet of materials, containing a letter (Appendix C), a stamped, self-addressed envelope, and another copy of the questionnaire was sent to non-respondents. A final deadline of May 24, 1985 was set. Total number of respondents was 229 for an accepting sample of 94 percent. Eleven of the returned instruments were not usable which produced a data sample of 89 percent (n=218). Data regarding the rating of job performance by supervisor were collected from the personnel records of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
Instrumentation

A questionnaire was developed (for original pilot instrument, see Appendix A) to gather data for the following variables: 1) "perceived desirability of staying variables" (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, satisfaction with supervision); 2) "perceived ease of movement"; 3) one of the job performance variables ("self-rating of job performance"); 4) job performance-reward contingency variables ("perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency", "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency"); 5) demographic variables ("age", "tenure in the job", "major program responsibility area"); and, 6) the dependent variable ("intention to leave the job"). After reviewing many existing instruments used to measure the variables of interest, the researcher designed a three-part questionnaire.

Part One

Part one of the instrument consisted of attitude statements to which the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement using a six-point, Likert-type scale. The six points on the scale were:

1 = Very strongly disagree
2 = Strongly disagree
3 = Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree
6 = Very strongly agree
Items were worded both positively and negatively to help respondents avoid response sets (Dillman, 1978). During data analysis, the weighting of responses of negatively worded items was reversed to provide consistent measurement. For example, for a negatively stated item like "I have little enthusiasm for my job," a response of "very strongly agree" received a score of "1" rather than "6".


Part one of the instrument was pilot-tested using Ohio Cooperative Extension Service District Specialists (n=18). An acceptable Cronbach’s alpha level was pre-determined for the variables in part one to be .50 based on work by Nunnally (1967). Nunnally suggested that: "What a satisfactory level of reliability is, depends on how a measure is being used. In the early stages of research on predictor tests or hypothesized measures of a construct, one saves time and energy by working with instruments that have only modest reliability, for which purposes reliability of .50 or .60 will suffice." Reliability coefficients using the Cronbach’s alpha were determined and reported in Table 1. Part one was also examined by a panel of experts (Appendix A) and was judged to have content validity.

After making the recommended changes and additions to Part one, the entire instrument was prepared. The final instrument (Appendix B) was reviewed by the panel of experts and was then sent to the population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Pilot (n=18)</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Actual (n=218)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-rating of job performance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.8969</td>
<td>.8318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job performance—extrinsic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.9469</td>
<td>.8973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reward contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job performance—intrinsic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7032</td>
<td>.7672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reward contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ease of movement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8805</td>
<td>.8323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to leave the job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7913</td>
<td>.9289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8914</td>
<td>.9048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Two

Part two of the instrument collected data on the following variables: "age," "tenure in the job," and "major program responsibility area." Respondents were asked to indicate their age (in years), the length of time in the present job (in years) and to mark one of four categories of major subject responsibility (agriculture, home economics, 4-H, community and natural resource development). The responses in the community and natural resource development category (n=2) were included with the agriculture category because of the small number of subjects in that category.
Part Three

Part three of the instrument consisted of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), a commercial instrument used to measure five facets of job satisfaction. They were promotion, pay, the work itself, co-workers, and supervision. The scales used were reported to have been sensitive to differences in the situation and the work force. The vocabulary was very simple and the JDI was quick and easy to complete. Reported reliabilities for many samples of workers have been consistently in the .80 to .90 range (Smith, Kendall, Bulin, 1969). Permission to use the JDI was obtained from Bowling Green State University which held the copyright.

Perceived Desirability of Staying Variables

Overall Job Satisfaction was measured by the following five items:

(+) "Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my current job as a county Extension staff member."

(+) "I usually feel excited about going to work since I've held my present job."

(+) "I enjoy my job more than most county Extension personnel enjoy their jobs."

(+) "Overall, I am happy with my job."

(+) "I feel enthusiastic about being a county Extension staff member."

The five facets of job satisfaction (promotion, pay, the work itself, co-workers, and supervision) were measured using the Job Descriptive Index. Each scale had words or phrases used to describe the facet. The promotion and pay scales consisted of nine items each. The
work itself, co-workers, and supervision scales consisted of 16 items each. Respondents answered Y=yes, N=no, or ?=I don't know, to each descriptor. The items were scored in the following way: a "yes" to a positive descriptor and a "no" to a negative descriptor received three points each. A "?" or a blank received one point, and other responses received no points. Scores were totaled for each scale and the score for each facet was the sum. The higher the score, the higher was the measure of satisfaction for that facet.

**Perceived Ease of Movement Variable**

This variable was measured using the following seven items:

IF I WERE TO LEAVE MY PRESENT POSITION...

(+)...I would have no trouble obtaining a better job.

(+)...there are many exciting jobs from which to choose.

(+)...I would have a much better chance of finding a new job than would most of my friends.

(+)...many employers would consider hiring me.

(-)...there are very few jobs for which I am qualified.

(-)...I would not know where to look for another good job.

(+)...I would be competitive in the job market.

**Self-Rating of Job Performance**

This variable was comprised of five categories of job performance: 1) program planning; 2) program promotion and public relations; 3) program implementation; 4) program support; and 5) interpersonal and personal behaviors.

Items used in this measurement were adapted from the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Performance Against Standards Instrument.
Items were purposefully selected from the five categories previously listed. The items were modified according to suggestions by Dillman (1978), so that any given item only measured one domain.

Items used were the following:

(+) "I plan programs with extensive involvement of support groups."

(+) "I am able to identify new project areas that interest many clients."

(+) "I consider county, district and state needs when I complete my program planning."

(+) "I think through each activity knowing what needs to be done."

(+) "I am continually looking for new audiences with which to work."

(+) "I develop leadership in volunteers."

(-) "I seldom cooperate with other agencies and organizations when planning activities."

(-) "I use the same teaching methods for most programs."

(-) "I attempt few evaluations of program efforts."

(+) "I use a variety of evaluation methods."

(+) "I participate in professional improvement activities whenever possible."

(+) "I am able to maintain a professional image at all times."

(+) "I usually take the time to help a co-worker with a problem."

(+) "I share innovative ideas with my co-workers."

(+) "I accept failure without placing blame on others."
(-) "I have little enthusiasm for my job."
(+) "I work evening and weekend hours when necessary."

Perceived Job Performance—Extrinsic Reward Contingency

Items designed to measure this variable tended to be highly reactive and were placed in the middle of the questionnaire as suggested by Dillman (1978). The eight items constructed to measure this variable were the following:

(+) "I am compensated fairly for the job that I perform."
(-) "I work harder but get rewarded less than most other employees who hold a similar position."
(+) "The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service promotes its employees according to how well they perform."
(-) "It seems that the harder I work, the less I am formally rewarded."
(+) "Generally speaking, I am paid equitably for my performance on the job."
(-) "I seldom get formally recognized when I do a good job."
(+) "Employees of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service are rewarded according to how well they perform."
(+) "Typically, Extension personnel are promoted according to their level of performance."

Perceived Job Performance—Intrinsic Reward Contingency

Items developed for this variable were based on the model developed by Lawler and Porter (1967). Three items were used to measure the intrinsic reward contingency:

(+) "I get a feeling of satisfaction when I do my job well."
"The harder I work, the greater are my feelings of accomplishment."

"I know when I've done my job well because I feel good about myself."

**Intention to Leave the Job**

The dependent variable was measured by four items. They were:

- "I intend to be employed in my current position a year from now."
- "I am willing to sign a contract to serve in my present position."
- "I will not have this particular job a year from now."
- "I intend to turn in my resignation this year."

The four items were scored so that the higher the score of an individual, the higher was the intention of the individual to leave the job.

**Supervisor Rating of Job Performance**

A measure of job performance was taken using the 1984 Performance Appraisal Score. Each individual received a rating from one to twelve. The district supervisor of that individual completed the rating during autumn, 1984. Scores were standardized according to district and supervisor but there were no significant differences in rating style among supervisors. Because of this, the original Performance Against Standards Instrument Scores were used instead of the calculated standard scores.

**Summary**

Two methods of data collection were used for this study. Method one, the mail questionnaire consisted of three parts, and was used to
collect the bulk of the data. Information on "supervisor ratings of job performance" and "major program responsibility area" was collected by method two; an examination of Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Records. The mail questionnaire was developed, pilot tested, and judged to be reliable and valid.

Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (Ray, et al, 1982) and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) (Nie, et al, 1975) computer programs available at The Ohio State University.

Descriptive statistics were used to organize and summarize the data. Levels of the variables were determined by the descriptive analysis. Scattergrams were plotted to determine linearity and homoscedasticity of relationships of variables.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the nature and strength of relationships between variables. An alpha level of .05 was set a priori to test for significance of relationships.

Analysis of variance was performed to compare the groups, agriculture, home economics, and 4-H youth on selected variables. Tests of significance were performed at the .05 alpha level.

Stepwise multiple regression was used to determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job." Moderated regression techniques were used to test for interaction effects of selected variables. The total $R^2$ was computed to determine
the amount of variance accounted for by the linear combination of independent variables.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the role that various factors played in the intentions of Ohio Cooperative Extension County Agents to leave the job, particularly the factor, job performance level as measured by supervisor rating and self-rating techniques. Additionally, this study sought to determine relationships between variables and to determine the levels of these variables as they existed in the population being studied.

The independent variables of interest were categorized into five groupings: 1) "perceived desirability of staying variables" (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers and satisfaction with supervision; 2) "perceived ease of movement variable"; 3) job performance variables ("supervisor rating of job performance", and "self-rating of job performance"); 4) perceived job performance-reward contingency variables ("perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" and "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency"); 5) demographic variables ("age", "tenure in the job" and "major program responsibility area"). The dependent variable was "intention to leave the job". The study was correlational in nature.
Data were collected by two methods: 1) mail questionnaire and 2) examination of personnel records of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The mail questionnaire consisted of three parts that measured all variables but "supervisor rating of job performance". Data for that variable were collected from personnel records of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

The objectives of the study included:

- To describe the levels of the independent and dependent variables among Ohio Cooperative Extension Service County Agents.

- To determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

- To determine the nature and strength of various relationships suggested by the following hypotheses formulated from the review of literature:

  a. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, and satisfaction with supervision) will be negatively related to the dependent variable "intention to leave the job".

  b. "Perceived ease of movement" will be positively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

  c. "Perceived ease of movement" will moderate the relationship between the "perceived desirability of staying variables" and the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

  d. "Age" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

  e. "Tenure" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

  f. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "age".

  g. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "tenure on the job".
h. "Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "age".

i. "Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "tenure in the job".

j. "Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "perceived ease of movement".

k. "Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "tenure in the job".

l. "Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "age".

m. "Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "supervisor rating of job performance".

n. "Major program responsibility area" will be related to "perceived desirability of staying variables".

o. "Perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".

p. "Perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".

Demographic Variables

Age

Table 2 displayed the data regarding the variable, "age". The average age of the Ohio Cooperative Extension County agent was 40 years. The youngest agent was 24, the oldest was 65. A similar study conducted in 1980 (Clark, 1981) reported the average age of the same population to be 37. The typical county agent was older than five years ago.
Table 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 40.0 years  
median = 38.0 years  
mode = 34.0 years  
standard deviation = 9.7  
range = 42.0

Tenure in the Job

The average length of time that an agent had held the present job was 9.3 years. Over 50 percent of the agents reported holding their present job for two to ten years. Thirteen had been in the job for less than one year. Over 30 percent of the responding agents had been in the same job for over 10 years; 15 of those had held the same job for over 20 years. One agent reported holding the present position for 38 years.

The findings shown in Table 3, suggested that Ohio Cooperative Extension County Agents tended to stay in the same job for an extended period of time.

Major Program Responsibility Area

Approximately thirty-eight percent (84) of the agents had agriculture or community and natural resource development as the major program responsibility area. Thirty-three percent (71) were home economics agents. Twenty-nine percent (63) responded as 4-H youth agents (See Table 4).
### Table 3

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR TENURE IN THE JOB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years In the Job</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 9.3 years  
median = 7.0 years  
mode = 6.0 years  
standard deviation = 6.7  
range = 39.0

### Table 4

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (including community and Natural Resource Development)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Youth</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Performance Variables

There were two measures of job performance. Data for the two job performance variables and conclusions were presented below.

Supervisor Rating of Job Performance

Scores for "supervisor rating of job performance" were obtained from the personnel files of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The scores (the 1984 Performance Against Standards scores) could range from one to 12. The average score was 9.24. The lowest rating was 6.7 (n=1) and the highest score was 11.4 (n=1). Forty-five percent of the agents had a rating of between 9.0 and 10.0. Results were displayed in Table 5.

Agents received the performance rating from their immediate district supervisor. Agents were supervised by one of five district supervisors. To guard against possible rater bias from different rating styles, an analysis of variance was performed on mean performance scores by district to determine if any significant differences existed. No differences were found (see Table 6). Had there been significantly different means, possibly indicating differences in rating style, standard scores would have been calculated and used. For the purpose of this study, the original Performance Against Standards scores were used, not standard scores.

Very few agents were rated extremely high or low. Only 15 agents fell below 8.0 and only two were rated higher than 11.0. There were also no differences in "supervisor rating of job performance" between
Table 5

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR SUPERVISOR RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0-6.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0-7.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0-8.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0-9.9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0-10.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0-11.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>218</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 9.24
median = 9.30
mode = 9.20
standard deviation = .848
range = 4.70

*a* = scores could range from 1 to 12

Table 6

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PERFORMANCE SUPERVISOR RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE BY DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>1 (N=38)</th>
<th>2 (N=52)</th>
<th>3 (N=41)</th>
<th>4 (N=49)</th>
<th>5 (N=38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation:</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9286</td>
<td>.7322</td>
<td>1.0182</td>
<td>.3988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>153.1474</td>
<td>.7190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>156.0760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the three main program responsibility areas of agriculture, home economics, and 4-H youth (Table 7). This finding indicated that according to supervisors, all three types of agents performed equally well. Both the highest and lowest scores were earned by agriculture agents.

**Self-rating of Job Performance**

Agents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with statements describing their extent of involvement with tasks that were included in the county agent responsibilities. As indicated in Figure 7, the actual scale was scored from one to six. A score of one would indicate very high disagreement with the statements; a score of six would indicate very high agreement with the statements. Negatively worded items were reversed so that the total score of an individual across items would indicate perceived level of job performance in the following way: the higher the score, the higher the perceived job performance.

To aid in interpretation, the scale was modified as shown in Figure 7. General levels of disagreement were indicated by scores of from 1.00 to 3.50. General levels of agreement were indicated by scores of 3.51 to 6.00. All variables measured in Part one were interpreted using the scale in Figure 7.

The average response was scored as strongly agree (4.73). There were no responses in the very strongly disagree and strongly disagree categories. Ninety-nine percent of the responses occurred in the agree to very strongly agree categories. The indication was that almost all
Table 7

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SUPERVISOR RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation:</td>
<td>.9016</td>
<td>.8416</td>
<td>.7757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7261</td>
<td>.8631</td>
<td>1.2022</td>
<td>.3025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>154.3499</td>
<td>.7179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>156.0760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTUAL SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VSD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>VSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCALE USED FOR INTERPRETATION OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VSD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>VSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>(1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>(2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>(3.51-4.50)</td>
<td>(4.51-5.50)</td>
<td>(5.51-6.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISAGREEMENT --> | AGREEMENT

Figure 7

INTERPRETATION OF SCALING PROCEDURES
agents rated themselves as fairly high performers (see Table 8). However, 27 percent rated themselves in the lowest of the agreement categories. As indicated in Table 9, there were no significant differences in "self-rating of job performance" among agriculture, home economics and 4-H youth agents.

Both "supervisor rating of job performance" and "self-rating of job performance" indicated that Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents performed at high levels. Very few agents were rated by their supervisors as low performers (below 8.00). Likewise, less than one percent were rated extremely high (above 11.00).

**Perceived Job Performance-Reward Contingencies**

Data for two variables were collected and reported below.

**Perceived Job Performance-Extrinsic Reward Contingency**

The data in Table 10 indicated that even though the average score for this variable was in the agree category (3.65), many agents disagreed that there indeed existed a performance-extrinsic reward contingency. Forty-two percent were in the disagreement range. Five agents very strongly disagreed and 11 strongly disagreed.

The finding was interesting in that the indication was that agents did not believe that they were rewarded equitably for their level of job performance. Their responses seemed to suggest that even though they perceived themselves to be high performers (as did their supervisors), the reward system was not contingent upon their high performance. According to Lawler and Porter (1967), without this contingency, high
Table 8
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE SELF-RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly disagree (1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (3.51-4.50)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (4.51-5.50)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly agree (5.51-6.00)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 4.73
median = 4.71
mode = 4.71
standard deviation = .406
range = 2.35
Table 9

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SELF-RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Self-Rating score:</td>
<td>4.694</td>
<td>4.788</td>
<td>4.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3979</td>
<td>.1989</td>
<td>1.2079</td>
<td>.3008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>35.4075</td>
<td>.1647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>35.8054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR PERCEIVED JOB PERFORMANCE-EXTRINSIC REWARD CONTINGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly disagree (1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (3.51-4.50)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (4.51-5.50)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly agree (5.51-6.00)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 3.65  
median = 3.75  
mode = 4.00  
standard deviation = .733  
range = 4.75
performance does not lead to high job satisfaction. Findings on this question have been presented and discussed later in this chapter.

An analysis of variance was performed (Table 11) on the mean score of this contingency variable for the three major program responsibility areas. Significant differences were found using the LSD test, between 4-H youth agents and agriculture agents as well as between 4-H youth agents and home economics agents. Even though there were no significant differences among these groups on both of the performance ratings, still 4-H youth agents more highly perceived themselves to be inequitably rewarded for their level of job performance.

Table 11
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PERCEIVED JOB PERFORMANCE-EXTRINSIC REWARD CONTINGENCY BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4948</td>
<td>1.7474</td>
<td>3.3233</td>
<td>.0379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>113.0461</td>
<td>.5258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>116.5408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, LSD
Perceived Job Performance-Intrinsic Reward Contingency

Unlike the previous contingency variable, the intrinsic reward appeared to be contingent upon performance (Table 12). The average score for this variable was in the strongly agree category (4.73). No agent very strongly disagreed or strongly disagreed. In fact, 97 percent were in agreement that they perceived a performance-intrinsic reward contingency. Even though home economics agents scored highest of all agents on this variable, there were no significant differences among major program responsibility areas (Table 13).

Table 12
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR PERCEIVED JOB PERFORMANCE-INTRINSIC REWARD CONTINGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly disagree (1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (3.51-4.50)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (4.51-5.50)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly agree (5.51-6.00)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 4.73
median = 4.67
mode = 5.00
standard deviation = .674
range = 3.00
Table 13
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF MEAN PERCEIVED JOB PERFORMANCE-INTRINSIC REWARD
CONTINGENCY BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>4.746</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td>4.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2155</td>
<td>.6078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>97.4255</td>
<td>.4531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>98.6410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 10 and 12 clearly showed that Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents generally agreed that there was an intrinsic reward contingency associated with their jobs but disagreed that there was an extrinsic reward contingency. The indication was that agents rewarded themselves for a job well done but they perceived that the organization did not provide rewards that were contingent upon performance.

Perceived Ease of Movement

Table 14 displayed the data for "perceived ease of movement". Most agents (93 percent) perceived that there were attractive and attainable alternatives to the job they presently held. The perceived alternatives could have been within Extension or outside of Extension. The average
response was in the agree category with a mean score of 4.23. Home economics agents had the lowest mean score for "perceived ease of movement" but there were no significant differences among the three major program responsibility areas (Table 15).

Table 14

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR PERCEIVED EASE OF MOVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly disagree (1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (3.51-4.50)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (4.51-5.50)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly agree (5.51-6.00)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 4.23  
median = 4.14  
mode = 4.00  
standard deviation = .607  
range = 3.14
Table 15

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF MEAN PERCEIVED EASE OF MOVEMENT BY MAJOR
PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>4.268</td>
<td>4.135</td>
<td>4.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8621</td>
<td>.4311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>79.0675</td>
<td>.3678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>79.9297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Desirability of Staying Variables

Six variables were included in this grouping. Results were presented below.

Overall Job Satisfaction

Over 90 percent of all agents responded in the agreement categories with the majority of responses in the agree category (average score was 4.42). The indication was that most agents experienced overall job satisfaction (Table 16).

An analysis of variance was performed and results were displayed in Table 17. The post hoc LSD test indicated significant differences between 4-H youth agents and agriculture agents and also between 4-H youth agents and home economics agents. In both comparisons, 4-H youth agents experienced lower levels of "overall job satisfaction".

Facets of Satisfaction

Results for the five facets of satisfaction were presented in Tables 18 through 27. The following description explained the method of interpretation of scores.

For the facets of "satisfaction with promotion" and "satisfaction with pay", scores could have ranged from zero to 27. Scores below eight were considered to be low satisfaction. Scores between eight and 19 inclusive were categorized as medium satisfaction. Scores of 20 to 27 inclusive indicated high satisfaction.

For the facets, "satisfaction with the work itself", "satisfaction with co-workers", and "satisfaction with supervision", scores could have ranged from zero to 54. Low satisfaction was indicated by scores of 20 and below. Medium satisfaction fell between the scores of 21 and 40
Table 16
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly disagree (1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (3.51-4.50)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (4.51-5.50)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly agree (5.51-6.00)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 4.42
median = 4.40
mode = 4.00
standard deviation = .764
range = 5.00
Table 17
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF MEAN OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION BY MAJOR
PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>4.560</td>
<td>4.507</td>
<td>4.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0400</td>
<td>3.5200</td>
<td>6.3286</td>
<td>.0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>119.5842</td>
<td>.5562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>126.6242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05, LSD
Table 18
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE SATISFACTION WITH PROMOTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 10.96  
median = 10.00  
mode = 12.00  
standard deviation = 7.18  
range = 27.00  

a = scores could range from 0 to 27
Table 19

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SATISFACTION WITH PROMOTION BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94.3446</td>
<td>47.1723</td>
<td>.9138</td>
<td>.4025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>11098.2839</td>
<td>51.6199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>11192.6284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

inclusive. Scores of 41 to 54 inclusive were considered to have represented high satisfaction.

Satisfaction with Promotion

As Table 18 indicated, "satisfaction with promotion" scores tended to be in the low and medium ranges. Less than eight percent of the agents had scores in the high satisfaction category. The average score of 10.96 was considered to be medium satisfaction. Ten agents reported a score of zero, an indication of no satisfaction with promotion opportunities. This facet had the lowest scores comparatively among the five facets of satisfaction.

No differences were found through analysis of variance among agriculture, home economics, and 4-H youth agents (Table 19). All three program responsibility areas appeared to experience comparable levels of satisfaction with promotion opportunities.
Satisfaction with Pay

Agents tended to be more satisfied with pay than with promotion. The average score still occurred in the medium satisfaction level but was higher than that of promotion (average score = 15.26) (Table 20). However, three agents recorded a score of zero for an indication of no satisfaction with the pay.

Approximately eleven percent of the responses were in the low satisfaction category. Over 68 percent of the agents had medium levels of satisfaction and just over 20 percent indicated scores in the high range.

Table 20

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE SATISFACTION WITH PAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 15.26
median = 16.00
mode = 19.00
standard deviation = 5.40
range = 25.00

a = scores could range from 0 to 27
As Table 21 indicated, analysis of variance procedures suggested differences among major program responsibility areas. An LSD post hoc test produced significant differences between 4-H youth agents and agriculture agents and also between 4-H youth agents and home economics agents. 4-H youth agents experienced lower levels of satisfaction with pay than did either agriculture agents or home economics agents.

Table 21

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SATISFACTION WITH PAY BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>197.8575</td>
<td>98.9287</td>
<td>3.4660</td>
<td>.0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6136.7113</td>
<td>28.5428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6334.5688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, LSD

As was previously reported, 4-H youth agents also scored significantly lower than both agriculture agents and home economics agents on the "perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency". The findings for both "satisfaction with pay" and the "performance-extrinsic reward contingency" variable logically were similar. Referring to Tables 7, 9, 11, and 21, 4-H youth agents were not different in "self-rating of job performance" and "supervisor
Table 22

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE SATISFACTION WITH THE WORK ITSELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 39.95
median = 41.00
mode = 45.00
standard deviation = 5.70
range = 28.00

a = scores could range from 0 to 54

rating of job performance but possessed lower levels of "satisfaction with pay" and perceived there to be less of a contingency between job performance and extrinsic reward than agriculture agents and home economics agents.

Satisfaction with the Work Itself

Data for "satisfaction with the work itself" were displayed in Table 22. About one-half the agents experienced medium levels of satisfaction with the actual work itself and about one-half experienced high levels. No agents reported scores in the low range. The average score was 39.95. The most frequently reported score was 45, in the high satisfaction range.
4-H youth agents scored lowest among the three major program responsibility areas on this variable. Analysis of variance and an LSD post hoc test indicated significant differences between 4-H youth agents and agriculture agents and also between 4-H youth agents and home economics agents (Table 23). Again, 4-H youth agents perceived less "satisfaction with the work itself" than did both other types of agents. Agriculture agents reported the highest levels of "satisfaction with the work itself".

Satisfaction with Co-workers

Seventy-two percent of the agents indicated high levels of satisfaction with their co-workers. A few indicated low levels (less than five percent). Generally, agents were very satisfied with their co-workers. The average score was 44.37 which fell into the high range of satisfaction. The highest number of responses occurred for the perfect score of 54, with 34 agents indicating that score (Table 24).

The analysis of variance performed suggested that agents in all three major program responsibility areas shared the same high levels of satisfaction with their co-workers. No significant differences were found. Agriculture agents, however, did score highest, and with the lowest variance in scores (Table 25).

Satisfaction with Supervision

Table 26 displayed the data for "satisfaction with supervision". The majority of the agents indicated high levels of satisfaction with supervision. Almost 60 percent responded with scores over 40. Only about six percent indicated low levels of satisfaction with their supervision. The average score was 41.46 and the most often occurring
Table 23

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SATISFACTION WITH THE WORK ITSELF BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>41.8095</td>
<td>40.098</td>
<td>37.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>5.548</td>
<td>4.310</td>
<td>6.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>728.6283</td>
<td>364.3141</td>
<td>12.3957</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6318.9130</td>
<td>29.3903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>7047.5413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, LSD
Table 24

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE SATISFACTION WITH CO-WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response, Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **mean** = 44.37
- **median** = 47.00
- **mode** = 54.00
- **standard deviation** = 9.94
- **range** = 51.00

*a = scores could range from 0 to 54*
Table 25
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SATISFACTION WITH CO-WORKERS BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>352.1333</td>
<td>176.0667</td>
<td>1.7950</td>
<td>.1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>21088.7703</td>
<td>98.0873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>21440.9037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score | Agriculture (N=84) | Home Economics (N=71) | 4-H Youth (N=63) |
-----------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|
|           | 45.964             | 43.563                 | 43.158           |

Standard deviation | Agriculture (N=84) | Home Economics (N=71) | 4-H Youth (N=63) |
-------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|
|                   | 9.081              | 10.401                 | 10.372           |
Table 26
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response a</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 41.46  
median = 44.00  
mode = 54.00  
standard deviation = 10.72  
range = 51.00  

a = scores could range from 0 to 54
score was again the perfect score of 54 (28 agents responded with a score of 54).

Typically, agents were moderately to highly satisfied with their supervision. Very few indicated low satisfaction and no agent reported a zero, indicating no satisfaction. There were no significant differences among agriculture, home economics and 4-H youth agents as Table 27 showed. Agents from each major program responsibility area shared fairly high levels of satisfaction with supervision.

Table 27

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISION BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>42.404</td>
<td>42.464</td>
<td>39.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>10.416</td>
<td>10.271</td>
<td>11.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>508.4823</td>
<td>254.2412</td>
<td>2.2399</td>
<td>.1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>24403.6461</td>
<td>113.5053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>24912.1284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Facets of Satisfaction

Agents tended to be highly satisfied with the work itself, co-workers, and supervision. Lower satisfaction was experienced with pay and promotion but, even so, the average scores of these two variables were in the medium satisfaction range.
4-H youth agents were the least satisfied overall (see Figure 8) and showed significant differences (scoring lower than the other two groups) with "satisfaction with the pay" and "satisfaction with the work itself". Overall, agents were most satisfied with co-workers, and least satisfied with promotion opportunities.

**Intention to Leave the Job**

For the purpose of measuring the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job", the interpretation of the scoring procedure was reversed. A high score indicated a high intention to leave the job and a low score indicated the reverse. Over 68 percent of the agents responded in the very strongly disagree and strongly disagree categories. Only about seven percent responded in the area of agreement. The indication was that there was a very low level of "intention to leave the job" among Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents (Table 28). The average score occurred in the strongly disagree category (mean=2.13) and the most common response was the lowest score possible; 1.00 (very strongly disagree). Fifty respondents indicated a response of 1.00.

Even though 4-H youth agents scored higher on this variable indicating higher intention to leave the job, there were no significant differences among the major program responsibility areas. Results of analysis of variance were presented in Table 29. 4-H youth agents also had the widest variance of responses. Most agents had very low intentions to leave the present job. All three types of agents shared these low intentions.
Figure 8

COMPARISON BAR GRAPHS OF MEASURES OF FACET SATISFACTION
BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

LEGEND
AG = Agriculture
HE = Home Economics
4H = 4-H Youth
Table 28
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (3.51-4.50)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (4.51-5.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly Agree (5.51-6.00)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean = 2.13
median = 2.00
mode = 1.00
standard deviation = 1.02
range = 5.00
Table 29

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ANALYSIS
OF VARIANCE FOR INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB
BY MAJOR PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture (N=84)</th>
<th>Home Economics (N=71)</th>
<th>4-H Youth (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>2.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8741</td>
<td>1.9370</td>
<td>1.8618</td>
<td>.1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>223.6826</td>
<td>1.0404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>227.5567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Hypotheses

There were 16 separate hypotheses proposed in this study. This section reported the findings and conclusions associated with each hypothesis.

For the purpose of describing the magnitude of the relationships between variables, the scale suggested by Davis (1971) was used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>very high relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>substantial relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>moderate relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>low relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>negligible relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses A, B, C

a. The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

b. "Perceived ease of movement" will be positively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".

c. "Perceived ease of movement" will moderate the relationship between "perceived desirability of staying variables" and the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job."

Hypotheses A, B, and C were tested using the following procedures. To determine the main effect of "overall job satisfaction" on the dependent variable "intention to leave the job", a variance increment was obtained by subtracting the $R^2$ of a model containing only "perceived ease of movement" from the $R^2$ of a model containing both "overall job satisfaction" and "perceived ease of movement". An F statistic was then calculated to determine the significance of the change in $R^2$ (the variance increment). The reverse was done to determine the main effect for "perceived ease of movement".

The main effect for "overall job satisfaction" was significant. The main effect for "perceived ease of movement" was not (Table 30). To test the hypothesis that the variable "perceived ease of movement" moderated the relationship between "overall job satisfaction" and "intention to leave the job", an interaction variable was added to the model.

The regression model was the following:
Table 30

RESULTS OF MODERATED REGRESSION OF THE INTERACTION OF PERCEIVED EASE OF MOVEMENT AND DESIRABILITY OF STAYING VARIABLES IN THE PREDICTION OF INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Intention to Leave the Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall job satisfaction (A)</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived ease of movement (B)</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction (AxB)</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with promotion (C)</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived ease of movement (D)</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction (CxD)</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with pay (E)</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived ease of movement (F)</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction (ExF)</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with the work itself (G)</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived ease of movement (H)</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction (GxH)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with co-workers (I)</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived ease of movement (J)</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction (IxJ)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with supervision (K)</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived ease of movement (L)</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction (KxL)</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, $F_{crit}$ 3.89
Intention to leave the job = overall job satisfaction + perceived ease of movement + the interaction of overall job satisfaction and perceived ease of movement.

To test the interaction, a variance increment was obtained by the following method:

1. Subtract the $R^2$ of the model containing "overall job satisfaction" and "perceived ease of movement" from the $R^2$ of the model containing 1) "overall job satisfaction" 2) "perceived ease of movement" and 3) the interaction of the two.

2. Calculate the F statistic to test the significance of that increment of $R^2$.

The interaction was determined to be significant at an alpha level of .05. The results indicated that "perceived ease of movement" did, indeed, moderate the relationship between "overall job satisfaction" and "intention to leave the job".

To determine what type of effect "perceived ease of movement" had on the relationship, regression lines were plotted using the extreme scores of the scale (1,6) of "perceived ease of movement" to represent low "perceived ease of movement" and high "perceived ease of movement". Results of the interaction were represented in Figure 9, along with the regression equation used to calculate the lines.

As can be seen in Figure 9, agents with "high perceived ease of movement" (those who perceived many alternatives to their present job) tended to have less "intention to leave the job" as "overall job satisfaction" increased. Those agents with low "perceived ease of
Regression Equation

\[ Y' = 1.503 + 1.452 \text{ (perceived ease of movement)} + 1.007 \text{ (overall job satisfaction)} - 0.373 \text{ (interaction)} \]

Figure 9

PLOT OF THE INTERACTION REPRESENTING THE MODERATING EFFECT OF PERCEIVED EASE OF MOVEMENT ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION AND INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB
movement", low alternatives, tended to have increased "intention to leave the job" as "overall job satisfaction" increased.

Thus, agents with high "perceived ease of movement" and high "overall job satisfaction" generally had lower "intentions to leave the job" than those agents with low "perceived ease of movement" and high "overall job satisfaction".

Main effects for each of the other "perceived desirability of staying variables" on the dependent variable "intention to leave the job", were tested using the described procedure. Results were in Table 30.

Tests for the moderating effects of "perceived ease of movement" on the relationships between each of the other "perceived desirability of staying variables" and "intention to leave the job" were performed as well. Results were reported in Table 30. Plots of the significant interactions appeared in Figures 10 and 11.

Two of the plots showing interaction appeared to be similar (Figure 9 and 11). Significant moderating effects for "perceived ease of movement" on the relationship between "perceived desirability of staying variables" and "intention to leave the job" were found for a) "overall job satisfaction", and b) "satisfaction with pay". The third interaction appeared to have indicated that "satisfaction with promotion" was the moderating variable for the relationship between "perceived ease of movement" and "intention to leave the job".

The logic for this interpretation came from the fact that main effects were found for "perceived ease of movement" in the model containing "satisfaction with promotion" and "perceived ease of movement"
Regression Equation:

\[ Y' = 2.080 + 0.038 \text{ (perceived ease of movement)} + 0.127 \text{ (satisfaction with promotion)} - 0.033 \text{ (interaction)} \]

Figure 10

PLOT OF THE INTERACTION REPRESENTING THE MODERATING EFFECT OF SATISFACTION WITH PROMOTION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED EASE OF MOVEMENT AND INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB
Regression equation:

\[ Y' = 1.836 + .180 \text{ (perceived ease of movement)} + .123 \text{ (satisfaction with pay)} - .037 \text{ (interaction)} \]

Figure 11

PLOT OF THE INTERACTION REPRESENTING THE MODERATING EFFECT OF PERCEIVED EASE OF MOVEMENT ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SATISFACTION WITH PAY AND INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB.
but main effects were not found for "satisfaction with promotion" in the same model.

This finding would have indicated that there was not a relationship between "satisfaction with promotion" and "intention to leave the job". Therefore, that hypothesized relationship could not be moderated because the relationship did not exist.

To summarize the results of the tests for hypotheses A, B, and C, the following conclusions have been made.

1. All of the "perceived desirability of staying variables" were negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job", which supported hypothesis A. The relationship was moderate for "overall job satisfaction", low for satisfaction with pay, the work itself, co-workers and supervision. The relationship for "satisfaction with promotion" was negligible (Table 31). The conclusion was that the higher the satisfaction experienced by agents, the lower were the intentions to leave the job. Even though all but one correlation coefficient were significant at alpha <.05, the amount of variance accounted for by these relationships was very small as could be determined by coefficients of determination. For example, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient for the largest correlation, "overall job satisfaction" was -.46. The amount of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by "overall job satisfaction" was -.46 squared which was 21 percent of the variance.

2. Using regression techniques, main effects of the dependent variable on "desirability of staying variables" were determined by significance testing of increments in the $R^2$ of the regression model of the
dependent variable. Significant main effects were found for all desirability of staying variables but "satisfaction with promotion" (Table 30).

3. Hypothesis B was not supported. A low negative relationship was found between "perceived ease of movement" and "intention to leave the job".

4. Using regression techniques, the main effects of the dependent variable on "perceived ease of movement" were tested. Five of six models contained variance increments that were significant (in the model containing "overall job satisfaction", the "perceived ease of movement" variance increment was not significant) at the alpha <.05 level. These findings would have indicated that in the prediction of "intention to leave the job" using a regression model containing a "perceived desirability of staying variable" and "perceived ease of movement", the "perceived ease of movement" variable accounted for a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable over and above the "perceived desirability of staying" variable in all but one model.

5. Hypothesis C was supported for three of the "perceived desirability of staying" variables ("overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with promotion", and "satisfaction with pay"). The nature of the interactions showing the moderated relationships was found to be similar for two of the three models. The moderating variable for the model containing "satisfaction with promotion" was determined to be "satisfaction with promotion" and not "perceived ease of movement" as was hypothesized. Models containing the other three "perceived
Table 31
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT FOR THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</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>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.113</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>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td></td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td></td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.470</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Self rating of job performance
2. Perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency
3. Perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency
4. Perceived ease of movement
5. Intention to leave the job
6. Overall job satisfaction
7. Tenure in the job
8. Age
9. Satisfaction with promotion
10. Satisfaction with pay
11. Satisfaction with the work itself
12. Satisfaction with co-workers
13. Satisfaction with supervision
14. Supervisor rating of job performance
1. **overall job satisfaction** → intention to leave the job 
   | perceived ease of movement

2. **satisfaction with promotion** → intention to leave the job 
   | perceived ease of movement

3. **satisfaction with pay** → intention to leave the job 
   | perceived ease of movement

4. **satisfaction with the work itself** → intention to leave the job 
   | perceived ease of movement

5. **satisfaction with co-workers** → intention to leave the job 
   | perceived ease of movement

6. **satisfaction with supervision** → intention to leave the job 
   | perceived ease of movement

**Figure 12**

**PARTIAL MODELS REPRESENTING THE MAIN EFFECTS AND INTERACTIONS FOR HYPOTHESES A, B, C**
desirability of staying" variables did not contain significant interaction terms, thus, the hypothesis of moderating effects was not supported when predicting the dependent variable from "satisfaction with the work itself", "satisfaction with co-workers", or "satisfaction with supervision" (Table 30).

Hypotheses D and E: "Age" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job."

"Tenure" will be negatively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job."

As can be viewed in Table 31, neither Hypothesis D nor E was supported. The correlation coefficient for "age" and "intention to leave the job" indicated a negligible positive relationship. The relationship between "tenure in the job" and "intention to leave the job" was also a negligible positive relationship.

These findings indicated that there was very little relationship between the age of an agent and "intention to leave the job", and "tenure in the job" and "intention to leave the job".

Hypotheses F and G: The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "age."

The "perceived desirability of staying variables" will be positively related to "tenure in the job."

Findings supported both hypotheses (Table 31). However, "age" was correlated higher with the "perceived desirability of staying" variables than was "tenure in the job". As agents "age" and "tenure in the job" increased, so did measures of job satisfaction.
Hypotheses H, I, J:

"Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "age".

"Perceived ease of movement" will be negatively related to "tenure in the job."

"Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "perceived ease of movement."

Findings for hypotheses H and I indicated that low negative relationships were found between "perceived ease of movement" and "age" and also between "perceived ease of movement" and "tenure in the job" (Table 31). The indication was that as the age of agents increased their perceptions of ease of movement decreased. Also, as tenure in the job increased, "perceived ease of movement" decreased.

As Table 31 indicated, the relationship between "perceived ease of movement" and "self-rating of job performance" was much stronger (r=.339). This relationship was described as moderate and suggested that the higher the "self-rating of job performance", the higher the "perceived ease of movement".

Hypotheses K, L, and M:

"Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "tenure in the job."

"Supervisor rating of job performance" will be positively related to "age".

"Self-rating of job performance" will be positively related to "supervisor rating of job performance."

Hypotheses K and L were not supported as determined by the size of the correlation coefficients for these relationships. Even though both were positive, they were both extremely low (Table 31).
These findings indicated that "age" and "tenure in the job" were not related to "supervisor rating of job performance". The style and methods of ratings of supervisors were not influenced by the age of agents or their "tenure in the job".

Hypothesis M was supported as determined by the correlation coefficient of .286 (a low positive relationship). This correlation represented just over eight percent of the variance in one variable accounted for by the relationship with the other.

Hypothesis N:

"Major program responsibility area" will be related to "perceived desirability of staying variables."

As was seen in Tables 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27, tests of analysis of variance of means of the three major program responsibility areas on "perceived desirability of staying variables" produced significant results for three of the six variables. These variables were "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with pay" and "satisfaction with the work itself". For all three variables 4-H agents scored significantly lower than agriculture agents or home economics agents on the measures of satisfaction.

Findings indicated that 4-H agents tended to be less satisfied with their pay, and their work as well as less satisfied overall. These findings supported the hypothesis.

Hypothesis O:

"Perceived job performance–extrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables."
Results for Hypothesis 0 were shown in Table 32. Main effects and interactions were determined by procedures previously described in the section on results for Hypotheses A, B and C.

"Perceived job performance–extrinsic reward contingency" was not found to be a moderating variable. The variable was found, however, to have main effects in all six of the regression models which indicated a direct relationship between the contingency variable and all "perceived desirability of staying variables" (Figure 13).

"Self-rating of job performance" was found to have main effects in only two of the models, the one containing "overall job satisfaction" and the model with "satisfaction with pay".

An interaction was found for the regression model with "satisfaction with promotion", but the moderating variable appeared to be "self-rating of job performance" rather than the hypothesized moderating variable of "perceived job performance–extrinsic reward contingency" (Figure 14).

The plot of the interaction showed that agents with low "self-ratings of job performance" as well as agents with high "self-ratings of job performance" tended to have increased "satisfaction with promotion" as their perceptions of "job performance–extrinsic reward contingency" increased. Those agents with high self-ratings tended to have less of an increase than those with low self-ratings.

To summarize the results of the tests for Hypothesis 0, the following conclusions have been suggested.

1. The hypothesis was not supported by the findings.

2. As can be viewed in Table 31, correlations between "perceived job performance–extrinsic reward contingency" and "perceived
Table 32

RESULTS OF MODERATED REGRESSION OF THE INTERACTION OF JOB PERFORMANCE-EXTRINSIC REWARD CONTINGENCY AND SELF-RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE IN THE PREDICTION OF DESIRABILITY OF STAYING VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Self-rating of job performance</th>
<th>Performance-Extrinsic Reward</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \Delta R^2 ) df ( F )</td>
<td>( \Delta R^2 ) df ( F )</td>
<td>( \Delta R^2 ) df ( F )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>.060 (1,215) *16.10</td>
<td>.119 (1,215) *31.43</td>
<td>.002 (1,214) .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>.012 (1,215) 3.55</td>
<td>.277 (1,215) *83.03</td>
<td>.040 (1,214) *12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>.018 (1,215) *5.37</td>
<td>.299 (1,215) *93.26</td>
<td>.003 (1,214) 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with the work itself</td>
<td>.008 (1,215) 1.99</td>
<td>.123 (1,215) *30.58</td>
<td>.000 (1,214) .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>.001 (1,215) .12</td>
<td>.127 (1,215) *31.22</td>
<td>.001 (1,214) .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with supervision</td>
<td>.005 (1,215) 1.36</td>
<td>.234 (1,215) *66.00</td>
<td>.000 (1,214) .08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05, F_{crit}^* = 3.89 \)
Figure 13

PARTIAL MODELS REPRESENTING THE MAIN EFFECTS AND INTERACTIONS FOR HYPOTHESIS O
Regression Equation:

\[ Y' = -104.46 + 19.9 \times \text{self-rating of job performance} + 33.24 \times \text{perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency} - 5.79 \times \text{interaction} \]

**Figure 14**

PLOT OF THE INTERACTION REPRESENTING THE MODERATING EFFECT OF SELF RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SATISFACTION WITH PROMOTION AND PERCEIVED JOB PERFORMANCE-EXTRINSIC REWARD CONTINGENCY
desirability of staying variables" were moderate to substantial in magnitude and positive in nature. These correlations suggested that a fairly strong relationship existed between how agents viewed the contingent nature of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service reward system and how satisfied they were with their jobs. When agents perceived that rewards were contingent upon performance, their job satisfaction tended to be higher.

3. The indication was that "self-rating of job performance" was associated with job satisfaction only in the cases of "overall job satisfaction" and "satisfaction with pay". The nature of these two relationships was opposite, however. As "self-rating of job performance" increased, "overall job satisfaction" increased also but "satisfaction with pay" decreased. This finding indicated that agents who saw themselves as higher performers tended to have increased job satisfaction overall but tended to be less satisfied with their pay.

4. The interaction of "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" in the case of "satisfaction with promotion" suggested that all agents, regardless of "self-rating of job performance", had increased "satisfaction with promotion" as their perceptions of the performance-reward contingency increased but that those with high "self-ratings of job performance" had lower "satisfaction with promotion" than did the low self-raters of performance for the same levels of "perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency".
Table 33
RESULTS OF MODERATED REGRESSION OF THE INTERACTION OF JOB PERFORMANCE-INTRINSIC REWARD CONTINGENCY AND SELF-RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE IN THE PREDICTION OF DESIRABILITY OF STAYING VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Self-rating of job performance</th>
<th>Performance-Intrinsic Reward</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in $R^2$</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>.008 (1,215)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.192 (1,215) *55.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>.012 (1,215)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.006 (1,215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>.018 (1,215)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.008 (1,215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with the work itself</td>
<td>.000 (1,215)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.007 (1,215) *18.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>.001 (1,215)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.001 (1,215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with supervision</td>
<td>.011 (1,215)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.028 (1,215) *5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 $F_{crit}$ 3.89
Hypothesis P:

"Perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables."

Hypothesis P was tested using moderated regression techniques and results were displayed in Table 33.

Only one interaction was significant but again, as with the extrinsic reward contingency, the moderating variable in this relationship appeared to be "self-rating of job performance", not the "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" variable as hypothesized (Figures 15, 16).

Figure 16 suggested that if agents rated themselves as high performers, their satisfaction with supervision would increase as their perceptions of job performance-intrinsic reward contingency increased. If the agents had rated themselves as low performers, the opposite relationship was true.

No significant main effects were found for the variable "self-rating of job performance" when the regression model contained both that variable and the intrinsic reward contingency. There were, however, significant effects for "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" in the models for "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with the work itself", and also for "satisfaction with supervision" (Table 33).

As can be viewed in Table 31, the correlations between each of these three "perceived desirability of staying variables" and the "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" variable were significant
1. **job performance reward contingency** → **overall job satisfaction**
   - self-rating of job performance

2. **job performance reward contingency** → **satisfaction with promotion**
   - self-rating of job performance

3. **job performance reward contingency** → **satisfaction with pay**
   - self-rating of job performance

4. **job performance reward contingency** → **satisfaction with the work itself**
   - self-rating of job performance

5. **job performance reward contingency** → **satisfaction with co-workers**
   - self-rating of job performance

6. **job performance reward contingency** → **satisfaction with supervision**
   - self-rating of job performance

Figure 15

PARTIAL MODELS REPRESENTING THE MAIN EFFECTS AND INTERACTIONS FOR HYPOTHESIS P
Regression equation:

\[ Y' = 152.33 - 26.21 \text{ (self-rating of job performance)} - 20.74 \text{ (perceived job performance—intrinsic reward contingency)} + 4.95 \text{ (interaction)} \]

Figure 16

PLOT OF THE INTERACTION REPRESENTING THE MODERATING EFFECT OF SELF-RATING OF JOB PERFORMANCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISION AND PERCEIVED JOB PERFORMANCE–INTRINSIC REWARD CONTINGENCY
and ranged from low to substantial so the significant main effects were not surprising to find.

Conclusions based on the findings of the tests for Hypothesis P included the following:

1. Hypothesis P was not supported in the study.
2. "Self-rating of job performance" was not related to any of the "perceived desirability of staying variables".
3. The "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" was positively related to three of the "perceived desirability of staying variables". Interpretations made suggested that as agents perceived that rewards they gave themselves depended on their performance, their job satisfaction increased. Conversely, when agents did not feel good about a job well done, their job satisfaction decreased.

**Summary of Tests of Hypotheses**

Hypothesis A was supported in all cases except "satisfaction with promotion".

Hypothesis B was not supported. The opposite relationship was found.

Hypothesis C was supported in the case of "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with promotion" and "satisfaction with pay". Hypothesis C was not supported for "satisfaction with the work itself", "satisfaction with co-workers" and "satisfaction with supervision".

Hypotheses D and E were not supported.

Hypotheses F, G, H, I and J were supported.
Hypotheses K and L were not supported.

Hypothesis M was supported.

Hypothesis N was supported for the variables, "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with pay" and "satisfaction with the work itself".

Hypothesis O was not supported.

Hypothesis P was not supported.

Independent Variables That Best Predicted Intention to Leave the Job

To determine the independent variable or set of independent variables that would best predict the dependent variable "intention to leave the job", a stepwise multiple regression technique was used. A significant level of .05 was used for entry into and removal from the model.

Variables were chosen that had significant correlations with the dependent variable. Also variables that, through the review of literature, should be related to the dependent variable were also used. The results of the regression technique were displayed in Table 34.

As shown, there were four independent variables that were determined to belong to the set of best predictors of "intention to leave the job". They were: 1) "overall job satisfaction"; 2) "age"; 3) "satisfaction with co-workers"; and 4) "self-rating of job performance". These four variables, as a set, accounted for 29 percent of the variance in "intention to leave the job". "Overall job satisfaction" accounted for 21 percent in and of itself.

One of the four best predictors, "self-rating of job performance", was one of the main independent variables of interest in this study.
Table 34

STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION
OF INTENTION TO LEAVE THE JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables Entered Stepwise in Equation</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Increment</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>(1,216)</td>
<td>*58.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>(1,215)</td>
<td>*6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with co-workers</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>(1,214)</td>
<td>*8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-rating of job performance</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>(1,213)</td>
<td>*7.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, $F_{crit} = 3.89$

The results indicated that as "self-rating of job performance" decreased, "intention to leave the job" increased.

A multiple regression technique was used to determine the amount of variance accounted for in the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job", by all independent variables in the study. The $R^2$ was .3329 which indicated that 33 percent of the variance could be accounted for by the linear combination of independent variables.

A comparison of the total model $R^2$ with the stepwise model $R^2$ showed that the other ten variables accounted for an increase of only four percent of the variance above that accounted for by the four best predictors.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships among factors associated with the intentions of Ohio Cooperative Extension County Agents to leave their jobs. Two variables were of particular interest; "self-rating of job performance" and "supervisor rating of job performance".

The objectives directing the investigation were:
1. To describe the levels of the independent and dependent variables among Ohio Cooperative Extension county agents.
2. To determine the best predictors(s) of the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job".
3. To determine the nature and strength of various relationships suggested by the 16 hypotheses of the study formulated through a review of literature.

Methodology

The section on Methodology included a summary of the following: Research Design, Population, Data Collection, Instrumentation, Reliability and Validity of the Instrument and Data Analysis.

Research Design

The research design was correlational allowing the researcher to determine the nature and strength of relationships between variables.
Descriptive information was collected as well, and used to determine levels of variables in the population.

**Population**

The population consisted of all Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents under contract March 1, 1985. This population included agriculture agents including two community and natural resource development agents (n=94), home economics agents (n=80) and 4-H youth agents (n=70). The total population was 244. Therefore, the findings, conclusions and recommendations of this study were applicable to this population.

The entire population was used in the study and was referred to as a sample of all populations of Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents who might have been employed by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as county agents at other points in time. This logic permitted the use of inferential statistics.

**Data Collection**

Two methods of data collection were used. The bulk of the data were collected using a mail questionnaire. Some data were also collected using the personnel files of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

Data were collected during the month of May, 1985. The population was 244 Ohio Cooperative Extension Service County agents. The total number of respondents was 229 agents for an accepting sample of 94 percent. Data for 218 agents were usable for a data sample of 89 percent. This included 84 agriculture agents, 71 home economics agents and 63 4-H youth agents.
Instrumentation

The instrument used to collect the majority of the data was developed by the researcher and contained three parts. Part one consisted of attitude statements using a Likert-type scale for responses. The following variables were measured in part one: 1) "self-rating of job performance"; 2) "perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency"; 3) "perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency"; 4) "overall job satisfaction"; 5) "perceived ease of movement" and 6) "intention to leave the job".

Part two collected information on the "age" of the agents, "tenure in the job", and "major program responsibility area". Part three measured satisfaction with facets of the job including promotion, pay, the work itself, co-workers, and supervision. These data were collected using the Job Descriptive Index (Smith et al., 1969).

Data regarding "supervisor rating of job performance" were collected from the personnel files of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The variable "supervisor rating of job performance" was measured using the 1984 Performance Against Standards score for each agent.

Reliability and Validity of the Instrument

Part one of the instrument was reviewed by a panel of experts and was judged to have content validity.

The instrument was then pilot tested using Ohio Cooperative Extension district personnel to determine the reliability of the instrument.
Cronbach's alphas were calculated to test for internal consistency. All items for each domain were determined to be contributing to the measurement of the appropriate domain.

The job descriptive Index reported reliabilities consistently in the .80 to .90 range using a variety of populations (Smith, et al., 1969).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al, 1975) and the Statistical Analysis System (Ray et al, 1982) at The Ohio State University.

Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency and variability were used to organize and summarize the data. Correlational and regression techniques were used to determine the nature and strength of relationships as well as to determine moderating effects of variables on relationships. These techniques included multiple regression, moderated regression, stepwise multiple regression and Pearson correlation coefficients.

Analysis of variance and t-tests were used to compare groups on selected variables. Also, generalizability of the study was determined using t-tests of scores of early and late respondents.

Summary and Implications of Findings

Findings, conclusions, and implications associated with the three objectives of the study were summarized below.
Objective One: Describe the levels of variables among Ohio Cooperative Extension county agents.

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables of "age", "tenure in the job" and "major program responsibility" were included in the study.

"Age"

Thirty-four agents were in the 20–30 year age range. Ninety-eight were in the 31–40 year age range. Fifty agents responded for the 41–50 year age range and the age of 36 agents was above 50. The average age was 40 years, three years older than the average age of the same population in 1980 as determined by Clark (1981).

"Tenure in the Job"

The majority of agents reported holding the present job for between two and ten years. A few agents had been in the present position for one year or less (n=13). A small percentage had held the same job for over 25 years (n=5). The Clark study (1981) reported the average "tenure in the job" as eight and one half years. The mean "tenure in the job" for this study was just over nine years. Agents may be staying longer in their jobs.

"Major Program Responsibility Area"

Thirty-eight percent of the subjects were agriculture agents. Thirty-three percent were home economics agents and twenty-nine percent reported being 4-H youth agents.

Job Performance Variables

Two measures of job performance were used in this study. They were a "self-rating of job performance" completed by the agent and a
"Supervisor rating of job performance" as indicated by the 1984 Performance Against Standards score given to agents by their district supervisor.

"Self-rating of Job Performance"

All agents but one reported responses in the agreement categories indicating high self-ratings of performance. The majority rated themselves in the strongly agree and very strongly agree categories. No differences were found among program areas.

These findings tended to agree with most job performance research using self-ratings as measures. People tend to rate themselves as high performers rather than low performers (Cascio, 1982).

"Supervisor Rating of Job Performance"

Forty-five percent of the agents received ratings of between nine and ten on a 12 point scale. Very few were rated extremely high (above 11) or low (below eight). No differences in rating style between district supervisors were found. Most agents, regardless of program area, were rated as fairly high performers by their supervisors.

The findings of this study supported previous research on job performance in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service which also indicated fairly high average scores for Ohio Cooperative Extension Service county agents (Igodan, 1984; Potts, 1984).

Perceived Job Performance-reward Contingency Variables

Two separate contingency variables were investigated in this study. The first one, "perceived job performance–extrinsic reward contingency", dealt with types of rewards that organizations give to their employees. The second one, "perceived job performance–intrinsic reward contingency", referred to rewards that individuals give to themselves.
"Perceived Job Performance-extrinsic Reward Contingency"

Forty-two percent of the county agents disagreed to some extent that the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service provided a performance contingent reward system. 4-H youth agents had significantly lower perceptions of a performance contingent reward system than did either agriculture or home economics agents.

The finding that there was a lack of a "perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" was not surprising. Dreher (1982) had suggested that organizations in non-business, educational settings (such as Extension) were less likely to have performance-contingent reward systems than other types of organizations.

"Perceived Job Performance-intrinsic Reward Contingency"

Higher levels of the intrinsic reward contingency existed among agents than for the extrinsic reward contingency. Ninety-seven percent of the agents agreed to very strongly agreed that there were indeed intrinsic rewards contingent upon job performance. This finding suggested that agents rewarded themselves for good performance. No differences among program areas existed for the intrinsic reward contingency.

The high level of intrinsic reward contingency should not be surprising after an examination of the results of data in this study concerning "satisfaction with the work itself". No agents reported low levels of satisfaction with their work and over 50 percent indicated high levels with scores over 40 (scaled zero to 54). Agents tended to receive satisfaction from the work itself, which in turn provided the intrinsic reward when a job was well done.
Perceived Ease of Movement

The majority of agents (93 percent) perceived there to be alternatives to their present jobs that were attractive and attainable. No differences were found among program areas. Results indicated that scores for "perceived ease of movement" in this study were higher than for the Clark study (1981). Possible explanations may have included economic trends and the job market. Also, movement within Extension was less of a possibility in 1981 than in 1985 (Smith, 1985).

Perceived Desirability of Staying Variables

Six measures of satisfaction were used in this study to indicate the level of desirability of staying on the job. The variables were: "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with promotion", "satisfaction with pay", "satisfaction with the work itself", "satisfaction with co-workers", and "satisfaction with supervision".

"Overall Job Satisfaction"

Most agents experienced overall job satisfaction with 90 percent responding in the agreement categories. 4-H youth agents had significantly lower overall job satisfaction than did agriculture agents or home economics agents.

Again, the Clark study (1981) also indicated fairly high levels of job satisfaction among Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents, as did the Igodan study on burnout (1984). Igodan also found that 4-H youth agents were lowest on satisfaction measures. The same differences were found in this study.
"Satisfaction with Promotion"

Agents were generally not satisfied with promotion opportunities. Even though the average score (10.96 on a scale of zero to 27) fell in the medium range of satisfaction, over 37 percent of all agents reported low scores on the JDI for promotion.

Findings concerning the extrinsic reward contingency suggested that individuals did not perceive organizational rewards such as promotion to be contingent upon performance. Thus, low satisfaction with promotional opportunities was not surprising.

"Satisfaction with Pay"

Similar to findings for "satisfaction with promotion", "satisfaction with pay" was also low. Only 20 percent scored in the high range and ten percent were in the low range. Again, pay was a reward that the organization gave to employees and the lack of a perceived extrinsic reward contingency could be a plausible explanation for low levels of "satisfaction with pay". 4-H youth agents scored significantly lower on "satisfaction with pay" than did agriculture or home economics agents.

"Satisfaction with the Work Itself"

Agents scored medium to high on the facet "satisfaction with the work itself". The average score of 39.95 was just under the high range. 4-H youth agents scored significantly lower on "satisfaction with the work itself" than did agriculture or home economics agents.

"Satisfaction with Co-workers"

The majority of responses for "satisfaction with co-workers" were in the high range with the average score being 44.37. Of all the
"perceived desirability of staying variables", scores for "satisfaction with co-workers" were the highest. All three types of agents shared high satisfaction with their co-workers with no significant differences between program areas being found.

The name, Cooperative Extension Service, indicated that to be a successful organization, cooperation and teamwork needed to be present. Findings supported this attitude as agents reported high levels of satisfaction with their co-workers.

"Satisfaction with Supervision"

Most agents were moderately to highly satisfied with their supervision. Sixty percent recorded scores in the high range and no agent reported a score of zero which would have indicated no satisfaction. Agents from each program area shared these fairly high levels of satisfaction with supervision.

"Intention to Leave the Job"

"Intention to leave the job" was scored so that the higher the score, the higher was the "intention to leave the job". Most agents scored low on this variable indicating low intention to leave the job. Sixty-eight percent of the agents responded in the very strongly disagree and strongly disagree categories. Seven percent responded in the agreement categories. Findings were consistent with those of Clark (1981).

Objective Two: Determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable, "Intention to leave the job".
Results of Stepwise Regression Technique

Four independent variables were found to be the best combination of variables to predict the dependent variable "intention to leave the job". They were, in order of most to least variance accounted for: "overall job satisfaction", "age", "satisfaction with co-workers" and "self-rating of job performance". Total amount of variance accounted for by the linear combination of these four variables was 29 percent ($R^2=.2907$). A total model with all independent variables only accounted for 33 percent of variance in "intention to leave the job". The single best predictor was "overall job satisfaction", which accounted for 21 percent of the variance of the dependent variable.

To discover that "overall job satisfaction" was the best predictor of "intention to leave the job" was not remarkable. Literature has supported a strong relationship between the two variables. Reviews by Porter and Steers (1973) and Steers and Mowday (1981) reported consistent strong negative relationships between job satisfaction and turnover.

This study supported the March and Simon model (1958) on which it was based. The suggestion was that job satisfaction would lead to perceived desirability of staying. Other models in agreement with these findings included Mobley (1977), Mobley et al. (1979) and Jackofsky (1984).

"Age", as a best predictor variable, was not surprising according to the literature. Reviews by Porter and Steers (1973) and Steers and Mowday (1981) reported the relationship between age and turnover as consistent and negative in nature. Other researchers (Mobley et al.,
1979, Muchinsky and Tuttle, 1979, Price, 1977) also reported this relationship. What was surprising, was the nature and strength of the relationship between "age" and "intention to leave the job". The relationship was a negligible, positive one. The indication from these findings was that the variable, "age", accounted for a significant amount of variance in the "intention to leave the job" variable, even though the Pearson correlation coefficient was not significant.

The nature of the relationship was also puzzling, for the suggestion was that the older an agent was, the higher the "intention to leave the job" which contradicted previous research findings. A possible explanation may have been that the lack of promotion opportunities perceived by the majority of agents may have raised intentions to leave the job as age and tenure in the job increased but promotion opportunities did not.

"Satisfaction with co-workers" was an unexpected member of the set of best predictors. Because of the size of the correlation of "satisfaction with co-workers", with the best predictor, "overall job satisfaction", one could expect the two variables to share enough variance to produce an insignificant amount of unique variance accounted for by "satisfaction with co-workers". This situation was not the case, however. Previous studies have not shown specific facets of satisfaction to be significant predictors of turnover. The findings of this study suggested that how satisfied agents were with the team of co-workers played an important role in whether they intended to leave the job or not. The nature of the job of the county Extension agent included a component of close teamwork which could account for the relationship found.
The fourth member of the set of best predictors, "self-rating of job performance", was shown to be negatively related to "intention to leave the job". As "self-rating of job performance" decreased, "intention to leave the job" increased. This finding was inconsistent with that of Dreher (1982) who found that high performers tended to leave educational organizations compared to business settings; and Extension was definitely an educational organization.

A possible explanation for the negative relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "intention to leave the job" was the nature of the promotion and tenure system of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Employees who did not perform well had very little chance of being promoted. Even though agents did not have high perceptions of the performance-extrinsic reward contingency, the promotion and tenure system was very well known and understood by agents. Poor performers may have known that promotion and tenure were not possible and therefore may have intended to leave the job for a better opportunity.

Objective Three: Determine the nature and strength of various relationships among variables suggested by 16 hypotheses.

Relationships between Independent Variables and the Dependent Variable

Five hypotheses dealt with relationships between independent variables and the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job":

"Perceived desirability of staying variables" will be negatively related.

"Perceived ease of movement" will be positively related.
"Perceived ease of movement" will moderate the "perceived desirability of staying" and "intention to leave the job" relationship.

"Age" will be negatively related.

"Tenure in the job" will be negatively related.

All "perceived desirability of staying" variables were found to be negatively related to "intention to leave the job". The higher was the satisfaction with job and facets of the job, the lower was the "intention to leave the job". Main effects in the prediction of the dependent variable were suggested by the results of regression techniques for each of the "perceived desirability of staying variables" except "satisfaction with promotion". The findings were consistent with previous research by Clark (1981), Mobley (1977), Mobley et al. (1979) and others.

"Perceived ease of movement" was negatively related to "intention to leave the job". As agents perceived higher ease of movement, their intentions to leave the job decreased. The literature review suggested that the opposite relationship existed. For the population studied, main effects for "perceived ease of movement" in the regression model using each of the five facets of satisfaction were present, but main effects were not present in the model with "overall job satisfaction". These main effects indicated that "perceived ease of movement" played a significant role in the determination of "intention to leave the job".

Moderating effects of "perceived ease of movement" on the relationships between "perceived desirability of staying" variables and the dependent variable were determined to be present in the cases of
"overall job satisfaction" and "satisfaction with pay". The opposite relationship was found for "satisfaction with promotion", in that the "perceived desirability of staying variable", "satisfaction with promotion", moderated the relationship between "perceived ease of movement" and "intention to leave the job".

Significant interactions were indicated by the following: a four percent change in the $R^2$ for the "overall job satisfaction-perceived ease of movement" interaction, a two percent change in the $R^2$ for the "satisfaction with promotion-perceived ease of movement" interaction, and a two percent change in the $R^2$ for the "satisfaction with pay-perceived ease of movement" interaction.

As can be seen, these changes in the total variance accounted for by an interaction variable ($R^2$) in the dependent variable in a model containing a "perceived desirability of staying" variable and "perceived ease of movement", and an interaction variable were very small. Even though they were statistically significant, a question remains as to how practically significant they were.

"Age" and "tenure in the job" were found to be positively related to the dependent variable, "intention to leave the job". Again, research supported an opposite relationship for both variables. The findings of this study indicated that as "age" and "tenure in the job" increased, so did "intention to leave the job". Possible explanations were suggested previously.

### Relationships between Various Independent Variables

Eleven hypotheses suggested relationships between various independent variables. The relationships were:
"Perceived desirability of staying" variables will be:
- positively related to "age"
- positively related to "tenure in the job"
- related to "major program responsibility area".

"Perceived ease of movement" will be:
- negatively related to "age"
- negatively related to "tenure in the job"
- positively related to "self-rating of job performance"

"Supervisor rating of job performance" will be:
- positively related to "age"
- positively related to "tenure in the job"
- positively related to "self-rating of job performance"

"Perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".

"Perceived job performance-intrinsic reward contingency" will moderate the relationship between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived desirability of staying variables".

Both "age" and "tenure in the job" were positively related to the "perceived desirability of staying variables". The relationships were negligible and low respectively with Pearson correlations of .062 for "tenure in the job" and .232 for "age". These small correlations suggested that a slight relationship existed between "age" and satisfaction and "tenure in the job" and satisfaction. The older that agents were and the longer that agents had held the job, the more satisfaction they should have experienced.
Literature supported these findings (Clark, 1981; Mobley, 1982b). Because the job of Extension agents is complex and contains many tasks, agents may become more satisfied with the job as they get more experienced in the job and become more at ease with expectations of performance. Older agents tend to have been in the job longer, thus they experienced more satisfaction because of the suggested explanation; a relationship that agreed with Mobley (1982b).

"Major program responsibility area" was associated with the "perceived desirability of staying variables" of "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with the pay" and "satisfaction with the work itself". 4-H youth agents experienced significantly less satisfaction in all three measurements than did agriculture agents and home economics agents. This relationship was consistent with findings by Igodan (1984) which suggested that 4-H youth agents experienced more burnout and less job satisfaction than other types of agents.

This finding suggested that because "overall job satisfaction" was the best predictor of "intention to leave the job", the chances were that 4-H youth agents, because of their lower levels of job satisfaction, might be more likely to have intentions to leave the job than other types of agents.

Both "age" and "tenure in the job" were found to be negatively related to "perceived ease of movement". The older the agents were, and the more time they had in a particular job, the fewer alternatives to the job they perceived. These relationships were very low indicating that there was a negligible relationship between "tenure in the job" and "perceived ease of movement" and a low relationship for "age" and
"perceived ease of movement". These findings, while not significant, certainly suggested that the nature of the relationships was the same as was suggested through previous research. The possibility existed that the measurement of the strength of the relationship may have been affected by the small amount of variance in the responses on the "perceived ease of movement" variable.

A moderate positive relationship (r=.34) was found between "perceived ease of movement" and "self-rating of job performance". Agents who rated themselves as high performers tended to have higher perceptions of ease of movement from the job. Literature also supported this relationship. Jackofsky and Peters (1983b) hypothesized that because individuals saw themselves as high performers, they would believe that they had more choices for alternative jobs.

Neither "age" nor "tenure in the job" were related to "supervisor rating of job performance". These hypotheses were suggested based on beliefs held about rating styles of supervisors. This finding was a pleasant surprise. The conclusion was that "supervisor rating of job performance" was independent of "age" of the agent and "tenure in the job" suggesting a more objective style for performance ratings than was originally theorized.

A low positive relationship was found between measures of job performance. The Pearson correlation coefficient was .29 suggesting that eight percent of the variance in one type of rating of job performance could be accounted for by the other rating. Eight percent was not an overwhelming amount of variance, which, to this researcher suggested that agents were perceiving and rating job performance
differently from their supervisors. Possible explanations for the discrepancy might have included inadequate feedback systems or unrealistic perceptions of agents and supervisors of expectations for job performance.

The moderating effects of reward contingencies upon relationships between "perceived desirability of staying variables" and "self-rating of job performance" were not found.

However, for the "perceived job performance–extrinsic reward contingency", moderating effects were found in the model containing "satisfaction with promotion". The interesting finding in this model was that it was not the contingency variable that moderated the relationship but the "self-rating of job performance" variable that did so. Conclusions suggested that "satisfaction with promotion" depended upon the interaction between "self-rating of job performance" and the "perceived reward contingency" present. High raters experienced an increase in "satisfaction with promotion" as their perceived reward contingency increased as did low raters (ordinal interaction) but satisfaction did not increase as quickly for the higher raters as it did for low raters.

The same situation occurred for the intrinsic reward contingency. Only one model contained a significant interaction term. That model containing "satisfaction with supervision" as the dependent variable contained the interaction between "self-rating of job performance" and "perceived job performance–intrinsic reward contingency" but "self-rating of job performance" was the moderating variable, not the contingency variable.
The interaction was disordinal and suggested that for low raters "satisfaction with supervision" decreased as perceptions of job performance-intrinsic reward contingency increased. The opposite was true for high raters. This interaction could be explained in terms of how low raters of job performance perceived their supervisors. Individuals who saw themselves as low performers may have tried to intrinsically reward themselves more and may have become less satisfied with supervisors who were associated with extrinsic rewards which the low performers may not have received.

Only two models containing the extrinsic reward contingency also contained significant main effects for the "self-rating of job performance". They were "overall job satisfaction" and "satisfaction with pay". All models, however, contained significant main effects for the extrinsic reward contingency. No models containing the intrinsic reward contingency also contained significant main effects for the "self-rating of job performance". Three models did contain main effects for the intrinsic reward contingency: "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with the work itself", and "satisfaction with supervision".

These findings indicated that "self-rating of job performance" was not related to job satisfaction except in the case of "overall job satisfaction" and "satisfaction with pay". In both of these models, however, were there also main effects for the "perceived job performance-extrinsic reward contingency" variable.

The relationship between performance and satisfaction has been in question for years. The supposition was that the relationship would be
positive if the individuals perceived rewards to be contingent upon performance. Even though this relationship was not supported by the findings, the appearance of significant relationships between reward contingencies and job satisfaction indicated that satisfaction depended more on perceptions of performance-contingent reward systems than the actual performance. Generally, findings indicated that agents would be more satisfied if they believed that the rewards they received depended on their levels of performance regardless of their perceived level of performance.

General Summary of Conclusions of the Study

Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents generally had low intentions to leave their present jobs. They experienced moderate amounts of overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision and the work itself; high satisfaction with co-workers; and fairly low amounts of satisfaction with promotion and pay. They perceived themselves to be high performers and generally their supervisors agreed. Perceptions of how easy it would be for them to obtain alternative jobs were favorable, overall.

Agents tended to intrinsically reward themselves for good performance but did not see that the rewards given to them by the organization were necessarily contingent upon their levels of performance.

Some significant differences existed between 4-H agents and agriculture agents as well as 4-H agents and home economics agents. 4-H youth agents experienced lower levels of overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with their pay and satisfaction with their work. They also
had lower perceptions of the job performance-extrinsic reward contingency than did their co-workers.

Lower performers had higher intentions to leave the job than did higher performers, and the "self-rating of job performance" was more closely associated with "intention to leave the job" than was supervisor rating of job performance. In fact, "self-rating of job performance" was included in the set of best predictors of "intention to leave the job".

Other members of the set of best predictors were "overall job satisfaction", "satisfaction with co-workers", and "age". Total variance accounted for by all independent variables was less than 35 percent.

**Recommendations**

When organizations lose good employees, the effects can be devastating. Individuals may want to leave a job for a variety of reasons. This study sought to investigate variables and their possible relationships with the intentions of county agents to leave their jobs.

The findings of this study can be used to aid administrators in decision-making, to help develop guidelines for policy-making, and for the development of personnel maintenance strategies. Findings should also be available for use by county agents, county chairpersons, district supervisors and others interested in the success of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and others involved with educational organizations similar to the Extension service.

A basic premise for this study was that organizations want and need to keep high performers and should either work to improve low performers
or discourage them so they will leave. For managers in any organization, a basic understanding must be had of the individual choice process involved in the models of turnover on which this study was based. A thorough review of literature was made to develop the understanding needed for the framework of this study.

Based on the findings, conclusions, and implications of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Organizations should make rewards given to employees contingent upon job performance so that higher performers are rewarded more than low performers. Rewards can include pay, promotion, formal recognition, environment changes (new office), and other rewards under the control of the supervisor and organization.

2. Organizations need to be aware of the attitudes, perceptions, and intentions of employees. Levels of job satisfaction, performance perceptions, feelings of fairness of rewards, satisfaction with specific parts of the job, and intentions to behave can all have implications for management policies and awareness of these perceptions is the first step in taking control of the situation.

3. To help manage levels of turnover, job satisfaction should be the first concern of managers and supervisors. Facets of satisfaction, as well as general satisfaction are all important.

4. Satisfaction with the team of co-workers is a very important indicator in turnover intentions of county Extension agents. Administrators and personnel managers should make every effort (through personnel development activities, etc.) to encourage a cooperative, pleasant atmosphere for Extension workers through a team approach.
Employees should be aware of organizational perceptions of job performance level and vice versa through the use of a counseling/feedback system included in the performance appraisal system.

6. A serious look should be taken at why 4-H youth agents have lower levels of job satisfaction and also see themselves as not being fairly rewarded for levels of job performance.

7. A thorough examination of promotion and tenure policies should be made to determine why agents are dissatisfied with promotion opportunities.

Need for Further Study

Previous research suggested that even though the body of knowledge on turnover is vast, still only a small portion of what can be known is known. In this study, fourteen independent variables were used to help understand turnover intentions of Ohio Cooperative Extension County agents. A mere 33 percent of the total variance in the dependent variable was accounted for by these variables.

The importance lies in not only discovering but in testing that discovery. Truth stands the test of time.

The following suggestions for further study have been made, based on the judgement of the researcher:

1. Replications of this study should be done, not only in Ohio, but in other states. States should be sought that are dissimilar to Ohio in the nature of their administrative structure of the Extension service. States with different reward systems, different promotion and tenure opportunities, and other policy differences should be used.
2. The study should be adapted and conducted in other formal and informal educational organizations similar to the Cooperative Extension Service.

3. The personological variable of family responsibilities should be included in future research on turnover.

4. Other studies should be conducted that examine more closely the relationships between performance, rewards, and satisfaction.

5. Case studies of agents from each of the program responsibility areas should be conducted to help determine why differences exist between 4-H youth agents and others.

6. A study on turnover should be conducted using measures of job performance other than supervisor rating and self-rating.

7. A follow-up study should be conducted on the population of this study to determine the rate of turnover and relationships between variables and actual turnover.

8. This study should be replicated using county personnel other than agents and the results between the groups compared.

9. Replications of this study should be conducted using district and state level personnel and the results between the groups compared.
APPENDIX A

PANEL OF EXPERTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Clarence J. Cunningham</td>
<td>Associate Director, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. David McCracken</td>
<td>Professor, Agriculture Education, The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Larry E. Miller</td>
<td>Professor, Agriculture Education, The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Keith L. Smith</td>
<td>Professor, Agriculture Education and Leader, Personnel Development, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Stitzline</td>
<td>Leader, Personnel, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. Robert Warmbrot</td>
<td>Professor and Chairman, Agriculture Education, The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: SELECTED PANEL OF EXPERTS  
WHAT: INSTRUMENT DEVELOPED TO MEASURE VARIABLES LISTED BELOW  
RESEARCHER: EPPA LOU VAN TILBURG, GRADUATE STUDENT, AGRICULTURE EDUCATION  

Hello. I have purposefully selected a small group of Extension and Agriculture Education faculty members to serve as a panel of experts to help me determine the validity of my instrument. I would like to request that you serve on this panel.

The instrument was developed to measure the following variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>Perceived job performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>Perceived performance - extrinsic reward contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 39</td>
<td>Perceived performance - intrinsic reward contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 53</td>
<td>Perceived alternatives to the job and to the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 - 61</td>
<td>Intention to leave the job and to leave the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 73</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the job and with the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>Job Descriptive Index designed to measure five facets of job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population to be studied is all county Extension agents in Ohio. The instrument will also be used with county Extension associates and program assistants. Data from these last two groups will not officially be used in this study but is being collected for future use in other studies.

Please comment on the following topics:

Content validity - Are the items representative of the concept being measured?
Clarity - Is each item clear? Do you understand the directions? Are you confused at all in what I am asking?
Format - Suggestions for improvement? (note that the questionnaire will be reduced and in booklet form according to Dillman, 1978)
Other - Are any items measuring more than one concept (double-barreled)? Are there enough items to measure each concept?

Please write your suggestions on the instrument.

I thank you in advance for your expertise and helpful suggestions. My timeline is tight. I would ask you to review the instrument as soon as you can, and let me know (422-9141) if you cannot have it reviewed by Weds., April 10 or cannot participate.

I will collect the reviewed instrument from you on Wednesday morning.

Thanks again.

EMMA VAN TILBURG
How many minutes did it take to complete the questionnaire? ___________________

On the following pages are groups of statements concerned with different aspects of your job and work life. For each statement, indicate your level of agreement or disagreement by circling the response that most nearly represents your feelings. Your responses should be based on the following scale:

VSD - VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD - STRONGLY DISAGREE
D - DISAGREE
A - AGREE
SA - STRONGLY AGREE
VSA - VERY STRONGLY AGREE

EXAMPLE:

This is a very complete questionnaire. VSD SD D A SA VSA

The response of SA indicates that this individual strongly agreed with the statement.

SECTION I - WORK TASKS AND JOB PERFORMANCE

Think about the tasks that you are involved with in your present job. The following statements may describe tasks that you perform as a member of a county Extension staff. With respect to your performance in your present job, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1. I thoroughly plan programs with extensive involvement of support groups. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT (circle your response)

2. I am able to identify new project areas that interest many clients.

3. I consider county, district, and state needs when I complete my program planning.

4. I think through each activity knowing what needs to be done.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I have good rapport with mass media personnel in my community.

6. I work with a group of community leaders who help me promote Extension.

7. Most large events that I arrange are disorganized.

8. I am continually looking for new audiences with whom to work.

9. I develop leadership in volunteers.

10. I seldom cooperate with other agencies and organizations when planning activities.

11. I introduce innovations on a trial basis.

12. I use the same teaching methods for most programs.

13. I include facts in my reports, such as numbers and dollars.

14. I attempt few evaluations of program efforts.

15. I use a variety of evaluation methods.

16. I contact clients to discover strengths and weaknesses in programming.
VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

17. I participate in professional improvement activities whenever possible.

18. I am able to maintain a professional image at all times.

19. I usually take the time to help a co-worker with a problem.

20. I share innovative ideas with my co-workers.

21. I accept failure without placing blame on others.

22. I have little enthusiasm for my job.

23. I am uncomfortable when handling conflict.

24. I work evening and weekend hours when necessary.
SECTION II - REWARDS

The next group of statements reflect feelings that Extension personnel may have when considering various rewards that they might receive for the work they perform. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

25. I am compensated fairly for the job that I perform.

26. I work harder but get rewarded less than most other employees who hold a similar position.

27. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service promotes its employees according to how well they perform.

28. It seems that the harder I work, the less I am formally rewarded.

29. I am worth more to the Extension Service than I am being paid.

30. Generally speaking, I am paid equitably for my performance on the job.

31. Employees of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service are rewarded according to how well they perform.

32. I seldom get formally recognized when I do a good job.
VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

33. Some employees in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service work less than I do but are paid the same as I am.

34. Typically, Extension personnel are promoted according to their level of performance.

35. I get a feeling of satisfaction when I do my job well.

36. The harder I work, the greater are my feelings of accomplishment.

37. I know when I've done my job well because I feel good about myself.

38. No matter how well I perform my job, I still do not feel good about my performance.

SECTION III - ALTERNATIVES

As you think about the items in this section, assume that you have the freedom to relocate. This group of statements is concerned with alternative jobs you might have within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

39. If I quit my present position, it would be easy for me to obtain a similar job with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

40. I would have little difficulty transferring to another county staff position with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

41. If I left my present job, I would not be able to obtain another job with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

42. There are many county Extension positions available from which to choose.

43. I would describe my opportunities for alternate positions within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as very limited.

44. There are virtually no Extension positions for which I am qualified other than my present county position.
VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE  
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE  
D = DISAGREE  
A = AGREE  
SA = STRONGLY AGREE  
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

Now, respond to the next set of items as if you would **not** take another position within Extension.

**IF I WERE TO LEAVE MY PRESENT POSITION...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>... obtaining another job as satisfying as my present job would be easy.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>...I would have no trouble obtaining a better job.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>...there are many exciting jobs from which to choose.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>...I would have a much better chance of finding a new job than would most of my friends.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>...many employers would consider hiring me.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>...there are very few jobs for which I am qualified.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>...I would not know where to look for another good job.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>...I would be competitive in the job market.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Level of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>...obtaining another job as satisfying as my present job would be easy.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>...I would have no trouble obtaining a better job.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>...there are many exciting jobs from which to choose.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>...I would have a much better chance of finding a new job than would most of my friends.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>...many employers would consider hiring me.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>...there are very few jobs for which I am qualified.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>...I would not know where to look for another good job.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>...I would be competitive in the job market.</td>
<td>VSD SD D A SA VSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV - INTENTION TO STAY OR LEAVE

This next series of statements represents thoughts you may have when considering your present position with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service or the Extension Service in general. Once again, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each.

61. I plan to keep this particular job until I have to retire. (circle your response)  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

62. I intend to be employed in my current position a year from now.  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

63. It is likely that I will apply for another job outside the Extension service within the next six months.  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

64. I will not have this particular job a year from now.  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

65. I am willing to sign a contract to serve in my present position.  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

66. I intend to turn in my resignation this year.  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

67. I will probably continue to work for the Extension service until I retire.  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

68. I plan on working the rest of my professional career for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.  
   VSD SD D A SA VSA
SECTION V - SATISFACTION WITH THE JOB AND ORGANIZATION

This section deals with your job satisfaction and the satisfaction you have with the organization, The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

69. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my current job as a county Extension staff member. LEVEL OF AGREEMENT

70. I am disappointed that I ever took this job.

71. I usually feel excited about going to work since I've held my present job.

72. I consider my job to be important.

73. I enjoy my job more than most county Extension personnel enjoy their jobs.

74. Overall, I am happy with my job.

75. I feel enthusiastic about being a county Extension staff member.

76. I am pleased to work for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

77. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is a better employer than most other organizations.

78. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is a good organization for whom to work.
VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

79. I am proud to work for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

80. Much of the time, I am disillusioned with the Extension service.
Dear Extension District Specialist,

We are presently preparing to conduct a study with county Extension personnel. The study will examine why Extension staff may want to leave their jobs.

We need to evaluate the instrument which has been developed. We are requesting that you complete the enclosed questionnaire to help us with this endeavor. Your prompt and honest responses will provide us with information we can use to evaluate it. Because the number of district personnel is limited, your response is extremely important.

We wish to thank you in advance for your cooperation in this effort. Please return the completed questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by April 19, 1985. If you have questions, please call (614) 422-9141 between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. weekdays. Ask to speak to Emma and leave a message if you need to.

Please remember that although the questionnaire refers to county Extension personnel, the subject matter is appropriate for any Extension employee. As you complete the questionnaire, translate any references to county positions into your specific position as district personnel.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Emma Van Tilburg
Graduate Student

Clarence J. Cunningham
Associate Director

cc: J. Michael Sprott
EXTENSION

It's a Team Effort!

Cooperative Extension Service
The Ohio State University
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1099

Thanks!
PART ONE

On the following pages are groups of statements concerned with different aspects of your job and worklife. For each statement, indicate your level of agreement or disagreement by circling the response that most nearly represents your feelings. Your responses should be based on the following scale:

VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

EXAMPLE:

This is a very complete questionnaire. VSD SD D A (SA) VSA

The response of SA indicates that this individual strongly agreed with the statement.

SECTION I - WORK TASKS AND JOB PERFORMANCE

Think about the tasks that you are involved with in your present job. The following statements may describe tasks that you perform as a member of a county Extension staff. With respect to your performance in your present job, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1. I plan programs with extensive involvement of support groups. VSD SD D A SA VSA

2. I am able to identify new project areas that interest many clients. VSD SD D A SA VSA
SECTION V - SATISFACTION WITH THE JOB AND ORGANIZATION

This section deals with your feelings of satisfaction toward your job and the Extension Service. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

45. It is likely that I will apply for another job outside the Extension Service within the next six months.

46. I will probably continue to work for the Extension Service until I retire.

47. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my current job as a county Extension staff member.

48. I usually feel excited about going to work since I've held my present job.

49. I enjoy my job more than most county Extension personnel enjoy their jobs.

50. Overall, I am happy with my job.

51. I feel enthusiastic about being a county Extension staff member.

52. I am pleased to work for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

LEVEL OF AGREEMENT

VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

LEVEL OF AGREEMENT

24. Employees of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service are rewarded according to how well they perform.

25. Typically, Extension personnel are promoted according to their level of performance.

26. I get a feeling of satisfaction when I do my job well.

27. The harder I work, the greater are my feelings of accomplishment.

28. I know when I've done my job well because I feel good about myself.

SECTION III - ALTERNATIVES

As you think about the items in this section, assume that you have the freedom to relocate. This group of statements is concerned with alternative jobs you might have within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

29. If I quit my present position, it would be easy for me to obtain a similar job with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

30. I would have little difficulty transferring to another county staff position with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
(Circle your response)

21. If I left my present job, I would not be able to obtain another job with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

22. I would describe my opportunities for alternate positions within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as limited.

23. There are virtually no Extension positions for which I am qualified other than my present county position.

Still assuming that you are free to relocate, respond to this next set of items as if you are thinking of all possible job alternatives whether within Extension or outside of Extension. Now, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item.

IF I WERE TO LEAVE MY PRESENT POSITION...

24. ...I would have no trouble obtaining a better job.

25. ...there are many exciting jobs from which to choose.

26. ...I would have a much better chance of finding a new job than would most of my friends.

27. ...many employers would consider hiring me.

28. ...there are very few jobs for which I am qualified.

29. ...I would not know where to look for another good job.

30. ...I would be competitive in the job market.

SECTION IV - INTENTION TO STAY OR LEAVE THE JOB

This next series of statements represents thoughts you may have when considering your present position with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service or with the Extension Service in general. Once again, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each.

LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
(Circle your response)

31. I intend to be employed in my current position a year from now.

32. I am willing to sign a contract to serve in my present position.

33. I will not have this particular job a year from now.

34. I intend to turn in my resignation this year.
VSD = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE
VSA = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

15. I accept failure without placing blame on others.
   (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

16. I have little enthusiasm for my job.
   (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

17. I work evening and weekend hours when necessary.
   (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

SECTION II - REWARDS

The next group of statements reflect feelings that Extension personnel may have when considering various rewards that they might receive for the work that they perform. Indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

18. I am compensated fairly for the job that I perform.
   (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

19. I work harder but get rewarded less than most other employees who hold a similar position.
   (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

20. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service promotes its employees according to how well they perform.
    (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
    VSD SD D A SA VSA

21. It seems that the harder I work, the less I am formally rewarded.
    (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
    VSD SD D A SA VSA

22. Generally speaking, I am paid equitably for my performance on the job.
    (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
    VSD SD D A SA VSA

23. I seldom get formally recognized when I do a good job.
    (Circle your response)  LEVEL OF AGREEMENT
    VSD SD D A SA VSA

53. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is a better employer than most other organizations.
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

54. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is a good organization for whom to work.
   VSD SD D A SA VSA

55. I am proud to work for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
    VSD SD D A SA VSA

PART TWO

56. How long have you held your present position? _______ YEARS

57. How long have you worked for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service? _______ YEARS

58. Your present age: _______ YEARS

59. Your current major subject matter responsibility: (Circle)
   a. AGRICULTURE
   b. HORT ECONOMICS
   c. H.H.
   d. CONSERVATION & NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (CRD)

60. Your job title: (circle)
   a. COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT
   b. ASSISTANT COUNTY AGENT
   c. EXTENSION ASSOCIATE
   d. PROGRAM ASSISTANT
   e. OTHER (please specify)
SECTION VI - FACETS OF JOB SATISFACTION

The next items refer to facets of your job and the occurrence of certain characteristics that may describe these facets. In the blank next to the word or phrase, indicate whether or not the word or phrase is a good descriptor of your job. Use the following scale:

Y = Yes
N = No
? = I'm not sure

EXAMPLE:

PAY
T = Fair
This response indicates that this word is a good descriptor of the facet, PAY.

N = Bad
This response indicates that this word is not a good descriptor of the facet, PAY.

? = Adequate
This response indicates that the individual is not sure whether this word is a good descriptor of the facet, PAY.

BE SURE TO ANSWER EACH ITEM

Good opportunity for advancement
Opportunity somewhat limited
Promotion on ability
Dead-end job
Good chance for promotion
Unfair promotion policy
Infrequent promotions
Regular promotions
Fairly good chance for promotion
Income adequate for normal expenses
Satisfactory profit sharing
Barley live on income
Bad
Income provides luxuries
Insecure
Less than I deserve
Highly paid
Underpaid

3. I consider county, district and state needs when I complete my program planning.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

4. I think through each activity knowing what needs to be done.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

5. I am continually looking for new audiences with whom to work.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

6. I develop leadership in volunteers.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

7. I seldom cooperate with other agencies and organizations when planning activities.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

8. I use the same teaching methods for most programs.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

9. I attempt few evaluations of program efforts.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

10. I use a variety of evaluation methods.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

11. I participate in professional improvement activities whenever possible.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

12. I am able to maintain a professional image at all times.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

13. I usually take the time to help a co-worker with a problem.
VSD SD D A SA VSA

14. I share innovative ideas with my co-workers.
VSD SD D A SA VSA
April 25, 1985

Dear County Extension Staff Member,

We would like to invite you to participate in a study we are conducting. The purpose of the study is to gain insight into why Extension personnel may want to leave their jobs.

We all know how important Extension work is. You are important too. That's why we ask you to fill out questionnaires and to participate in research studies. The information that is collected can be used to help us retain excellent personnel in Extension. Much can be learned and eventually affect policies using the information that you provide.

Understanding why some people quit their jobs and why others stay involves looking at several different aspects of their jobs, worklife, and personal characteristics. This questionnaire asks you to look at your job with Extension and examine closely your attitude towards your position and also your attitude towards the Extension Service. Only about 20 minutes will be needed to complete it.

Your response to this questionnaire is very critical and will be kept in strict confidence. The code number on the top of the questionnaire is used for follow-up purposes only. Notice the back cover of the questionnaire has been left blank for your comments and suggestions.

We certainly thank you in advance for your prompt, honest responses. If you have any questions as you complete the questionnaire, please call Emma Van Tilburg (614) 688-8110. (leave a message if you need to and your call will be returned) Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope by May 10, 1985.

Sincerely,

Emma Van Tilburg
Graduate Student

Sincerely,

Emma Van Tilburg

Clarence J. Cunningham
Associate Director

College of Agriculture and Home Economics of The Ohio State University and The United States Department of Agriculture Cooperating
May 13, 1985

Dear Extension Staff Member,

Approximately two weeks ago, you were sent a questionnaire and asked to complete it. As of today, we have not received your questionnaire.

We are particularly concerned that it may have been misplaced or lost in the mail. Therefore, enclosed you will find another copy of the questionnaire for you to complete.

Please be assured that your responses will be kept in strict confidence. Remember, the code number is for follow-up purposes only.

We would appreciate your prompt return of the questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope. Any questions you may have should be directed to Emma Van Tilburg at (614) 888-8110.

Thank you for your immediate attention.

Sincerely,

Emma Van Tilburg

Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics of The Ohio State University and The United States Department of Agriculture Cooparating
May 7, 1985

Dear County Extension Staff Member,

This postcard is a reminder that we have not yet received the research questionnaire sent to you last week.

We know this is a busy time of year for you and appreciate the value of the time needed to complete the questionnaire but your response is important!

If you have already put your questionnaire in the mail, thank you very much. If not, please take the time to give us your response now. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Emma Van Tilburg

Emma Van Tilburg
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