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The assessment center has been one of several methods available to organizations for use in evaluating or predicting managerial success of individuals. Assessment centers have brought together many of the instruments and techniques of managerial selection. By using multiple assessment techniques, by standardizing methods of making inferences from such techniques, and by pooling the judgments of multiple assessors in rating the behavior of each candidate, the likelihood of successfully predicting future performance has been enhanced considerably (Cronbach, 1970; Taft, 1959; Cascio, 1982).

According to Thornton and Byham (1982, p. 1),

An assessment center is a comprehensive, standardized procedure in which multiple assessment techniques such as situational exercises and job simulations (i.e. business games, discussion groups, reports, and presentations) are used to evaluate individual employees for various purposes. A number of trained management evaluators, who are not in direct supervisory capacity over the participants, conduct the assessment and make recommendations regarding the management potential and developmental needs of the participants. The results of the assessment are communicated to higher management and can be used for personnel decisions involving such things as promotion, transfers, and career planning. When the results are communicated to the participants, they form the basis for self-insight development planning.

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) assessment center has been developed to assist in the analysis of current managerial abilities and future training needs of employees in supervisory positions. The
assessment center has incorporated exercises that enable participants to demonstrate their skills and abilities on sixteen job-related dimensions. These dimensions have been: oral communication, written communication, leadership, perception, sensitivity, objectivity, initiative, planning/organizing, development of coworkers, decision making/judgment, behavioral flexibility, assertiveness, organizational sensitivity, management control, evaluation, and collaborativeness (OCES, 1984).

The use of assessment centers has recently been on the increase. The reasons for this increased popularity of assessment centers were not difficult to ascertain. McNutt (1979) noted that perhaps the most dramatic and impressive feature of assessment centers was the greatly increased validity when compared to traditional selection and promotion techniques. Jaffee and Sefcik (1980) have claimed that an assessment center developed on the basis of a job analysis was inherently content valid. Byham (1983) reported that the assessment center technique had shown itself a better indicator of future success than any other tool management has yet devised. Based on reported assessment center validity evidence, Cayer and Kirschner (1977) concluded that the assessment center method generally may be a more valid method of management selection and promotion than more traditional methods such as supervisory appraisals or paper-and-pencil testing.

Byham (1983, p. 235) wrote that over and above the explicit goals of assessment, companies have consistently found that added dividends accrued from assessment centers. For example, candidate training took place even when it was not a defined objective of a center. Completing an in-basket exercise, participating in group discussions, and playing
playing management games were genuine training exercises, even if there was no immediate feedback of results. Byham (1983) observed that other benefits included: positive influence on morale and job expectations—candidates saw the center as a chance to show their ability in fair and realistic situations. By designing the exercises carefully, it was possible to improve the understanding and attitudes of candidates subtly while they were being assessed. Finally, Byham noted that assessor training occurred as a valuable fringe benefit and stated:

...the actual training of an assessor prior to his/her assignment paralleled a management training program. An even more important training experience was actual participation as an assessor. Almost all of an assessor's training and experience was transferable to his/her job and should improve his/her ability to interview and appraise his/her subordinates.

Assessment centers have been used for development in at least three ways: early identification of management potential, diagnosis of development needs, and as development experience per se (Thornton and Byham, 1982).

According to Boehm and Hoyle (1977, p. 211), the use of assessment centers as a basis for development had a number of advantages over less formal and subjective procedures. These advantages benefitted both the organization and the individuals who participated. The benefits to the organization included: a valid estimate of individual potential not influenced by the job environment, supervisory evaluations, or functional and occupational differences; an objective procedure which measured all participants on relevant abilities or qualities using equivalent standards; the opportunity to learn about individual motivation (needs, expectations, goals, and interests) using standard procedures outside the
work environment; the opportunity to identify specific strengths and weaknesses in assessed qualities for each participant and use this information for career guidance and development; produced a pool of high potential people who, with appropriate development, would be ready to fill future vacancies in the management ranks with a high probability of success.

The benefits to the individual included equal opportunity to demonstrate potential for advancement independent of current job functions, responsibilities, and performance; better understanding of what a manager did and the qualities needed to be a successful manager; opportunity to express career interests, goals, and aspirations under conditions designed to effectively use the information; opportunity to learn through feedback about individual strengths, weaknesses, and overall potential for self-development purposes; opportunity to make better informed decisions on personal career plans and life goals. When the assessment center was used effectively, these benefits provided a sound foundation for career development, placement, and constructive manpower utilization, regardless of the developmental strategy selected (Boehm and Hoyle, 1977).

According to Thornton and Byham (1982, p. 328), diagnostic assessment centers have usually been longer and typically have had more dimensions. They wrote that the need to accurately diagnose the unique needs of each manager demanded that the strengths and weaknesses of the individual be determined in the most specific manner possible so a highly specific developmental prescription could be developed.
In modern organizations, systems for the appraisal of job performance have been designed to accomplish two major purposes: organizational control and individual development (Cummings and Schwab, 1973). Individual development may be fostered by designing appraisal systems that "help improve performance directly by aiding the employee in identifying areas for improvement and growth" (Cummings and Schwab 1973, p. 5).

**Job Satisfaction**

The literature on the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance have suggested two rival hypotheses regarding the direction of the causal relationship between job satisfaction and performance: (1) that job satisfaction was the determinant of job performance such that past job satisfaction caused present job performance or (2) that job satisfaction is the effect of job performance such that the previous job performance causes present job satisfaction (Sheridan and Slocum, 1975, p. 159). Previous research has not provided conclusive support for either hypothesis and strong arguments have been made that under different work environments or for workers with different value systems either causal relationship could exist (Porter and Lawler, 1968; Locke, 1970; Schwab and Cummings, 1970; Sutermeyer, 1971).

**Initiating Structure**

According to Schriesheim, House and Kerr (1976, p. 297), leader consideration has systematically been found to have a positive relationship (sometimes significant, sometimes not) with satisfaction and performance of subordinates. Leader initiating structure, on the other hand, has been found at various times to have significantly positive,
significantly negative, and insignificant relationships with subordinate satisfaction and with leader and subordinate performance.

Role Clarity

Role theory has suggested that role conflict and role ambiguity were negatively related to job satisfaction and performance. According to Lyons (1971), the concept of role clarity or ambiguity could be operationalized in at least two ways. First, role clarity or ambiguity could refer to the presence or absence of adequate role-relevant information due either to restriction of this information or to variations of the quality of the information. Lyons called this an operationalization of objective role clarity. Role clarity or ambiguity could also refer to the subjective perception of having as much or not as much role-relevant information as the person would like to have.

Since lack of goal clarity and specificity of role requirements appeared to be characteristic of many management jobs, especially those of middle managers (Couch, 1979), role clarification and identification activities became an instrumental and integral part of task accomplishment, hence a parameter of success on the job.

Personal and Job-Related Factors

According to Schneider (1976), the possibility of differential validity must always be examined because of possible moderator effects. Schneider cautioned that factors outside the control of employees that may be adversely affecting their performance should either be removed or acknowledged.
A variety of worker characteristics have been suggested as potential moderators of affective reactions of workers to job attributes (Vecchio, 1980). The empirical literature in this area has addressed such individual differences moderators as authoritarianism (Vroom, 1959), and urban/rural residence (Blood and Hulin, 1967). In a review of this literature, White (1978) argued that the more serious problems pertaining to this area included (a) an unclear theoretical statement of the expected magnitude and direction of the moderating effects of individual differences, (b) inadequate operationalizations of the variables of interest, and (c) an unacceptable level of obtained support for the moderator hypothesis.

The extent to which assessment ratings were moderated by personal and job-related factors has not been widely addressed in the literature. Huck and Bray (1976) reported that racial or sex differences had no effect on the validity of the assessment center process. However, Huck (1977) suggested that additional research must be done on both the assessors and assesses with regard to sex, race, and job differences. Age has been found to correlate negatively, positively and at times not at all with assessment center performance as measured by the overall assessment rating, OAR (Burroughs, Rollings, and Hopkins, 1973; Neidig et al., 1978; Hall, 1976).

Experience has been shown to be an important factor in work behavior. Schneider (1976, p. 146) wrote that the behavior of people was "quite reliable over time because their experiences today in part determine their behavior tomorrow; indeed, their experiences yesterday in part determine their behavior today." Schneider further suggested that the
quality and quantity of experiences people brought with them to an organization, and the experiences an organization provided them, should be related to their behavior.

Cascio (1982) noted that the assessment center method was not free of problems, but it had proven reliable, valid, and fair to minority as well as non-minority candidates. Huck (1973, p. 209) reviewed the external and internal validities of assessment centers and indicated that research results have been quite impressive in demonstrating both the external and internal validities of multiple assessment procedures. Huck further observed that numerous questions regarding the assessment process remained unanswered. He concluded that considering the large numbers of individuals affected by assessment results, a critical need existed for additional research dealing with the assessment center approach.

Statement of the Problem

The possible relationships existing between individual and job factors and the performance of assesses on the OCES assessment center needed to be investigated with regard to validity and evaluation-related concerns and overall personnel development efforts. Specifically, the problem was stated in two parts:

(1) What was the relationship between assesses age, gender, extension program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years in the Cooperative Extension Service, job satisfaction, leader initiating structure, role clarity, number of previous jobs, and perception of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center; and their
performance in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center?

(2) What independent variables were the best predictors of assesssees' performance on The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center?

The study included the following variables.

I. Independent Variables:
   Age
   Gender
   Major Area of Graduate Study
   Number of Years in Extension Work
   Job Satisfaction
   Initiating Structure
   Role Clarity
   Extension Program Area of Major Responsibility
   Number of Previous Jobs
   Perceptions of Assessment Center.

II. Dependent Variable:
    Overall Assessment Rating.

Objectives of the Study

Specifically, the objectives that directed this study were as follows:

1. To describe assesssees in terms of the following characteristics: age, gender, major area of graduate study, and number of years in Extension work.
2. To describe assesses on the following job-related variables: job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, perceptions of assessment center, Extension program area of major responsibility, number of previous jobs, and overall assessment rating.

3. To describe the relationship between the independent variables (age, gender, extension program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years in the cooperative extension service, number of previous jobs, job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, and perceptions of assessment center), and the dependent variable (overall assessment rating).

4. To describe the inter-relationships among the variables of the study.

5. To determine the best predictors of each of the sixteen assessment center dimensions from the independent variables of the study.

6. To determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by each of the independent variables.

7. To determine the best predictors of overall assessment rating (the dependent variable) from the independent variables of the study.

8. To determine if assesssee differences on the independent variables significantly affect their performance on the assessment center as measured by the overall assessment rating (OAR).
Definition of Terms

The following terms were operationally defined for the purposes of this study.

**Assessor:** A member of a trained team of evaluators drawn from within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service who observed participant performance during the OCES assessment center process and judged the extent to which participants exhibited behavior required in certain levels and types of jobs.

**Assessee:** An individual who was currently a county chairperson of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and who participated in a variety of exercises and techniques designed under the OCES assessment center to measure predetermined qualities or abilities.

**Dimension:** A cluster of behaviors that were considered specific, observable, and verifiable under the OCES assessment center policy, and that could be reliably and logically classified together.

**Initiating Structure:** The extent to which a county-chairperson was likely to define and structure his/her role and those of his/her subordinates toward the attainment of OCES goals.

**Role Clarity:** The extent to which required information was adequate, and was communicated and understood by an extension county chairperson.

**Overall Assessment Rating:** This was a consensus rating, clinically derived by three assessors for an assessee over the latter's performance on the sixteen assessment center dimensions.

**Oral Communication:** The extent to which one gave an oral presentation and communicated on a one-to-one basis by listening and responding. Specific behaviors were: oral presentation - material was organized, expressed oneself clearly, quality of speaking voice, good use of nonverbal behavior such as eye contact, hand gestures, small signs of nervousness; group discussion - comments clearly stated and understandable, gave reasonable arguments to support views, listened to others' comments and gave due consideration; listened when appropriate, stated ideas clearly and understandably.

**Written Communication:** The extent to which one expressed effectively his/her ideas in writing. Specific behaviors included: answers were well organized, clearly written, readable, conveyed message effectively, reasonable in length and misspelled words or poor grammar did not detract from quality of information presented.

**Leadership:** The ability to influence others to move toward the attainment of a specific goal as efficiently as possible using such techniques as delegation and persuasiveness. Specific behaviors were: setting goals; defining a problem; motivating, inspiring, and stimulating a group...
or person; expressed self forcefully, and the degree of influence on other group members' or individuals' final decision.

**Initiative:** The ability to begin actions without stimulation and support from others, the capacity to see courses of action and to discover new means of goal achievement.

**Planning/Organizing:** The process of establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal. Behaviors to be noted were: approaching problems systematically - setting priorities, etc.; organizing and planning solutions - included promised dates, series of steps, etc.; control and follow-up necessary to assure compliance of solutions.

**Decision Making/Judgment:** The process of identifying problems securing relevant information, developing alternative courses of action, and the readiness of making a decision (decisiveness) from the information gathered. Specific behaviors were: group discussion - had many ideas and opinions, considered many points brought up, focused on overall plan/decision rather than on individual items; in-basket, case study and fact-finding - had good arguments to support ideas, questions, problems instead of accepting at face value, approached problems systematically - set priorities, etc., recognized need for more information, saw several alternative solutions, solutions were practical and realistic.

**Development of Coworkers:** The extent to which one developed and/or assisted in developing the skills and competencies of coworkers through training and development activities, counseling, and delegating the duties related to current and future jobs. Specific behaviors - delegated responsibility to individuals in order to provide experience in new areas, assisted coworkers in the development of a plan to improve performance, helped coworkers analyze their strengths and weaknesses.

**Behavioral Flexibility:** The extent to which one's behavior was flexible, adaptable and effective when confronted with different situations, circumstances or personalities. Specific behaviors were: ability to assume a role and portray it effectively, willing to compromise view when necessary, adjusted approach to individual(s) he/she was working with, and encouraging and supportive, yet willing to challenge when necessary.

**Organizational Sensitivity:** The degree of knowledge or awareness one had of formal and informal organizational policies and procedures. Specific behaviors - recognized when policy had a bearing on decisions that needed to be made and correctly utilized this information in order to solve problems.

**Assertiveness:** The degree to which one effectively stated his/her position positively and forcefully without being hostile or destructive. Behaviors to be noted were: backs own view/position strongly, expressed self forcefully, participates actively, willingness to challenge a position without being argumentive or aggressive, displayed self-confidence.
Objectivity: The extent to which one analyzed, judged and made a fair decision about a person or situation regardless of one's own attitudes or feelings.

Perception: The ability to identify or recognize a problem or potential problem.

Sensitivity: The ability to respond/react to a problem considering the feelings, emotions, and needs of others.

Management Control: The extent to which one maximized and monitored the use of all resources (personnel, office, committee, etc.) to obtain effective outcomes.

Collaborativeness: The degree to which one was willing to work cooperatively with others in making decisions. Specific behaviors were: worked effectively with group members, had orientation toward working with others rather than approaching the situation alone, was supportive of others, was willing to share with others and to consult on important items.

Evaluation: Assessed and appraised proposals of reported or observed performance; conducted performance appraisal; judged outcomes of programs; and judged individual proposals and suggestions.

Need for the Study

In 1981, a long-range planning committee studied the future of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) and sought to identify progressive future directions, needed changes in the organization, and modification of its delivery of programs. The focus of this committee was: mission and clientele, communications systems, organization and staffing, funding, and image (OCES, 1983).

The OCES assessment center was developed as part of a continuing effort to develop and maintain high quality supervisory staff to provide balance and assure effective, timely programs. Thornton and Byham (1982) suggested that one response to the need to develop better supervisors and managers was to use assessment technology to overcome many of the problems inherent in most training and development activities. Alon
(1977) wrote that the assessment center method could be engaged as a planned strategy for change in that it both generated and utilized vital data about individual behavior, focusing on how it may be employed, in turn, to increase organizational effectiveness. To help achieve desired assessment center results, Thornton and Byham (1982) emphasized that each assessment center dimension must be measured with a high degree of reliability and validity because decisions were being made on each dimension.

Although previous studies, beginning with the American Telephone & Telegraph (AT&T) Management Progress Study and subsequent evaluation of operational programs have concluded that assessment centers showed high predictive validity for criteria such as salary, managerial level, and performance ratings (Bray and Grant, 1966; Bray et al., 1974; Campbell and Bray, 1967; Moses, 1972), there was also a need for each user to ascertain the validity of the program as applied in one's own organization (Moses and Byham, 1977). The 1978 revision of Standards and Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations did not require validation by each new adopter, but warned that prior research did not guarantee validity in a new setting (Thornton and Byham, 1982). A related concern was how managers and assessees would accept an assessment program. The need to establish the validity and reliability of the OCES assessment process, if it was to be used to make judgments about the present or future performances and further development needs of personnel could, therefore, not be overemphasized.

The need to investigate the possible relationships existing between personal and job-related factors, and assessees performance on the
assessment center was necessitated when one considered the fact that in order to be successful, a developmental assessment center must be embedded within a carefully planned program of management selection, training, evaluation, and development.

The validity of selection, appraisal and training techniques would always be of concern in organizations since employers and employees alike would continue to question the job-relatedness of appraisal techniques and procedures. Since the Griggs et al. vs. Duke Power Supreme Court Case (1971), which affirmed the guidelines on employee selection and promotion promulgated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, organizations must be prepared to prove that their standards for selection and appraisal were job-related. This included assessment centers (Byham, 1977, p. 90).

Another issue of concern was differential validity. According to Schneider (1976, p. 130), differential validity "indicated the possibility that an assessment procedure may be a valid measure of a particular criterion for some people in some situation, but have different (or no) validity for another group of people or for people in another situation." Schneider further indicated that individual differences (say in terms of age, sex, race self-esteem, ability, and so forth), or different working conditions (leadership style, task reward characteristics, and so forth) may moderate the relationship between the predictor variable and the criterion variable.

Researchers have noted that subjective ratings often played a role in the selection and promotion of personnel as well as in their subsequent performance evaluation (Schmitt and Hill, 1977). Interviews,
assessment centers, or performance ratings were generally considered to be reliable, if there was agreement among independent raters. However, as Schmitt and Hill (1977) noted, the presence of high interrater reliability did not preclude the presence of bias in the rating. They further indicated that this was particularly true in the case of biases associated with sex and race because these characteristics were reliably identified and associated with relatively strong and widely shared cultural stereotypes.

Haefner (1977) investigated the effect of age on interviewers' evaluations, and the findings indicated strong bias against older individuals. Similar findings were reported by Rosen and Jerdee (1976). Thayer (1983) suggested that age was a powerful moderator variable and reported studies by Kurtz (1938) and Sweeny (1964) that age also moderated the validity relationship of personality items to the criterion.

A review of literature indicated a paucity of research on the relationship between demographic characteristics and assessment center performance. Moses and Byham (1977, p. 280) wrote that the available evidence suggested that the assessment process, particularly the behavioral simulations, tended to produce similar validity for males and females, whites and blacks, non-college and college graduates, as well as lower- and middle-management positions. However, they cautioned that the findings from these investigations did not necessarily generalize to all assessment programs. They concluded that additional research must focus on both the assessors and assessees with regard to sex, race, and job differences.
To achieve its purpose as a diagnostic procedure, the OCES assessment center must be investigated for any forms of differential validity that may exist. This was important in view of the developmental goals envisaged for the participating candidates. Also of importance was the fact that the dimensions assessed differed from assessment center to assessment center and this made evaluating each assessment center an attractive and meaningful undertaking.

The need to thoroughly understand the personnel involved in personnel development efforts in an organization has never been greater, for such knowledge helps us to accurately diagnose each individual's unique needs and capabilities. The expected results of this study would provide much needed information relating to the face validity and reliability of the OCES assessment center. Furthermore, information generated from this study would include: description of assessees in terms of the following characteristics: age, gender, extension program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years in extension work, number of previous jobs, and how these variables related to their assessment center performance; also information on relationships between job satisfaction, initiating structure, and perception of the OCES assessment center of assessees, and their performance on the assessment center.

The results of this study would help: 1) serve as a diagnosis of training needs by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates on the assessment center dimensions. This should be reflected by the assessment ratings they receive from assessors on each exercise; 2) provide a basis for modifications of assessment exercises to reflect OCES goals, i.e., provide relevant and useful information for improving
the assessment center; for example, information on whether males do
better than females may suggest examination of assessment structure for
sex bias or differential validity; 3) intensify personnel development
efforts by providing feedback to assesses. Based on performance of
assesses on the assessment center dimensions, recommendations on
remedial coursework may be made and appropriately planned into the
schedule of an assesse for self-development and improvement on the job;
4) reveal the need for and create the opportunity for new training and
development programs. Overall assessment ratings together with an
evaluation of the entire assessment program (including evaluation of
assesses, assessors and assessment staff) would provide information for
developing and building a valid training component into the personnel
development program.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The use of assessment centers by professionals and practitioners involved in selection and development of managerial personnel, continue to be on the increase. This increasing popularity has been reflected in a large number of published articles (e.g., Finkle, 1976; Huck, 1976; Klimoski and Strickland, 1977), the publication of standards and ethical considerations involved in assessment center operations (Task Force on Assessment Center Standards [TFACS], 1979) and the unusual support of the federal courts (Byham, 1979). According to Schmitt, Noe, Meritt and Fitzgerald (1984); this enthusiasm has been generated to a great extent by the positive research findings concerning the validity of the assessment center. Hinrichs and Haanpera (1976) suggested a number of reasons why the assessment center method was a powerful and useful tool: "it is relatively objective, provides uniform standards for judgment by trained observers, is valid, and can serve as a developmental experience for the participants."

Byham (1977, p. 31) attributed the rapid growth and acceptance of the assessment center movement to several key factors, including:

-- a process that had considerable scientific research and evaluation prior to widespread implementation;

-- a number of organizations with a management climate that
fostered research and development in the personnel selection area;

-- a scientific and business community which facilitated communication of this idea; and

-- the development of software items (manuals, techniques, simulations) which enabled smaller organizations to adapt the method.

Byham (1977, p. 85) noted that assessment centers could aid an organization in the early identification of management potential and in the diagnosis of individual management development needs so that training and development effort could be invested most efficiently. Centers could also act as a powerful stimulant to management development, providing self-insight into problem areas and identifying possible development actions.

Definitions

Assessment centers have been described as comprehensive, standardized procedures in which multiple techniques such as interviews, tests, situational exercises, and job simulations are used to evaluate individual employees for various purposes (Thornton and Byham, 1982). The assessment center has also been defined as a behaviorally based managerial selection procedure that incorporated multiple assessments and multiple ratings by trained line managers of various behavioral dimensions that were representative of the job in question (Cascio, 1982).

Dreher and Sackett (1983, p. 227) described an assessment center as one in which:

...job candidates participate in a variety of exercises designed to simulate the job for which they are being considered. Their performance in these exercises is
observed and evaluated by a team of trained assessors, typically made up of higher-level managers. These evaluations are made on a number of dimensions determined to be important for success in the job in question. By using multiple exercises, multiple assessors, and multiple-performance dimensions a more complete portrait of the job candidate should be obtained than would be the case if the selection procedure relied on performance in a single situation, if performance were evaluated by a single assessor, or if performance on only one performance dimension were taken into account.

Keil (1981) presented the logic of assessment centers:

1. Use of job analysis to understand requirements of the job.

2. From job analytic information, life-like situations are developed to elicit behaviors correlated with those required on the job.

3. Groups of candidates are asked to participate in exercises while trained observers record their behavior.

4. The observed behavior is presumed to be evidence of the existence of traits considered important to job success.

5. Trained assessors make independent judgments, then pool them and reach consensus on ratings. An overall assessment rating results for each applicant.

6. Formal feedback is provided to the applicant. This is considered useful for personal and career development.

7. This report is also furnished to persons making promotional decisions.

The Task Force On Assessment Center Standards (1979) presented some essential elements necessary for a process to be considered an assessment center. These included: the use of multiple assessment techniques at least one of which must be a simulation; the use of trained multiple assessors. These assessors must receive thorough training prior to
participating in a center; the use of judgments resulting in an outcome (i.e., recommendation for promotion, specific training or development) must be based on pooling information from assessors and techniques; the presence of an overall evaluation of behavior made by the assessors at a separate time from observation of behavior during the exercises; the use of simulated exercises. These exercises must be developed to tap a variety of predetermined behaviors and must have been pretested prior to use to insure that the techniques provide reliable, objective and relevant behavioral information for the organization in question. The simulation must be job related; an analysis of relevant job behaviors to determine the dimensions, attributes, characteristics, qualities, skills, abilities or knowledge evaluated by the assessment center; and the use of techniques in the assessment center that are designated to provide information which is used in evaluating the dimensions, attributes or qualities previously determined.

**Brief History**

The major features of current assessment centers have dated back to the 1930's when German military psychologists used a very advanced multiple-assessment procedure to select future military officers (Farago, 1942). Assessment procedures were built on the guiding principles of holistic and naturalistic evaluation emphasizing the need to assess the total personality rather than separate abilities of potential officers. These officer assessment programs were among the first attempts to use both multiple assessment techniques and multiple assessors to evaluate complex behavior (Thornton and Byham, 1982, p. 25).
During World War II, the British War Office Selection Boards (WOSBs) were developed to meet the pressing need of identifying potential successful officers for the British army (Vernon and Perry, 1949). The British program was adopted and modified by Australia and Canada for their military assessment programs. In both cases, the British programs served as the models but were modified to serve somewhat different needs in the other countries (Yan and Slivinski, 1976).

The United States Office of Strategic Services (OSS) used what is considered to represent the first fully developed assessment programs for selection and placement devised in the United States. The purpose of the OSS management program was to develop a set of procedures to evaluate the personalities of candidates for jobs such as secret intelligence agents, saboteurs, propaganda experts, secretaries, and office workers. The intention was to reliably predict effective field operations and emphasis was, therefore, laid on situational and performance exercises (Thornton and Byham, 1982).

The British Civil Service Commission developed and validated a procedure for selecting civil servants for all middle- or high-level domestic and foreign jobs (Vernon, 1950). This program was the first to apply the assessment center concept to a 'nonmilitary' setting. The nature of the situational tests changed to reflect administrative and managerial responsibilities. Peer ratings and rankings were used more systematically. To deal efficiently with large numbers of candidates, a multi-stage assessment procedure was implemented in which various components were applied to successively more select groups (Thornton and Byham, 1982).
The first industrial firm to adopt the assessment center approach was AT&T in 1956 in its Management Progress Study. According to Cascio (1982), this longitudinal study was the largest and most comprehensive investigation of managerial career development ever undertaken. Its purpose was to attempt to understand what characteristics (cognitive, motivational, and attitudinal) were important to the career progress of young employees from the time they took their first job in the Bell system and as they continued to move into middle- and upper-management levels. The AT&T Management Progress Study (Bray, Campbell, and Grant, 1974) demonstrated that certain characteristics were related to subsequent progress in management, that these characteristics were relatively stable, and that they could be reliably measured. This led in part to the widespread use of assessment centers as a means of identifying further management potential (Ritchie and Moses, 1983).

Validity

According to Dreher and Sackett (1983), a central issue in the area of personnel selection has continued to be the development of various ways of showing that a selection procedure was related to successful performance on the job. Validation studies have tried to do this. Dreher and Sackett referred to validation as the process of providing evidence that a selection procedure is related to or predictive of subsequent job performance. Cronbach (1970) referred to validity as the accuracy of inferences about test scores. Schneider (1976) used validity to describe when an assessment of one behavior domain (e.g., a test of mechanical aptitude) must be correlated with an assessment of another behavior domain (e.g., performance).
According to Stewart and Stewart (1981), the types of validity most frequently encountered are face validity, content validity, construct validity, concurrent validity, and predictive validity. Dreher and Sackett (1983) described the validation process in terms of three broad classes of validity evidence: criterion-related validity, content validity, and construct validity.

Cronbach (1970, p. 444) defined content and construct validities:

Content validity is evaluated by showing how well the content of the test samples the class of situations about which conclusions are to be drawn. Construct validity is evaluated by investigating what psychological qualities a test measures; i.e., by determining the degree to which certain explanatory concepts or constructs account for performance on a test.

Guion (1974) referred to criterion-related validity as the extent to which scores on one variable, usually a predictor, may be used to infer performance on a different and operationally independent variable called a criterion. Guion further noted that criterion related validity was evidence of job-relatedness only if the criterion measure was a valid measure of overall job performance, an element or sample of performance, or a construct related to job behavior.

Norton (1977, p. 443) suggested that the assessment center method could properly be used, after content validation, to select among candidates for a position which was substantially managerial in content, even in the absence of an empirical validity study. This view has been shared by other authors who argued that one reason for the popularity of assessment centers was the degree to which the approach lent itself to validation based on content-oriented procedures (Byham, 1977, 1980; Jaffee and Sefcik, 1980).
Wernimont and Campbell (1968) pointed out that it was appropriate to
defend a selection procedure on the basis of content validity only when
you wanted to sample a current level of performance. Sackett and Dreher
(1982) reported on the failure of three different sets of assessment
center ratings to satisfy certain requirements for construct validity.
Based on these findings, Sackett and Dreher concluded that assessment
centers should not rely on a content validation strategy. Sackett and
Dreher apparently arrived at this position through their belief that
content-oriented validation was of value only to the extent that it could
provide evidence for construct validity. They went on to state that
authors who have supported content-oriented validation for assessment
centers are knowingly or unknowingly referring to evidence for construct
validity. Sackett and Dreher (1982, p. 401) stated:

A belief underlying the assessment center method is that
people exhibit consistent patterns of behavior, which can
be meaningfully categorized as representing a particular
dimension. The various exercises are included to provide
multiple opportunities for the observation of behavior
relevant to each dimension.

Neidig and Neidig (1984) contended that Sackett and Dreher's
explanation of the purpose of multiple exercises was too simplistic.
Neidig and Neidig contended that different situational exercises were not
developed to simply provide multiple input on what Sackett and Dreher
referred to as constructs. Neidig and Neidig (1984, p. 183) stated:

Multiple exercises are included in an attempt to
adequately sample the relevant content domain of incumbent
behavior. This strategy demands that the various contexts
of performance are also sampled. Properly designed
assessment centers are carefully developed to provide
observations of the participants' behaviors in a variety
of contextually accurate job situations. The different
situational exercises are designed to represent the
various demands that confront incumbents in the target
positions. If construct validation or simply multiple observation were the primary concern, little regard would need to be given to this context feature. The accurate sample of situations (or work settings) is, therefore, one of the critical steps in the establishment of the job relatedness of any assessment center.

Neidig and Neidig concluded that the intent of assessment centers should be to allow for the observation and evaluation of job-related behaviors. The use of different exercises, they believed, reflected the position that stable performance across exercises by all participants was not necessarily expected and that this variance was not necessarily due to error in measurement. In their view, this did not establish an advocacy for construct validation, as Sackett and Dreher (1982) appeared to infer.

In a study examining the predictive validity of assessment center evaluations and traditional predictor variables in forecasting multiple criteria of supervisory job performance, Turnage and Muchinsky (1984) observed that (a) both assessment center evaluations and traditional predictors were generally unrelated to job performance but that (b) assessment center evaluations were predictive of promotability. The data in their study came from a one-day supervisory selection program developed by a large manufacturing firm. Groups of 12 candidates per assessment center, who had either volunteered or been recommended by their supervisor, were rated by trained assessors.

Schmitt, Noe, Meritt, and Fitzgerald (1984) conducted research directed to the validation of an assessment center used to select school administrators. A job analysis conducted prior to the development of the center indicated that 12 dimensions of behavior were important for successfully working school administrators. These dimensions were:
problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, range of interests, personal motivation, educational values, stress tolerance, oral communication, and written communication.

Criteria used in the Schmitt et al. (1984) study included ratings on behaviorally anchored rating scales by supervisors, teachers, and support staff. Results indicated a significant relationship between an overall assessment center placement recommendation and supervisory, teacher, and support staff ratings on most performance dimensions.

Schmitt et al. (1984) included climate measures because during the job-analysis interviews, various groups were asked about critical aspects of the job of the principal and many responded that the primary responsibility of the principal was the establishment of a good school climate. In operationalizing this construct, they developed seven climate measures for different job-performance dimensions. They found that interdimensional correlations were highly relative to the interitem consistencies, suggesting a large general climate factor. However, correlations between assessment center consensus skill ratings and student, teacher, and support staff perceptions of school ratings were all generally low and nonsignificant regardless of the source of climate information and skill dimension considered.

Ritchie and Moses (1983) examined the relationship between assessment center predictions of middle-management potential for a large group of college graduate women. Ritchie and Moses also made comparisons between predictions of success for this group and those made for men in the Management Progress Study. They found a sizable correlation (r=.42)
between predictions made by the assessment staff and subsequent progress seven years later. They also found substantial similarities in the relationship between specific dimension ratings and progress of men and women.

In 1956, AT&T became the first industrial firm to adopt multiple assessment procedures in its Management Progress Study. Bray and Grant (1966) reported on the predictive validity of the assessment center in this longitudinal study after observing the career progress of the assessees from the time they took their first job in the Bell system and as they continued to move into middle- and upper-management levels. The original sample (N=422) was comprised of 274 college men and 148 non-college men. Bray and Grant found that for 125 college men and 144 non-college men originally assessed, the predictive validities of the assessment staff's global predictions were .44 for college men and .71 for non-college men. Of the 38 college men who were promoted to middle-management positions, 31 (82%) were correctly identified by the assessment center staff. Also 15 (75%) of the 20 non-college men who were promoted into middle management were correctly identified. Finally, of the 72 men (both college and non-college) who were not promoted, the assessment center staff correctly identified 68 (94%).

Data from Moses (cited in Huck, 1973) showed a highly significant relationship between the assessment rating and progress in management (see Table 1). The results indicated that individuals assessed as "More than Acceptable" were twice as likely to be promoted two or more times than individuals assessed as "Acceptable," and almost 10 times more likely than those rated as "Not Acceptable."
Table 1
Relationship Between Assessment Rating and Progress in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Rating</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Number receiving two or more promotions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than acceptable</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not acceptable</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,943</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Byham (1970, p. 154) concluded that the accumulation of research findings from a variety of types of centers lend considerable credibility to the overall validity of the technique. He stated:

In a survey of the 20 companies that operated centers, I uncovered some 22 studies in all that showed assessment more effective than other approaches and only one that showed it exactly as effective as some other approaches. None showed it less effective.

Hinrichs (1969) showed that ratings of managerial potential based on information already available in the personnel records of 47 IBM managers correlated .46 with the ratings of managerial potential received in their assessment program. Based on this finding, Hinrichs suggested that a careful review of company records may produce much of the same information which evolves from an expensive two-day assessment program. Huck (1973) noted that this did not hold true for information related to interpersonal behavior which was one of the salient features of a multiple assessment procedure. Dunnette (1971, p. 106) reacted to Hinrich 's conclusion by stating:

In my opinion, Hinrichs' argument, though reasonable cannot be sustained on the basis of the single coefficient of .46 he reports in his investigation. Nearly 80 percent of the variance in the assessment program ratings remains unassociated with the ratings based on the personnel records; therefore, it seems highly probable that the 'lengthy and expensive' assessment program does contribute independent, valid, and useful diagnostic information about men's abilities and behavioral tendencies that is not contributed by ratings based merely on file information.

Reliability

In addition to its role in selection, today the assessment center method is increasingly being used to make differential decisions about individuals for action such as placement, job rotation, training, and
development. More and more the thrust is on individual rather than actuarial use of the method (Fleming and Sells, 1972). Hinrichs and Haanpera (1976) contended that because of these growing roles, as well as other reasons, it was important to be sure that what the assessment center measures had validity and reliability of measurement.

According to Hinrichs and Haanpera (1976, p. 32), the reliability of measurement came in three varieties. Inter-rater reliability evaluated the extent of agreement among two or more raters observing the same exercise. Test-retest reliability looked for stability of repeated measurements over time. Finally, the internal consistency model was built on an assumption of "parallel forms" to the various exercises; i.e., that "assertiveness" or "creativity" as measured in Exercise A meant the same as "assertiveness" or "creativity" as measured in Exercise B.

Table 2, presented by Hinrichs and Haanpera, showed that there was at least minimal reliability to the overall assessment rating, the judgments about overall performance within specific exercises, and the overall summary evaluations of specific characteristics or traits for individuals. Such reliability and validity, according to the authors, was adequate for making global overall decisions within the straight-forward managerial selection paradigm (Hinrichs and Haanpera, 1976, p. 33).

Hinrichs and Haanpera (1976) concluded:

when assessment evaluations are used for individual placement and development rather than actuarial and selection decision making, it becomes more important to ensure that all of the individual components of assessment are being measured reliably. The data can then be used for meaningful feedback to the individual for self-
## Table 2
Assessment Reliability Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Overall Assessment Rating</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
<th>Test-retest</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McConnell &amp; Parker (1972)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.85-.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.88 6 different organizations 5 raters per individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell &amp; Parker (1972)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses (1973)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Reassessment to &quot;validate&quot; a shortened assessment center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Overall, Within Exercise</th>
<th>Inter-rater</th>
<th>Test-retest</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bray &amp; Grant (1966)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>.60-.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.68 Mfg.&amp; Group Discussion exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray &amp; Grant (1966)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>Ratings by psychologists of the narrative protocols describing In-basket performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray &amp; Grant (1966)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>.31-.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.43 Communications skills, as measured in two exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bray, Campbell, &amp; Grant (1974)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>.06-.71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.29 Reassessment after eight years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton (1970)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>.01-.65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.27 Assessment committee ratings of traits vs. supervisory ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finley (1970)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.00-.65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.26 Assessment Committee ratings of traits vs. supervisory ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell &amp; Parker (1972)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.64-.90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.82 Five raters making overall judgments about each characteristic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses (1973)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.49-.72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.52 Reassessment to &quot;validate&quot; a shortened assessment center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78-.95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.88 Manager observers in assessment center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

developmental purposes or for differential placement decisions.

Huck (1973, p. 204) stated:

One unique feature of the assessment center procedure is the use of multiple observers or assessors whose judgments regarding the observed performance of candidates are pooled. This raises the question of interrater reliability in the assessment process. Research directed at this issue is rather conclusive in showing that the assessment process is not limited by low reliability.

According to Huck (1973, p. 205), a study conducted by Michigan Bell (Moses, in press) provided the most definitive data regarding reliability of the total assessment process. The study was designed to determine the relationship between two multiple assessment programs. A sample of 85 nonmanagement employees (39 men, 46 women, 42 blacks, and 43 whites) who attended Michigan Bell's one day Early Identification Assessment (EIA) program were later assessed by the company's more extensive two-day Personnel Assessment Program (PAP). The correlation between overall performance in the two programs was quite substantial for the total sample (.73), as well as for each of the subgroups (men, .77; women, .70; blacks, .68; whites, .73). No significant differences were found between the reliabilities obtained for any of these subgroups. Huck noted that this was one of the few studies which dealt with the consistency of performance of assesseees over time.

Despite the wealth of information on assessment center research, not much was encountered in the literature concerning the possible effects of the selected independent variables of this study on assessment center performance. The independent variables in this study were selected on the basis of their discussed relationship with general performance in the literature, or because they were intuitively appealing with regard to
their possible relationship with assessment center performance. Furthermore, assessment center researchers have suggested that, among other things, research on assessment centers should address the following questions: (1) "What effects do differences in age, sex, race, and job experiences have on assessment center performance?" and (2) "Are there individual differences in evaluation apprehension and do these differences affect assessment center performance?" (Thornton and Byham, p.406).

**Job Satisfaction**

The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance has been investigated extensively over the past decades. Several reviews of relevant literature (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell, 1957; Vroom, 1964), have documented the absence of a consistent empirical relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Schneider (1975) noted that satisfaction has been conceptualized as an independent, mediating and dependent variable.

Locke (1969, p. 316) defined job satisfaction as "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values." This definition is based on Locke's premise that what individuals seek in a job is the realization of their basic goals and values. Porter (1961) operationally defined job satisfaction as need deficiency. Need deficiency was in turn defined as the difference between the subject's response to the "How much should there be?" question and the response to the "How much is there now?" question.

According to Schneider (1975, p. 461), the concept of job satisfaction implied an evaluation of the work or organization. Job satisfaction
research, then, concentrated on the individual's affective state:
evaluation of organizational structure, practices and procedures and/or
evaluation of the outcomes derived from organizational participation.
Schneider stated:

The idea that job satisfaction should be an assessment of the affective state of the person is precisely the logic underlying the largest proportion of attitude research. Affect served as the guiding theme for the development of techniques for the assessment of attitudes.

According to Schneider (1976, p. 52), using satisfaction as a
standard of excellence cannot be validated by the relationship between
satisfaction and performance. This may be due to the lack of a theory
stating causal relationships (Lawler, 1974, p. 354). Lawler stated:

A great deal is known about what factors are related to satisfaction, but very little is known about the causal basis for the relationships. This is a serious problem when one attempts to base change efforts on the research. This problem also increases the difficulty of developing and testing theories of satisfaction. Perhaps the best example of the resulting dilemma concerns the relationship between satisfaction and performance. If satisfaction causes performance, then organizations should try to see that their employees are satisfied; however, if performance causes satisfaction, then high satisfaction is not necessarily a goal but rather a by-product of an effective organization.


**Fulfillment Theory**

Schaffer (1953, p. 3) suggested that "job satisfaction will vary
directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can
be satisfied are actually satisfied." Vroom (1964) also saw job satisfac-
tion in terms of the degree to which a job provided the person with
positively valued outcomes. He equated satisfaction with valence and added that if we described a person as satisfied with an object, we meant that the object had positive valence for that person. According to Lawler (1974), researchers who have adopted the fulfillment approach measured the satisfaction of people by simply asking how much of a given facet or outcome they were receiving.

**Discrepancy Theory**

Proponents of the Discrepancy Theory argued that satisfaction was determined by the differences between actual outcomes a person received and some other outcome level. According to Lawler (1974, p. 355), the theories differed widely in their definitions of this outcome level. For some theories it was the outcome level the person felt should be received, and for other theories it was the outcome level the person expected to receive.

**Equity Theory**

Proponents of this theory contended that satisfaction was determined by a person's perceived input-outcome balance in the following manner: the perceived equity of a person's rewards was determined by his input-outcome balance; this perceived equity, in turn, determined satisfaction. Satisfaction resulted when perceived equity existed, and dissatisfaction resulted when perceived inequity existed. This theory, primarily a motivation theory emphasized that either under-reward or over-reward could lead to dissatisfaction, although the feelings were somewhat different (Lawler, 1974, p. 355).
Two-Factor Theory

Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) developed modern two-factor theory. The theory maintained that satisfaction and dissatisfaction did not exist on a continuum running from satisfaction through neutral to dissatisfaction. Two independent continua existed, one running from satisfied to neutral, and another running from dissatisfied to neutral. The theory emphasized that different job facets influenced feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) mentioned factors such as achievement, recognition, work itself, and responsibility in connection with satisfying experiences; while working conditions, interpersonal relations, supervision, and company policy were mentioned in connection with dissatisfying experiences.

Brayfield and Crockett (1955) reviewed empirical data on job satisfaction and job performance and concluded that there was little evidence that employee attitudes bore any appreciable relationship to performance on the job. Schneider (1976, p. 52) pointed out that there just was no reliable relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Herzberg et al. (1957), however, found frequent evidence that positive job attitudes were favorably related to increased productivity. However, the correlations obtained in many of the positive studies were low. Vroom (1964) found that the median correlation between measures of job satisfaction and one or more criteria of performance was +.14 for 23 cases. Despite the low magnitude of the correlation, Vroom pointed out that the consistency of the direction of relationship was
quite impressive, since 20 of the correlations were positive. Vroom (1964, p. 264) concluded:

Individuals are satisfied with their jobs to the extent to which their jobs provide them with what they desire, and they perform effectively in them to the extent that effective performance leads to the attainment of what they desire.

Lawler and Porter (1967) explained the slight relationship existing between satisfaction and performance as probably due to better performance indirectly causing satisfaction rather than the reverse. They proposed a performance-satisfaction model. Lawler pointed out that although a more logical view is that performance causes satisfaction, some people still believe that "satisfaction causes performance."

The relationship between satisfaction and turnover, absenteeism, and organizational effectiveness have been studied. Lawler (1974, p. 351) reported that the research evidence clearly showed that decisions made by employees about whether they would go to work on any given day and whether they would quit were affected by their feelings of job satisfaction. Lawler concluded:

The fact that present satisfaction influences future absenteeism and turnover clearly indicates that the causal direction is from satisfaction to behavior. This conclusion is in marked contrast to our conclusion with respect to performance — that is, behavior causes satisfaction.

Thus, it could be seen that previous research had not provided conclusive support for the causal direction of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

**Leader Initiating Structure**

Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, behavior, influence over other people, interaction patterns, role relationships,
occupation of an administrative position, and perception of others regarding legitimacy of influence (Yukl, 1981, p. 2). Stogdill (1974, p. 259) concluded that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept." The following are some examples of varying leadership definitions presented by Yukl (1981, pp. 2-3).

1. Leadership is "the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal." (Hemphill and Coons, 1957, p. 7)

2. Leadership is "interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals." (Tannenbaum, Weshler and Massarik, 1961, p.24)

3. Leadership is "the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction." (Stogdill, 1974, p. 411)

4. Leadership is "the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization." (Katz and Kahn, 1978, p. 528)

According to Yukl (1981, p. 5), the most commonly used measure of leader effectiveness has been the extent to which the leader's group or organization performed its task successfully and attained its goals. Measures used have been either objective or subjective.

The leadership dimensions of Consideration and Initiating structure emerged after factor analyses of leadership behavior questionnaires were carried out by psychologists at The Ohio State University in an attempt
to find a few general behavior dimensions which would apply to all types of leaders (Hemphill and Coons, 1957; Halpin and Winer, 1957).

Consideration refers to the degree to which a leader acts in a warm and supportive manner and shows concern and respect for his subordinates. Fleishman and Peters (1962, pp. 43-44) described Consideration as reflecting the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relations characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and consideration of their feelings. They described Initiating Structure as reflecting the extent to which an individual was likely to define and structure his role and those of his subordinates towards goal attainment.

Campbell et al. (1970, p. 137) wrote that initiating structure involved a manager's acts oriented toward defining or structuring the personal position and the work group's set toward getting work done and toward goal attainment. High scores on Initiating Structure denoted attitudes and opinions indicating highly active direction of group activities, group planning, communicating information, scheduling, trying out new ideas, etc.

The principal method for measuring these variables has been the use of either the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Hemphill and Coons, 1957) or the Supervisory Behavior Description questionnaire (Fleishman, 1957). These questionnaires have been administered to a leader's subordinates. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) has been completed by a manager or leader and presumably showed, via his or her own attitudes and opinions, the preference of the evaluator for utilizing Consideration, Initiating Structure, or both in a personal "leadership style" (Campbell et al. 1970, p. 137). Korman (1966, p. 350)
described the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) as a Likert-type attitude scale which attempted to measure how the supervisor thought one should behave in a leadership role.

Korman (1966) found the median value of 30 validity coefficients in 7 different studies using the LOQ to be -.02. The range of coefficients was between -.19 and .51. Parker (1963) obtained values of .45 and .51 between consideration and subordinates' ratings of their supervisors; Oaklander and Fleishman (1964) obtained correlations of .37 and .46 between supervisors' consideration scores and their own ratings of the degree of stress present between units in a large hospital.

Factor analyses of self-report descriptions using the LOQ indicated that Consideration and Initiating Structure were orthogonal dimensions (Fleishman, 1953). These results suggested that the two dimensions were independent; thus, actions by a leader on one dimension would not affect actions on the other. This, according to Weissenberg and Kavanagh (1972), meant it should be possible to exert considerable direction on subordinates toward meeting organizational goals while maintaining highly supportive relations with them.

Weissenberg and Kavanagh (1972, p. 127) questioned the orthogonality of Consideration and Initiating Structure and did a search of the literature using either the LBDQ or the LOQ to measure leadership behavior. Their study indicated that the two leadership dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure were not always empirically independent as stated and implied in various research studies and management training programs. They concluded:

It appears that the independence of the dimensions is contingent mainly on the type of questionnaire used to
measure the behavior. the high frequency of nonsignificant correlations for the LOQ indicates that managers think they should behave as if Consideration and Initiating Structure are independent, however, descriptions by subordinates (LBDQ) indicate that their supervisors do not, in fact, behave in this manner, or at least, they are not perceived as behaving in this way.

Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy and Stogdill (1974) suggested that the fact that Consideration and Initiating Structure often failed to be independent and in fact sometimes negatively correlated may reflect "realities" of the environment being studied, or may result instead from respondent inability to consider the two dimensions separately. They submitted that in either case it was often extremely difficult for leaders to behave in such a way that their subordinates would perceive them to be simultaneously high in both Consideration and Initiating Structure.

Wollowick and McNamara (1969) reported a correlation of .13 between Initiating Structure (LOQ) and change in position level. Thus, Initiating Structure would appear to have a positive relationship with performance. However, Schriesheim, House and Kerr (1976) noted that the relationship between Initiating Structure and performance were inconsistent.

Role Clarity

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) described role ambiguity (lack of role clarity) as a condition in which information was lacking or not communicated. In a study of three occupational groups, Ivancevich and Donnelly (1974) defined role clarity as the extent to which required information was communicated and understood by salespeople, supervisors and operating employees.
According to Kahn et al. (1964), role ambiguity resulted in coping behavior by the role incumbent which may take the form of attempts to solve the problem to avoid the sources of stress, or to use defense mechanisms which distorted the reality of the situation. Thus, according to role theory, ambiguity should increase the probability that a person would be dissatisfied with a role, would experience anxiety, would distort reality, and would thus, perform less effectively.

The literature on role theory suggested two constructs describing role perceptions: role conflict and role ambiguity (Schuler, 1975). Role ambiguity was a direct function of the discrepancy between the information available to the person and that which was needed to adequately perform the role, while role conflict was a simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult (Kahn et al., 1964).

The relationship between role ambiguity and work-related outcomes has been examined by a number of researchers (Breaugh, 1980). In general, the findings of these studies have shown role ambiguity to be both widespread and adversely related to several variables: job tension (Kahn et al., 1964), employee turnover (Beehr, 1976), and performance (Schuler, 1975). Breaugh (1980) concluded from these and other studies that it was evident that role ambiguity was an important variable from both an individual and organizational perspective.

Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) described the development and testing of questionnaire measures of role conflict and ambiguity. Analyses of responses of managers showed these two constructs to be factorially identifiable and independent. Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman
found that derived measures of role conflict and ambiguity tended to correlate in two samples in expected directions with measures of organizational and managerial practices and leader behavior, and with member satisfaction, anxiety, and propensity to leave the organization.

Hamner and Tosi (1974) indicated that the nature of positions at higher levels of an organization was primarily one of solving unstructured tasks and problems, thereby making role ambiguity a more crucial source of stress and dissatisfaction than role conflict. Kahn et al. (1964) suggested that role conflict was more stressful and dissatisfying in lower level positions because the employee was more dependent on the supervisor and had little influence. Schuler (1975) hypothesized that role clarity would have a greater negative relationship than role conflict with job satisfaction and performance for employees at higher levels in an organization. Conversely, role conflict was hypothesized to have a greater negative relationship than role ambiguity with job satisfaction and performance for employees at lower levels in an organization.

Jackson and Schuler (1985) wrote that correlations between role ambiguity and role conflict and performance were predicted by both cognitive and motivational explanations of performance. Jackson and Schuler (1985, p. 42) stated:

from a cognitive perspective, performance should be hindered by role ambiguity and role conflict because with them the individual faces either a lack of knowledge about the most effective behaviors to engage in or an almost impossible situation for doing everything expected. Therefore, regardless of the amount of effort expended, behaviors are most likely to be inefficient, misdirected, or insufficient . . . a motivational perspective would predict that performance should be negatively correlated with role ambiguity and role conflict because they are
negatively associated with effort-to-performance and performance-to-reward expectancies.

Hickson (1966) pointed out that the concepts of role specificity and role ambiguity or role clarity have been discussed under various labels by almost every major organizational theorist; yet, there was no unanimity among these writers about the effects of varying degrees of specificity or ambiguity of member roles. Lyons (1971) noted that, more than most, this topic was apparently over-discussed and under-researched. Lyons observed that there had been surprisingly few direct investigations of these concepts and even fewer studies of their behavioral rather than attitudinal correlates. This observation was shared by Ivancevich and Donnelly (1974) who wrote that there had been few attempts at directly investigating the behavioral correlates of role clarity. Hence, the inclusion of this variable in the present study.

Experience (Number of Years/Number of Previous Jobs)

Arvey and McGowen (1983) noted that industrial psychologists have largely ignored experience requirements over the past 20 years or more in their research and thinking about possible predictors of job performance. Instead, focus has been predominately on psychological tests to forecast future employee job performance. Johnson, Guffey, and Perry (1980) outlined the basic assumptions or theories presumed to justify the use of experience in personnel selection. These were reported by Arvey and McGowen (1983, p. 28) as:

a. The behavioral consistency model. The typical notion here was that if applicants had done something in the past, they could do it in
the target job if it was indeed required in that job. The emphasis here was on behaviorism as its philosophical underpinning.

b. **Motivational model.** The assumption here was that an individual who had performed something in the past had an interest in and commitment to that activity and related activities.

c. **The "indicant" model.** The assumption inherent in this model was that the kinds of experience an applicant has had acted as indicators of various knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to performance of a target job. Here the philosophic undertone reflected the idea that mental abilities, information and cognitive processing, etc., were the major determinants of job performance.

According to Arvey and McGowen (1980, p. 29), some "propositions" on experience such as the following have been suggested:

a. There is a linear relationship between experience and job performance. That is, more experience will be reflected in better performance.

b. In contrast, there is a "curvilinear" relationship between experience and job performance such that after a certain critical level of experience, job experience will not increase.

c. Recent experience is more "valuable" than old experience.

Avery and McGowen however, emphasized that no data existed, to their knowledge, which lent support to any of these models or propositions.

Using data from three experiments and 385 managers and supervisors of task groups in five different organizations, Fiedler (1970) tested the hypothesis that number of years of supervisory experience will correlate positively with leadership performance as measured by group productiv-
ity. None of the experimental tests, and none of the seven field studies he investigated supported this hypothesis. The median correlation between years of supervisory experience and leadership performance was -12.

OTHER VARIABLES

Arnold (1982, p. 143) noted that the interrelated topics of "moderator variables," "moderated relationships," "interactions," "differential validity," "test fairness," and so on have been the object of considerable interest and debate in the industrial/organizational psychology literature over the past decade.

The literature was replete with personnel selection problems particularly concerned with legal and ethical issues surrounding whether selection tests may be differentially valid for different subgroups of the population, and with the conditions necessary for the "fair" use of tests. From this standpoint, Arnold (1982) observed that the focus of researchers has tended to be upon subgrouping variables such as race and sex as "moderator" variables.

In a review of literature, White (1978) submitted that the more serious problems pertaining to research in this area included (a) an unclear theoretical statement of the expected magnitude and direction of the moderating effects of individual differences, (b) inadequate operationalizations of the variables of interest, and (c) an unacceptable level of obtained support for the moderator hypothesis. White observed that three versions of the moderator hypothesis have been proffered for workers who are "low" on a moderator variable under study. One version, the weakest, proposes that the relationship between job quality and
affective response will be positive but of lesser magnitude relative to workers who are categorized as high on the moderator variable. A second, stronger, version of the hypothesis contends that the relationship between job quality and affective response will be near zero, while the third and strongest version suggests that the relationship will be substantial and negative.

The extent to which assessment ratings have been moderated by personal and job-related factors has not been very widely addressed in the literature. Thayer (1983) wrote that it was clear that organizational variables did affect individuals and individual performance.

Huck (1977, p. 280) observed that the available evidence suggested that the assessment process, particularly the behavioral simulations, tended to produce similar validity for males and females, whites and blacks, non-college and college graduates, as well as lower- and middle-management positions. Huck concluded that the findings from these investigations did not necessarily generalize to all assessment programs.

Ritchie and Moses (1983) found substantial similarities in the relationship between dimension ratings and progress of men and women. The researchers concluded that it appeared increasingly clear that differences in management potential were far more attributable to individual rather than sex differences. The decremental theory of aging, which is based on extensive laboratory investigations, maintained that abilities decline as workers age (Botwinick, 1978; Welford, 1962). Giniger, Dispenzieri, and Eisenberg (1983) cited loss of agility and the lessening of energies, as well as the increase in illness and dependency,
as some of the factors that contributed to the difficulties of older workers.

Welford (1977) gave three reasons for slowing with age that are of physiological origin: reduced signal-to-noise ratio in the brain, slowing of electroencephalogram rhythm, and cardiac insufficiency. Welford also discussed three reasons that are of psychological origin: difficulty in manipulating data mentally, difficulty in monitoring of response, and increased caution. Applying the theory to garment industry workers, Giniger, Dispenzieri, and Eisenberg (1983) examined the variables of age and experience as related to worker productivity, absenteeism, accidents, and turnover. The researchers separated workers into six age categories and drew a distinction between jobs requiring speed (n=212) and those demanding skill (n=455). The hypothesis was that physical decrements would be more relevant to performance on speed jobs than on skill jobs, but contrary to predictions, older workers surpassed the younger ones in both job categories. Partial correlations between experience and performance, which removed the influence of age, demonstrated that experience rather than age determined performance. The researchers reported that the older workers in the study were also more experienced.

**SUMMARY**

**Job Satisfaction and Performance**

The absence of a consistent empirical relationship between job satisfaction and job performance have been documented. Thus, job satisfaction has been found to bear little relationship to performance on the job (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955), and some relationship with performance
(Herzberg, 1957; Vroom, 1964). Schneider (1976, p. 52) pointed out that there just was no reliable relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Do satisfied county chairpersons perform higher on assessment dimensions? Satisfaction on the job was not encountered in literature to have been used to account for assessment center performance; however, it has been theorized that satisfaction would be positively related to productivity and that less satisfaction created less communication with other members of the organization which led to less confidence in the organization and a heightened sense of futility, culminating in increased feelings of tension (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick, 1970, p. 412). This theoretical view, applied in the context of this study, would suggest that county chairpersons with high satisfaction on the job would perform higher on the assessment dimensions than would their counterparts with low satisfaction on the job.

Initiating Structure and Performance

Research findings regarding Initiating Structure and performance has been inconsistent. Leader Initiating Structure has been found at various times to have significantly positive, significantly negative, and insignificant relationships with leader performance (Schriesheim, House and Kerr, 1976).

Role Clarity and Performance

The existing evidence indicated that there was at best a modest negative relationship between role ambiguity and role conflict and performance (Jackson and Schuler, 1985). Individuals on jobs in which their performance was more dependent upon interacting with others, such
as jobs in upper organizational levels, may be more affected by role ambiguity and role conflict than individuals with jobs in which their performance was more dependent upon interacting with the job task itself, such as jobs in lower organizational levels (Hamner and Tosi, 1974; Schuler, 1975).

According to role theory, ambiguity should increase the probability that a person will be dissatisfied with a role, will experience anxiety, will distort reality, and will, thus, perform less effectively (Rizzo et al., 1970). Thus, it would seem from applying this theory that there would be a negative relationship between role ambiguity (or the lack of role clarity) and county chairperson performance on the assessment center.

**Age and Performance**

Although the decremental theory of aging has maintained that abilities declined as workers aged (Botwinick, 1978; Welford, 1962), this has not always been found to be the case in the field. Giniger et al. (1983) tested the hypothesis that physical decrements would be more relevant to performance on speed jobs than on skill jobs, but contrary to predictions, older workers surpassed the younger ones in both job categories. Partial correlations between experience and performance, which removed the influence of age, demonstrated that experience rather than age determined performance. The researchers reported that the older workers were also the more experienced.

Thornton and Byham (1982) wrote that they were aware of unpublished research studies that showed a strong relationship between age and overall assessment rating. Burroughs, Rollings, and Hopkins (1973) found
a correlation of -.34 between OAR and age among 117 middle managers in a telephone company, and Neidig et al. (1978) found a correlation of -.12 for 260 FBI agents being considered for first level management. However, Hall (1976), Quarles (1980), and Parker (1980) found no relationship of age and OAR in the different populations they studied.

As has been noted, several inconsistencies have been revealed in the relationship between age and assessment center performance. However, the theoretical view of the decremental theory of aging would suggest that younger county chairpersons would perform better than older county chairpersons on the assessment center.

Sex and Performance

The available evidence suggested that the assessment process, particularly the behavioral simulations, tended to produce similar validities for males and females (Moses and Byham 1977).

The lack of published research related to women and assessment centers were obvious as one reviewed literature. Larwood and Wood (1977) suggested that this may be due to the small size of the sample available to most researchers, or because, until recently, women were under-represented in managerial jobs. Among the few studies reported on women, Moses and Boehm (1975) found that the overall assessment rating was significantly related to progress in management and that the success rate for women was comparable to that of men. Ritchie and Moses (1983) reported that substantial similarities were found in the relationships between specific dimension ratings and progress of men and women. Ritchie and Moses concluded that differences in management potential were far more attributable to individual rather than sex differences. This
would suggest that male and female county chairpersons would not be expected to be significantly different on their performance on the assessment center.

**Experience (Number of Years/Number of Previous Jobs) and Performance**

As indicated by Arvey and McGowen (1980, p. 29) some suggested propositions showed that: (1) more experience would be reflected in better performance, and (2) recent experience was more valuable than old experience. Fiedler (1970) tested the hypothesis that number of years of supervisory experience would correlate positively with leadership performance and found that the findings did not support the hypothesized position. However, Giniger (1983) reported that experience rather than age determined performance. There does not seem to be enough research on experience as operationalized in this study by 'the number of years in extension', and 'number of previous jobs' to hypothesize directivity in the relationship with assessment center performance. However, the behavioral consistency model which has logical appeal would suggest that longer serving county chairpersons would obtain higher overall assessment ratings than county chairpersons who have not served as long.

**Perceptions of Assessment Center and Performance**

The perceptions of people affect their behavior. Perhaps a statement from Domm, Blakeney, Matteson, and Scofield (1971) summed this up best. Domm et al. (1971, p.129).

Events within the work environment must be, and are, judged by both lower level and administrative personnel. However, the individual's input of data from the external environment is not "clean." The data is affected by the interpretation of the individual receiving the data, in
effect by the perceptual process. Thus objective reality becomes subjective when perceived by the individual, and it is this subjectivity which is problematic for the administrator and the task organization. The nature of the individual's values, attitudes and beliefs, of previous learning, socializing, and cultural heritage.

Vroom (1960) conducted a study which confirmed the hypothesis that the more positive a person's attitude toward an organization, the greater the tendency for the person to perceive a similarity between the organizational goals and personal goals for the organization. Vroom also found support for the hypothesis that a person would accurately perceive organizational goals with which they agreed to the extent that they would have a positive attitude toward the organization.

Applying these hypothesized viewpoints to this assessment center study, the researcher believed that since the assessment center was part of personnel development efforts of the OCES, county chairpersons who had a positive attitude toward the organization and accurately perceived the organization's goals, would perceive the assessment center positively, which in turn would influence their performance in a desired direction.

Dodd (1977) reported that attitudes towards assessment centers in general were quite positive. The important role of evaluation in providing vital information for improving assessment centers cannot be overemphasized. Assessees must always be surveyed to obtain relevant data for subsequent program planning and improvement. Dodd (1977) suggested that getting at the reactions of assessees could help the practitioner track administrative and procedural changes in his program to make sure that it continued to improve in participant and management acceptability.
The foregoing review of literature and summary, coupled with the fact that this was the first study done on the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service assessment center, led the researcher to propose two working models to guide and reflect the study. The first model (Figure 1), has been derived from hypothesized relationships in literature, and intuitive and logical appeal of possible relationships between the variables. The second model (Figure 2), reflected a structural representation (working model) of the assessment process.
Figure 1. Proposed Model of the Inter-relationship Among Variables of the Study.
Figure 2. Proposed Structural Representation (Working Model) for the Study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The population, instrumentation, validity and reliability of the research instrument, data collection procedures, and statistical procedures utilized for data analysis were described in this chapter.

Population

The population for this study was the extension county chairpersons in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (N=88). A census of all extension county chairpersons who participated as candidates (N=83) in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center between June and August 1985 was conducted. All extension county chairpersons were required to attend the assessment center unless they were near retirement. Eighty-three county chairpersons attended the assessment center. The schedule for the assessment center was drawn by the State Cooperative Extension Service Office but candidates selected attendance times based on compatibility with their county schedules. Candidates were, however, randomly assigned to groups during the assessment center experience.

Research Design

A descriptive-correlational study was utilized to obtain data on the nature and strength of relationships between the variables in the study. A five-part questionnaire, described under the instrumentation section of this chapter, was used to collect data in a follow-up study of all
candidates. A videotape instrument also described under the instrumentation section of this chapter was used to gather data from all assessors (N=15) for the purpose of establishing inter-rater reliability.

Internal and External Validity

Internal validity, as it related to survey research, has been addressed with concerns of measurement error. Attempts were made to reduce measurement error in this study by using a panel of experts to ascertain content validity. Also the instrument was pilot tested to establish reliability, and relevant data were collected from appropriate personnel files of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service rather than from respondents.

With regard to external validity, this study addressed non-response and frame error. Selection error and non-representative sample were not a problem with this research because a census of all county chairpersons was conducted. Frame error was controlled by acquiring and using the most complete and up-to-date list of all extension county chairpersons in the state from the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Non-response error was handled in the manner described by Miller and Smith (1983): the results from late respondents were statistically compared with results from early respondents using a t-test to determine if there was significant differences between the two groups on the independent variables. No significant differences were observed between the groups on the independent variables so all the data were combined for analysis.
Instrumentation

A five-part questionnaire was constructed and utilized for the purpose of collecting data through the mail from county chairpersons. Part one of the instrument, designed to measure job satisfaction, consisted of statements to which respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement using a five-point, Likert-type scale. The five points on the scale were:

- SA = Strongly Agree
- A = Agree
- U = Undecided
- D = Disagree
- SD = Strongly Disagree

This part of the instrument was a modified version of the Brayfield-Rothe "Job Satisfaction Index" as modified by Warner (1973), and previously used with Extension agents in Ohio by Kitrell (1980) and Igodan (1984).

The reliability and validity of the instrument was originally established by Brayfield and Rothe (1950). The questionnaire had a Spearman-Brown coefficient of .82 before it was modified by Warner (1973). Warner observed that by deleting four items that did not consistently measure job satisfaction from the original 18 items on the Brayfield-Rothe "job satisfaction index" the split half coefficient of .82 as obtained by Brayfield and Rothe was raised to .87. A Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .96 was also obtained by Bowen (1980) using the 14 items of this "job satisfaction index" instrument.

Face and content validity for the instrument was established by Bowen and Warmbrot (1980) in a national study of job satisfaction of
teacher educators. The instrument was held to be measuring what it purported to measure after field and pilot testing of the questionnaire (Bowen, 1980). A panel of four experts were asked to examine the instrument for the further establishment of content validity before the instrument was used with county chairpersons in this study (Appendix A, p. 147).

Part two of the instrument measured leader initiating structure. This variable was measured by ten items drawn from twenty original items on the revised form of the Ohio State Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) as constituted by Fleishman (1957, p. 122). According to Fleishman (1957, p. 120), the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was parallel to the Supervisory Behavior Description which measured the same two dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure. Fleishman contended that while not considered a substitute for the Supervisory Behavior Description, the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was more easily administered and had been used in a greater variety of situations than had the Supervisory Behavior Description.

In the initial development of the instruments, items loaded on the "Consideration" factor described behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust and respect, and good "human relations" between the leader and the group. Items loaded on the "Initiating Structure" factor denoted behavior of the leader in organizing and defining the relationships between the leader and the group, in defining interactions among group members, establishing ways of getting the job done, scheduling, criticizing, etc. (Fleishman, 1957).
The decision to use a new initiating structure scale instead of the original twenty items on the LOQ initiating structure dimension stemmed from the fact that the orthogonality of Consideration and Initiating Structure had been questioned (Weissenberg and Kavanagh, 1972, p. 127). Also, to the extent that the response categories on the LOQ contained unequal intervals, the assumption of interval data and frequent use of parametric statistical analysis may be unsupportable (Schriesheim and Kerr, 1974, p. 762).

To obtain the new initiating structure scale, factor analysis was done on responses of county chairpersons on the entire LOQ instrument using principal components extraction (PA1) and oblique rotation. Two factors were specified for extraction using the criteria subcommand in the statistical package SPSS 2.1 with a view to extract the consideration and initiating structure scales.

All items loading on the Initiating Structure scale were subjected to further factor analysis using the principal components analysis (PA1) and oblique rotation. Oblique rather than varimax rotation was utilized because several items were observed in the initial factor analysis to have loaded on both Consideration and Initiating Structure. The results of this subsequent analysis revealed two factors: one factor of thirteen items loaded on Initiating Structure while the remaining items loaded on factor two. A cut-off point of .4 was specified and the ten items contained above this cutoff point were constituted into the new Initiating Structure scale (see appendix C, p. 154). Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient (.79) was established for this scale. To test instrument stability, thirty day test-retest reliability was established.
for the scale by having county chairpersons respond to the items on the new initiating structure scale after 30 days. Analysis of the data yielded a Pearson correlation test-retest reliability coefficient of .72. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 6.

The five points on the Likert-type initiating structure scale were:

1 = Always
2 = Often
3 = Occasionally
4 = Seldom
5 = Never

Part three of the questionnaire measured role clarity. This independent variable was measured using a 5-item scale developed by McEnrue (1984). This index of role clarity measured the lack of two types of ambiguity originally specified by Kahn et al. (1964). In addition, the measure did not include items referring to conditions which may engender clarity (e.g., clear, planned goals and objectives, clearly defined policies, rules, and regulations) but rather items which referred to the psychological reaction they induced (Lyons, 1974). The five items measuring role clarity were: 'I know what my responsibilities are'; 'I pretty much know how my performance is judged compared to others at the same level in the organization'; 'It is unclear what I'm responsible for as a county chairperson'; 'I am not sure how others evaluate my performance as a county chairperson'; 'I know exactly what is expected of me'.

Responses were made on the following 7-point, Likert-type scale developed by McEnrue (1984; personal communication, April, 1986).

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Slightly Agree
4 = Neutral
5 = Slightly Disagree
6 = Disagree
7 = Strongly Disagree

The mean, standard deviation, and reliability coefficient as reported by McEnrue (1984) for the role clarity scale were 4.67, 1.29, and .80, respectively.

Part four of the questionnaire measured candidates' perceptions of the OCES assessment center. Five of the list of ten items comprising this part of the questionnaire were drawn from a list of suggested survey questions for measuring attitudes toward assessment centers. This list was suggested by Dodd (1977). The selected items were chosen based on their face validity and were slightly modified for the purpose of this study. Five more items were added by the researcher after a review of literature to bring the number of items in this part of the questionnaire to ten. In this part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the attitude statements by circling their preferred levels on a five-point Likert-type scale. The five points on the scale were:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree.
Part five of the questionnaire consisted of six sections collecting demographic information on age, gender, program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years as an employee of the Cooperative Extension Service, and number of professional full-time job positions held before joining the Cooperative Extension Service. A copy of the entire instrument is included in Appendix C, p. 154.

The second set of data used in this study was collected in a follow-up study of assessors for the purpose of establishing inter-rater reliability of assessors. The videotape instrument utilized for collecting this information comprised of four shortened, separate fifteen-minute assessment center interviews dealing with the same topic but featuring different interviewers and different interviewees.

Validity of the Questionnaire Instrument

Face validity of the instrument was determined by the researcher with help from faculty and graduate students. Copies of the entire research instrument were submitted to a panel of four experts in the subject area of extension personnel development and evaluation to be evaluated for content validity. The panel of experts (Appendix A, p. 147) determined that the subscale contents had been adequately sampled.

Reliability of the Questionnaire Instrument

Reliability coefficients were computed for the following independent variables of the study: 'job satisfaction', 'initiating structure', 'role clarity', and 'perceptions of the assessment center' from data collected from an accepting sample of eighty county chairpersons.
Reliability coefficients were also reported for 'job satisfaction' and 'role clarity' from previous research. In order to test for stability of the 'initiating structure', and 'perceptions of the assessment center' subscales, county chairpersons were asked to fill out a second questionnaire containing the same items on the two subscales as the initial questionnaire they had completed thirty days earlier. The results were analyzed using Pearson product moment correlations to establish a 30-day test-retest reliability for the 'initiating structure' and 'perceptions of the assessment center' subscales. The data on instrument reliability was summarized in Table 3.

**Data Collection**

Three sets of data were collected in this study. The first set of data consisted of assessment center performance ratings on the sixteen dimensions of the assessment center and also the overall assessment ratings on each extension county chairperson who participated in the assessment center. This information was obtained unobtrusively from personnel records of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Permission was sought from the Associate Director, and also from the Leader, Personnel Development for the collection and use of such information in the study. Complete anonymity was assured in the use of all information.

The second set of data was collected in a follow-up study of all assesses (county chairpersons). A five-part questionnaire eliciting responses pertaining to (i) job satisfaction, (ii) initiating structure, (iii) role clarity, (iv) perceptions of the assessment center, and (v) demographic information was mailed to all assesses on April 22, 1986.
Table 3
Summary of Internal Reliability Analysis of Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient</th>
<th>Pearson's Test-Retest Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 49
** n = 64
To ensure as adequate and complete response as possible, a cover letter from the Leader, Personnel Development explaining the study and encouraging respondents to cooperate with the researcher was included with all mailed questionnaires. Also included was an appropriately stamped, self-addressed return envelope which was used to return the completed instruments. A two-week deadline of May 4, 1986 was set as cutoff date for the return of all first-round instruments. Fifty-two (63%) of the questionnaires were received the initial deadline date.

A second mailing of questionnaires was carried out to send second copies of the instrument to all nonrespondents. Another letter from the Leader, Personnel Development, urging assessees to cooperate with the study was included with second mailing. Again an appropriately stamped, self-addressed envelope to be used in returning the completed questionnaire was included with all second mailings. A two week deadline was set for the return of all questionnaires. Twenty-five (30%) more questionnaires were received after this follow-up mailing bringing the total response rate to seventy-seven (93%). Double-dipping of the six remaining non-respondents was carried out. Three (50%) of the six remaining non-respondents were randomly selected to receive a third mailing of the questionnaires. This final sample was contacted by phone and informed of the third questionnaire. They were requested to cooperate with the study by filling out and returning the questionnaires. These final questionnaires were mailed on May 20, 1986. All three county chairpersons returned the questionnaires bringing the total response to eighty (96%). An examination of mean scores of each of the following: early and late respondents, early and double-dipping group, and late and
double-dipping group of nonrespondents, on the variables of the study using the t-test of significance indicated no significant differences between the groups so all the data were combined for analysis.

The third set of data for the study was collected in a follow-up study of assessors for the purpose of establishing inter-rater reliabilities of assessors. Video cassettes containing four shortened assessment center interviews were mailed to all assessors on April 22, 1986. Assessors rating sheets were mailed along with the videotapes for use in rating each video tape. An appropriately stamped self-addressed envelope was enclosed to be used to return videotapes and completed rating sheets to the author. A letter from the Leader, Personnel Development explaining the purpose of the study was enclosed with the videotapes to all assessors. All fifteen assessors returned the assessors rating sheets of which fourteen were usable. One rating sheet was discarded because it was not fully completed. The Pearson inter-rater reliability coefficient was .79.

Data Analysis

This section describes how data from the study were analyzed to provide answers to the objectives of the study. The statistical package SPSS .21 available at the Instruction and Research Computer Center (IRCC), The Ohio State University was utilized for managing, analyzing and displaying the data in this study.

To avoid response sets, items on subscales were worded both negatively and positively (Dillman, 1978). All negatively worded items were scored in reverse during data analysis to provide for consistency in measurement.
Correlations were interpreted as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very strong association (relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Objectives 1 and 2

The first two objectives were: (1) To describe assesses in terms of the following characteristics: age, gender, major area of graduate study, and number of years in the Extension work; (2) to describe assesses on the following job-related variables: job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, perceptions of assessment center, extension program area of major responsibility, number of previous jobs, and overall assessment rating.

With regard to the first two objectives, descriptive statistics were used to organize and summarize the data. Thus, measures of central tendency, frequencies and percentage distributions were computed to describe assesses.

Objectives 3 and 4

Before analyzing the data to provide answers to objectives 3 to 8, the data was tested for linearity. An inspection of the results for significance of linearity and nonsignificance of deviations from linearity revealed linearity.

The third and fourth objectives sought respectively to: (3) describe the relationship between the independent variables (age, gender,
extension program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years in the cooperative extension service, number of previous jobs, job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, and perceptions of assessment center), and the dependent variable (overall assessment rating); and (4) describe the inter-relationships among the variables of the study.

Pertaining to objectives 3 and 4 Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed to describe the nature and strength of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable and also between the independent variables. The independent variable 'major program responsibility area' was split up into the major component areas of Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H and Youth, and Administration as reflected by assesses respondents (see Table 16). Each component area was dummy coded, and point biserial correlations were then established between the dummy coded areas (Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H and Youth, Administration), and the dependent variable, OAR. An alpha level of .05 was set a priori to test for significance of relationships.

Objective 5

Objective 5 was to determine the best predictors of each of the sixteen assessment center dimensions from the independent variables of the study. To provide answers to objective 5, separate stepwise multiple regressions were computed for the independent variables in the study with each of the sixteen dimensions as a dependent variable in different computational runs. A significant level of .05 was specified for entry of the independent variables into the model. Beta coefficients, and changes in $R^2$ were inspected for each regression model, and optimal
prediction models were presented for each of the sixteen dimensions (oral communications, written communications, leadership, initiative, planning and organizing, decision making/judgment, development of coworkers, behavioral flexibility, organizational sensitivity, assertiveness, objectivity, perception, sensitivity, management control, collaborative-ness, and evaluation).

Objective 6

The sixth objective of the study was to determine the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (OAR) explained by each of the independent variables. To answer this objective, coefficients of determination ($r^2$) were calculated by squaring correlation coefficient values obtained between independent variables and the dependent variable.

Objective 7

This objective sought to determine the best predictors of overall assessment rating (the dependent variable) from the independent variables of the study. To this end a stepwise multiple regression incorporating all independent variables was executed. Dummy coded variables for major area of program responsibility (agriculture, home economics, 4-H and youth, and administration) were also entered as a block. The overall assessment rating was defined as the dependent measure for the model. $R^2$ values and Beta coefficients were tabulated for the data and an optimal prediction model was derived for the dependent variable.

Objective 8

Objective 8 was to determine if assessee differences on the independent variables significantly affected their performance on the assessment
center as measured by the overall assessment rating. Oneway analysis of variance was used to determine if there were significant differences in performance (OAR scores) between groups on the basis of major area of program responsibility, and number of years in extension. Three groups were constituted on the variable 'number of years in extension' according to how long they had served in extension. Group 1 comprised of county chairpersons who had served 10 years or less. Group 2 was made up of county chairpersons who had served between 11 and 20 years, whereas group 3 was composed of all county chairpersons who had served more than 20 years in extension.

On the variable 'perceptions of assessment center' two groups - high perception group and low perception group - were constituted based on ratings on the variable. Assessees scoring above 3.90 on the variable were classified into the high perception group while assessees scoring 3.90 or below were classified into the low perception group. A t-test of significance was than conducted to see if the two groups differed significantly on the dependent measure (OAR).

**Assessment Center Reliability**

The overall assessment center reliability was computed using assessees consensus scores on the sixteen assessment center dimensions. The results showed a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .95. A summary of the assessment center reliability data is provided in Table 4.

**Inter-rater Reliability of Assessors**

Data obtained from ratings by assessors of an assessment center videotape instrument described under the instrumentation section of this
Table 4

Overall Reliability of Assessment Center Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dimensions</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Alpha reliability coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Inter-Rater Reliability of Assessors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessors</th>
<th>Number of videotape interviews</th>
<th>Inter-Rater reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Factor Distribution of Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Dimensions</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Percent of Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor One</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Two</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
chapter were analyzed to test for rater agreement. An inter-rater reliability value of .79 was obtained. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 5.

Factor Analysis of Dimensions

The overall mean scores of assessees on the sixteen assessment center dimensions were subjected to factor analysis to determine the extent to which the conceptually separate domains were empirically independent. Results of the principal components factor analysis using oblique rotation yielded two underlying factors. Factor one had an eigen value of 9.08 and accounted for 57 percent of the variance. Eleven dimensions loaded on this factor. Factor two had an eigen value 1.60 and explained 10 percent of the variance. Five dimensions loaded on factor 2. Table 6 reports the oblique rotated factors, number of dimensions, eigen values and percentage of variance explained. The factor pattern matrix is presented in Table 7. Factor 1 was identified as representing planning and interpersonal relations while factor 2 represented an executive function. The correlation between factor 1 and factor 2 was .55 indicating substantial positive association between the two (Table 8).

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficients computed between dimensions indicated low to high positive intercorrelations among the dimensions. The highest correlation of .79 was between 'leadership' and 'initiative' whereas the lowest correlation .19 was between 'sensitivity' and 'assertiveness.' Most of the dimensions correlated above the .50 range. The correlation matrix of the assessment center dimensions is presented in Table 9.
Table 7
Factor Pattern Matrix for Assessment Center Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.94925</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.87355</td>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.83964</td>
<td></td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.74425</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.74176</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making/judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.71862</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.66614</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of coworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63837</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63478</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.57793</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54411</td>
<td>.95400</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.92709</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.74410</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65348</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.59937</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.59937</td>
<td>Oral communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Factor Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V1 Oral communications  V6 Decision making/judgment  V11 Objectivity  
V2 Written communications  V7 Development of coworkers  V12 Perception  
V3 Leadership  V8 Behavioral flexibility  V13 Sensitivity  
V4 Initiative  V9 Organizational sensitivity  V14 Management control  
V5 Planning and organizing  V10 Assertiveness  V15 Collaborativeness  
V6 Evaluation
Correlations between the assessment center dimensions and overall assessment rating indicated moderate through substantial to very strong association. The data showing Pearson correlation coefficients of assessment center dimensions with overall assessment rating was summarized in Table 10.
Table 10

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Assessment Center Dimensions with Overall Assessment Rating (OAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Correlation with OAR</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Correlation with OAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral communications</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Organizational sensitivity</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communications</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making/judgment</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Management control</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of coworkers</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral flexibility</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 80
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This study was descriptive correlational in nature and had the primary purpose of investigating the relationships between various personal and job-related factors, and assessment center performance as measured by the overall assessment rating (OAR) of candidates. In addition, this study sought to determine the importance of the independent variables of the study in predicting the overall assessment center rating of assesses.

The independent variables of this study were: age, gender, program responsibility area, major area of graduate study, number of years in the cooperative extension service, number of previous jobs, job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, and perceptions of assessment center. The dependent variable was overall assessment center rating as determined by assessors.

Data were collected through: (1) the use of mail questionnaires, and (2) the examination of personnel records of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The first part of the questionnaire was designed to measure job satisfaction, the second part measured initiating structure, the third part measured role clarity, while the fourth part measured candidates' perception of the assessment center. Personal and demographic information were collected with the fifth and final part of the questionnaire.
The objectives of the study were:

1. To describe assesses in terms of the following characteristics: age, gender, major area of graduate study, and number of years in Extension work.

2. To describe assesses on the following job-related variables: job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, perceptions of assessment center, extension program area of major responsibility, number of previous jobs, and overall assessment rating.

3. To describe the relationship between the independent variables (age, gender, extension program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years in the cooperative extension service, number of previous jobs, job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, and perceptions of assessment center), and the dependent variable (overall assessment rating).

4. To describe the inter-relationships among the variables of the study.

5. To determine the best predictors of each of the sixteen assessment center dimensions from the independent variables of the study.

6. To determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by each of the independent variables.

7. To determine the best predictors of overall assessment rating (the dependent variable) from the independent variables of the study.

8. To determine if assesssee differences on the independent variables significantly affected their performance on the assessment center as measured by the overall assessment rating (OAR).
Personal and Demographic Variables

Information was collected on the following variables: age, gender, program responsibility area, major area of graduate study, number of years in the cooperative extension service, and number of previous jobs. The findings regarding the above variables were systematically presented in Table 11 through Table 15 to provide answers to objective 1 of the study.

Age

Two (3 percent) of the county chairpersons who participated in the study were between the age range of 21 to 30 years. Thirty-four (43 percent) of the county chairpersons were between the ages of 31 and 40 years. Twenty-two (28 percent) of the county chairpersons were within the age range 41 to 50 years, while another 22 (28 percent) of the respondents were older than 51 years. The youngest county chairperson was 28 years old while the oldest was 62 years old establishing a range of 34 years. The data on age distribution were displayed in Table 11.

Gender

Out of the accepting sample of 80 county chairpersons, 59 (74 percent) were male and 21 (26 percent) were female. Data on gender were summarized in Table 12.

Major Area of Graduate Study

Fifty (65 percent) of the county chairpersons responding majored in agricultural education or home economics education for their masters degree. Eighteen (23 percent) majored in other areas in agriculture such
Table 11
Age Distribution of Assessees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 43.8  
Median = 42.0  
Mode = 38.0  
Standard Deviation = 8.2  
Range = 34.0

Table 12
Gender Distribution of Assessees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as animal science. Nine (12 percent) indicated that they majored in other areas such as textiles and clothing (Table 13).

**Number of Years in Extension**

A summary of the frequency distribution for the number of years the county chairpersons had served in the cooperative extension service was presented in Table 14. Sixty-nine percent (55 county chairs) had served 20 years or less. Thirty-one percent indicated they had worked in extension for 21 years or more. The average number of years served in Extension was 17 years. The least number of years served in extension was one year. Thirty-seven years was recorded as the highest number of years served in extension. Thus, the range in number of years served in the cooperative extension service was 36.0 years.

**Number of Previous Jobs**

The average number of previous jobs held was one. Thirty (37.5 percent) of the respondents did not hold any full-time professional job before joining Extension. Only five percent of the county chairpersons had held three or more full-time professional jobs before joining the Cooperative Extension Service. The data on the distribution of number of previous jobs were displayed in Table 15.

**Job-Related Variables**

The findings pertaining to objective 2 of the study were presented in this section. Objective 2 sought to describe assessees on the following job-related variables: job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, perceptions of assessment center, extension program area of
Table 13
Major Area of Graduate Study
(Masters degree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education or Home Economics Education</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Area in Agriculture</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
Frequency Distribution for Number of Years in the Cooperative Extension Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 17.14
Median = 17.00
Mode = 28.00
Standard deviation = 7.34
Range = 36.0
Table 15

Frequency Distribution for Number of Previous Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Previous Jobs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.01
Median = 1.00
Mode = 0
Standard deviation = 1.03
Range = 5.00
major responsibility, and overall assessment rating. The data were presented in Tables 16 through .

Job Satisfaction

Ninety-five percent (76) of the respondents indicated agreement with the items measuring the domain of job satisfaction. The range of mean scores on this scale was 1 (strongly disagreed on all items) to 5 (strongly agreed on all items). None of the respondents' mean scores fell within the 'Disagree' or 'Strongly Disagree' category. Sixty-five percent and 30 percent of the county chairpersons 'Agreed' and 'Strongly Agreed' respectively with items on the job satisfaction scale. This indicated that on the average county chairpersons were satisfied with their jobs. The mean score of 4.30 fell in the 'Agree' category (Table 16). The job satisfaction item ranked highest by respondents was "my job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored". This item received a mean score of 4.75 and was in the 'Strongly Agree' category. The item receiving the lowest mean score was "I like my job better than most extension agents do". This item received a mean score of 3.49, a value within the 'Undecided' category. Table 60 in Appendix F is a summary of items ranking on job satisfaction as perceived by county chairpersons.

Initiating Structure

The response categories for this independent variable were: 'Never', 'Seldom', 'Occasionally', 'Often', and 'Always'. Most of the agents responded in the 'Occasionally' and 'Often' categories (60 percent and 38 percent respectively). The mean score for the Initiating
Table 16

Frequency Distribution for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.00 - 1.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.51 - 2.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.51 - 3.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.51 - 4.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.51 - 5.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 4.30
Median = 4.29
Mode = 4.29
Standard deviation = 0.38
Range = 1.7
Structure variable was 3.44 and the standard deviation was 0.45. The lowest and highest mean scores on this scale were 1.70 and 4.70 respectively resulting in a range of 3.00. The two items rated lowest and highest respectively were 'stress being ahead of competing work groups' and 'emphasize meeting of deadlines'. The former received a mean rating of 2.51 while the latter received a mean rating of 3.85. A summary of the data on initiating structure was presented in Table 17. The ranking of items on this scale as scored by respondents was presented in Table 61 of Appendix F.

Role Clarity

In response to items on role clarity, most county chairpersons (75 percent) indicated 'slight agreement' to 'agreement'. The range of mean scores on this scale was 1 (strongly disagreed on all items) to 7 (strongly agreed on all items). Forty-five percent of the respondents 'agreed' with the items measuring the role clarity domain indicating that they did not perceive much ambiguity in their roles as county chairpersons. Four percent of the respondents marked the 'strongly agree' category whereas one percent marked the 'disagree' category. No respondents marked the 'strongly disagree' category whereas 18 percent indicated their uncertainty by marking 'neutral' on the response scale. The role clarity item ranked highest by respondents was "I know what my responsibilities are". This item received a mean score of 6.19 and was in the 'agree' category. The item rated lowest was "I am not sure how others evaluate my performance as a county chairperson". This item received a mean score of 4.13, which placed it within the 'neutral' category. The overall mean score was 5.21 with a standard deviation of 0.96 (Table 18).
Table 17
Frequency Distribution for Initiating Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never (1.00 - 1.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom (1.51 - 2.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally (2.51 - 3.50)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often (3.51 - 4.50)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always (4.51 - 5.00)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.44
Median = 3.40
Mode = 3.10
Standard deviation = 0.45
Range = 3.00
Table 18  
Frequency Distribution for Role Clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1.00 - 1.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (1.51 - 2.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly disagree (2.51 - 3.50)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (3.51 - 4.50)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly agree (4.51 - 5.50)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (5.51 - 6.50)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (6.50 - 7.00)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 5.21  
Median = 5.40  
Mode = 5.60  
Standard deviation = 0.96  
Range = 4.60
Table 62 in Appendix F was a summary of the ranking of items on the role clarity scale as scored by respondents.

**Perceptions of Assessment Center**

The response categories for this independent variable ranged from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Sixty-three percent of the respondents indicated agreement with the items measuring this domain by marking the 'agree' category. Ten percent marked 'strongly agree' whereas 26 percent indicated they were 'undecided'. The overall mean score for this variable was 3.83 with a standard deviation of 0.52. The two items rated lowest and highest respectively were "I had adequate information to understand what the assessment center was all about before I agreed to attend it" (X=3.00), and, "the assessment center staff were cooperative during the entire session" (X=4.41).

The summary of data on county chairpersons perceptions' of the assessment center was presented in Table 19. The ranking of items on this scale as scored by respondents was presented in Table 63 of Appendix F. The item "Overall, the assessment center measures important qualities required of Extension County Chairs" received a mean rating of 3.76 from county chairpersons. This item was singled out and reported because of its importance in evaluating the face validity of the assessment center.

**Extension Program Area of Major Responsibility**

The summary of data for major program responsibility area was displayed in Table 20. More than one-half of the county chairpersons (59 percent) indicated they had major program responsibility area in Agricul-
# Table 19

Frequency Distribution for Perception of Assessment Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1.00 - 1.50)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (1.51 - 2.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided (2.51 - 3.50)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (3.51 - 4.50)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (4.51 - 5.00)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.83  
Median = 3.80  
Mode = 3.60  
Standard deviation = 0.52  
Range = 3.00
### Table 20

**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</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H and Youth Programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 21

**Frequency Distribution for Overall Assessment Rating of Assessees as Rated by Assessors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Number of Assessees</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting management expectations is questionable (1).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could meet normal management expectations with development (2).</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should meet normal management expectations (3).</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should exceed normal management expectations (4).</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.83  
Median = 3.00  
Mode = 3.00  
Standard deviation = .85  
Range = 3.00
ture. Eighteen (23 percent) had major area of program responsibility in Home Economics. Sixteen percent of the respondents had 4-H and Youth as their major program responsibility area while three percent indicated administration as their major program responsibility area.

Overall Assessment Rating

The overall performance of assesses was represented on the following four point scale: 1 = "meeting management expectations is questionable", 2 = "could meet normal management expectations with development", 3 = "should meet normal management expectations" and 4 = "should exceed normal management expectations". Thirty-two (40 percent) of the assesses were rated in group 3 ("should meet normal management expectations"). Twenty-five (31 percent) were rated in group 2 and were, therefore, considered to be able to meet normal management expectations with development. Nineteen (24 percent) were expected to exceed normal management expectations whereas meeting management expectations was questionable for 4 (5 percent) of the county chairpersons. The overall mean and standard deviation on this scale was 2.83 and 0.85, respectively. The distribution of respondents on the dependent variable (overall assessment rating) was shown in Table 21.

Objective 3

The third objective of this study was to describe the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The findings pertaining to this objective were presented in Table 22. Negligible correlations were found between the dependent variable (overall assessment rating) and the following independent variables: job
Table 22

Correlation Between Independent Variables and Overall Assessment Rating (OAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with OAR (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of assessment center</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area (agriculture)</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area (home economics)</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area (4-H and youth)</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in extension</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous jobs</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* r pb
satisfaction \( (r=0.03) \), gender \( (r=0.06) \), major area (agriculture, \( r=-0.05 \); home economics, \( r=0.04 \); 4-H and youth, \( r=-0.03 \)). Low associations were found between the overall assessment rating and the following independent variables: role clarity \( (r=0.13) \), initiating structure \( (r=0.10) \), age \( (r=0.14) \), major area (administration, \( r=0.13 \)), number of years in extension \( (r=0.18) \), number of previous jobs \( (r=0.13) \). The positive correlations, though low, indicated that assessment center performance tended to increase as the following variables increased: role clarity, initiating structure, age, number of years in Extension, and number of previous jobs. A correlation of 0.35 was found between the perceptions of the assessment center by county chairpersons and the overall assessment rating, indicating moderate association between the two variables. Thus, county chairperson performance on the assessment center tended to increase with increased positive attitude towards the assessment center.

Objective 4

Objective 4 sought to describe the inter-relationship among the variables of the study. To provide answers to this objective Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for each variable of the study with every other variable of the study with the exception of gender and major program area of responsibility for which point biserial correlations were computed with the other variables of the study. The results were summarized in Table 23.

Job Satisfaction

Except for role clarity, initiating structure, and number of previous jobs, the relationship between job satisfaction and all the
Table 23

Pearson Correlation Coefficients 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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.030</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.387*</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>4</td>
<td>.353*</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.336*</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.323*</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.230*</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>-.416*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.216*</td>
<td>-.316*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>-.712*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>-.415*</td>
<td>.903*</td>
<td>-.601*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.239*</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>-.269*</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.492*</td>
<td>-.227*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.342*</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.211*</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.818*</td>
<td>-.440*</td>
<td>.448*</td>
<td>-.433*</td>
<td>-.190*</td>
<td>.195*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.195*</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

1 Overall assessment rating
2 Job satisfaction
3 Role clarity
4 Perceptions of assessment center
5 Initiating structure
6 Age
7 Gender
8 Major program area of responsibility (Agriculture)
9 Major program area of responsibility (Home Economics)
10 Major program area of responsibility (4-H and Youth)
11 Major program area of responsibility (Administration)
12 Number of years as Cooperative Extension Service employee
13 Number of previous jobs before joining the Extension Service
other variables in the study were not significant at the .05 level.
There was moderate positive relationship between job satisfaction and role clarity ($r=.39$, $p < .01$), and between job satisfaction and Initiating Structure ($r=.34$, $p < .01$). There was a low positive relationship between job satisfaction and the number of previous jobs held ($r=.20$, $p < .05$). These significant positive correlations indicated that job satisfaction increased as each of the following variables role clarity, Initiating Structure, and number of previous jobs held increased. The coefficients of determination indicated that only 15 percent, 12 percent, and 4 percent of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by role clarity, initiating structure, and number of previous jobs, respectively. The correlations between job satisfaction and the variables of the study is shown in Table 23. Nonsignificant positive correlations were found between job satisfaction and the following variables: age ($r=.14$), gender (.06), and number of years in extension ($r=.05$).

**Role Clarity**

Significant, moderately positive relationships were found between role clarity and both Initiating Structure ($r=.36$, $p < .01$), and age ($r=.32$, $p < .05$). Nonsignificant correlations were found between role clarity and the following variables of the study: 'perceptions of the assessment center' ($r=.16$, $p > .05$), 'gender' ($r=-.07$, $p > .05$), 'number of previous jobs' ($r=.05$, $p > .05$).

**Perceptions of Assessment Center**

This variable showed the highest correlation with the dependent variable, OAR ($r=.35$, $p < .01$). In addition, significant correlations
were found between 'perceptions of assessment center' by county chairpersons and the following: 'gender' (r=.23, p < .05), and 'major area (agriculture)' (r=-.22, p < .05). A nonsignificant negative correlation was found between 'perceptions of assessment center' and 'number of years in extension' (r=-.14, p > .05) indicating that older county chairpersons tended to rate the assessment center lower in terms of how positively they perceived the entire process. This tendency may be due to the fact that in view of their longer experience on the job, older county chairpersons may not be very positively inclined to what they perceive as a test of their abilities.

Initiating Structure

Initiating Structure was found to have moderate positive relationship with role clarity, and job satisfaction. These relationships were significant at the .01 level (r=.34, p < .01; r=.36, p < .01 with job satisfaction and role clarity respectively). These relationships suggested that 'Initiating Structure' increased with increasing role clarity and job satisfaction.

Age

The relationship between 'age' and 'number of years in extension' was very high and positive. This relationship was significant at the .01 level (r=.82, p < .01). Also, 'age' was positively associated with 'role clarity' (r=.32, p < .01). This trend may be explained by the fact that older county chairpersons had worked longer with the extension service and, therefore, had less ambiguity in understanding what their roles were. This finding may be supported by the fact that significant
positive correlations were observed between 'role clarity' and 'number of years in extension' \( r = 0.21, p < 0.05 \), and 'age' and between 'number of years in extension' \( r = 0.82, p < 0.01 \).

The relationship between age and assessment center performance, as indicated by the overall assessment rating (OAR) was low and positive. This relationship was however nonsignificant at the .05 level \( r = 0.14, p > 0.05 \) indicating that although older county chairpersons tended to perform better on the assessment center, this tendency was not significant at the alpha level specified. There was a significant, negative relationship between age and gender \( r = -0.42, p < 0.01 \) suggesting that male county chairpersons tended to be older than female county chairpersons. The Pearson correlation coefficients are presented in Table 23.

**Gender**

A very high negative correlation \( r = -0.71 \) was found between 'gender' and 'major area of responsibility (agriculture)'. This indicated that there were significantly more male county chairpersons with major area of responsibility in agriculture than there were females. This relationship was significant at the .01 level. There were, however, significantly more females in home economics than there were males \( r = 0.90, p < 0.01 \). Moderate negative association existed between 'gender' and 'number of years in extension'. This relationship was significant at the .01 level \( r = -0.44, p < 0.01 \) indicating that male county chairpersons had served significantly longer in extension than their female colleagues. A similar relationship was observed between 'gender' and 'age' \( r = -0.42, p < 0.01 \).
Positive low associations were found between 'gender' and 'perceptions of the assessment center', and 'gender' and 'initiating structure'. These relationships were both significant at the .05 level ($r=.23$, and $r=.30$ for 'perceptions of assessment center,' and 'initiating structure', respectively) indicating that female county chairpersons perceived the assessment center, and their own initiating structure significantly higher than did their male counterparts.

**Number of Years in Extension**

The variable 'number of years in extension' had positive and significant relationships with 'role clarity' and with 'age'. The association with 'role clarity' was low ($r=.21$) whereas that with 'age' was very strong ($r=.82$). Thus, both 'role clarity' and 'age' increased with increasing 'number of years in extension'. Both relationships were significant at the .05 level. The data for Pearson correlation coefficients for the variables of the study were displayed in Table 23.

**Number of Previous Jobs**

This variable showed significant correlation with only 'job satisfaction' ($r=.20$, $p < .05$). The relationships with the rest of the variables in the study were nonsignificant. The positive relationship with job satisfaction indicated that job satisfaction increased as the 'number of previous jobs' before joining extension increased.

**Objective 5**

The fifth objective of the study sought to determine which independent variables of the study: age, gender, major area of graduate study, number of years in the cooperative extension service, number of previous
jobs, job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, perceptions of assessment center, and extension program area of major responsibility, significantly predicted the performance of assessees on the sixteen dimensions of the assessment center.

To provide answers to objective 5, stepwise multiple regression, incorporating the independent variables of the study with each of the sixteen assessment dimensions as dependent variables, was conducted. The summary of these results was presented in Table 24 through Table 38. A .05 level of significance was specified for entry into models. 'initiating structure' and 'age' were not found to be significant predictors for any of the sixteen dimensions of the assessment center.

**Oral Communications**

The only significant predictor of oral communication was 'perceptions of the assessment center'. The results of a stepwise regression incorporating the independent variables of the study as predictors of oral communication indicated that 'perceptions of the assessment center' accounted for only four percent of the variance in oral communication. The results are presented in Table 24.

**Written Communications**

The results of a stepwise regression incorporating the independent variables of the study as predictors of 'written communication' were presented in Table 25. The results indicated that 'major area (4-H and Youth)' accounted for seven percent of the variance in 'written communication'. 'Gender' accounted for an additional four percent of the variation, while 'job satisfaction' explained a further five percent of
### Table 24
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Oral Communication'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Overall Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Regression Equation

$$Y = .22X_1$$

where: $Y =$ oral communication  
$X_1 =$ perceptions of assessment center

### Table 25
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Written Communication'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Overall Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Area (4-H and Youth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>6.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>6.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.87*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Regression Equation

$$Y = -.26X_1 + .26X_2 + -.23X_3$$

where: $Y =$ written communication  
$X_1 =$ major area (4-H and Youth)  
$X_2 =$ gender  
$X_3 =$ job satisfaction
the variance in written communication. Together, the three independent variables accounted for 16 percent of variance in 'written communications'.

Leadership

Two independent variables were found to be significant predictors of 'leadership'. The independent variable 'perceptions of assessment center' explained five percent of the variance in 'leadership', with a further four percent being accounted for by 'number of years in extension'. The results, presented in Table 26, were a summary of the stepwise regression of independent variables on the dependent variable 'leadership'.

Initiative

The significant predictors of 'initiative' were the independent variables 'role clarity', 'number of previous jobs', and 'extension program area of major responsibility'. The results of a stepwise multiple regression incorporating the independent variables of the study as predictors of 'initiative' showed that 'role clarity' accounted for six percent of the variance in 'initiative'. 'Number of previous jobs' accounted for an additional four percent of the variation. 'Extension program area of major responsibility' explained a further two percent of the variance in 'initiative'. Together, the three independent variables accounted for a total of 12 percent of the variance. The results were presented in Table 27.
### Table 26

Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Leadership'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>F (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05

Regression Equation

$$Y = 0.27X_1 + 0.25X_2$$

where: $Y = \text{leadership}$

$X_1 = \text{perceptions of assessment center}$

$X_2 = \text{number of years in extension}$

### Table 27

Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Initiative'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>F (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Previous Jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>5.82*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05

Regression Equation

$$Y = .26X_1 + .22X_2$$

where: $Y = \text{initiative}$

$X_1 = \text{role clarity}$

$X_2 = \text{number of previous jobs}$
Planning and Organizing

When the independent variables were regressed on the assessment dimension 'planning and organizing' in stepwise fashion, it was found that the significant predictors of 'planning and organizing' were 'extension program area of major responsibility (home economics)' and 'number of years in extension'. 'Major area (home economics)' explained five percent of the variance in 'planning and organizing' while 'number of years in extension' accounted for an additional six percent of the variance. This brought the total amount of variance explained by the two variables to 11 percent. The results of this stepwise multiple regression were presented in Table 28.

Decision Making/Judgment

None of the independent variables of the study emerged as a significant predictor of 'decision making/judgment' when stepwise multiple regression incorporating the independent variables of the study as predictors of 'decision making/judgment' was executed.

Development of Coworkers

The only significant predictor of the dimension 'development of coworkers' was 'perceptions of assessment center'. The results of the stepwise regression, presented in Table 29, indicated that 10 percent of the variance in 'development of coworkers' was accounted for by 'perceptions of assessment center'.

Behavioral Flexibility

The results of stepwise regression incorporating the independent variables of the study as predictors of 'behavioral flexibility' were
Table 28
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Planning and Organizing'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Overall Beta</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>F (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Area (Home Economics)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Regression Equation

$Y = .37X_1 + .30X_2$

where: $Y =$ planning and organizing

$X_1 =$ major area (Home Economics)

$X_2 =$ number of years in extension

Table 29
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Development of Coworkers'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Overall Beta</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>F (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>9.58*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Regression Equation

$Y = .33X_1$

where: $Y =$ development of coworkers

$X_1 =$ perceptions of assessment center
presented in Table 30. The results indicated that the only significant predictor of 'behavioral flexibility' was 'perceptions of assessment center'. Twenty percent of the variance in 'behavioral flexibility' was accounted for by 'perceptions of assessment center'.

**Organizational Sensitivity**

When the independent variables of the study were regressed on the assessment dimension 'organizational sensitivity' in a stepwise method, it was found that 'number of years in extension' and 'perceptions of assessment center' together explained 19 percent of the variance in 'organizational sensitivity'. 'Number of years in extension' accounted for 12 percent of the variance in 'organizational sensitivity'. An additional seven percent of variation was accounted for by 'perceptions of assessment center'. The results of this stepwise multiple regression were presented in Table 31.

**Assertiveness**

Two independent variables were found to be significant predictors of 'assertiveness'. The independent variable 'number of previous jobs' explained four percent of the variance in 'assertiveness'. A further five percent of variation in 'assertiveness' was accounted for by 'number of years in extension'. The results were summarized in Table 32.

**Objectivity**

The only significant predictor of the dimension 'objectivity' was 'perceptions of assessment center'. The results of the stepwise regression indicated that 15 percent of the variance in 'objectivity' was
### Table 30
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Behavioral Flexibility'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>20.34*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Regression Equation

$Y = .46X_1$

where: $Y =$ behavioral flexibility

$X_1 =$ perception of assessment center

### Table 31
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Organizational Sensitivity'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>12.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>10.32*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Regression Equation

$Y = .40X_1 + .28X_2$

where: $Y =$ organizational sensitivity

$X_1 =$ number of years in extension

$X_2 =$ perceptions of assessment center
Table 32
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Assertiveness'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>F (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Previous Jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>4.69*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Regression Equation

$Y = .26X_1 + .24X_2$

where: $Y = assertiveness$

$X_1 = number of previous jobs$

$X_2 = number of years in extension$

Table 33
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Objectivity'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>F (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>14.68*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Regression Equation

$Y = .40X_1$

where: $Y = objectivity$

$X_1 = perceptions of assessment center$
explained by 'perceptions of assessment center'. A summary of the results was presented in Table 33.

**Perception, Sensitivity, Collaborativeness, and Evaluation**

'Perceptions of assessment center' was the only independent variable that emerged as a significant predictor of each of the following assessment center dimensions: 'perception', 'sensitivity', 'collaborativeness', and 'evaluation'. The independent variable 'perceptions of assessment center' explained four percent, ten percent, six percent, and five percent of the variance in 'perception', 'sensitivity', 'collaborativeness', and 'evaluation' respectively. The results of these findings were presented in Tables 34 through 37.

**Management Control**

The results of stepwise regression incorporating the independent variables of the study as predictors of 'management control' were presented in Table 38. The results indicated that the only significant predictor of 'management control' was 'perceptions of assessment center'. Only four percent of the variance in 'management control' however, was accounted for by 'perceptions of assessment center'.

**Objective 6**

This objective sought to determine the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (OAR) explained by each of the independent variables of the study. The findings pertaining to this objective were summarized in Table 39.

Twelve percent of the variance in assessment center performance as represented by the overall assessment rating (OAR) was explained by
### Table 34

**Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Perception'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

**Regression Equation**

\[
Y = .27X_1
\]

where:  
- $Y$ = perception
- $X_1$ = perceptions of assessment center

### Table 35

**Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Sensitivity'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>9.91*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

**Regression Equation**

\[
Y = .34X_1
\]

where:  
- $Y$ = sensitivity
- $X_1$ = perceptions of assessment center
Table 36  
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Collaborativeness'  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5.73*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Regression Equation  

$Y = .26X_1$

where: $Y =$ collaborativeness  

$X_1 =$ perceptions of assessment centers

Table 37  
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on 'Evaluation'  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Assessment Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.42*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Regression Equation  

$Y = .25X_1$

where: $Y =$ evaluation  

$X_1 =$ perceptions of assessment center
Table 38
Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables
on 'Management Control'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Overall Beta</th>
<th>Overall ( R^2 )</th>
<th>Change in ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( F ) (regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.55*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* \( p < .05 \)

Regression Equation

\[ Y = 0.24X_1 \]

where: \( Y = \) management control

\( X_1 = \) number of years in extension
Table 39
Proportion of Variance in Overall Assessment Rating (OAR) Explained by Each Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Correlation with OAR (r)</th>
<th>Proportion of Variance (r²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of assessment center</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area (agriculture)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area (home economics)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major area (4-H and youth)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in extension</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous jobs</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
county chairpersons 'perceptions of the assessment center'. This single independent variable explained the most variance in the dependent variable. 'Age', 'role clarity', and 'number of jobs' each accounted for two percent of the variance in the overall assessment rating. Initiating structure explained one percent of the variance in OAR while job satisfaction and gender accounted for no variance in the dependent variable. With the exception of 'major area (administration)' which accounted for two percent of the variance in OAR, the other major areas of program responsibility (home economics, 4-H and youth, and agriculture) did not explain any of the variance in the overall assessment rating.

Objective 7

Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on Overall Assessment Rating

The results of a stepwise multiple regression incorporating the independent variables of the study as predictors of overall assessment rating (OAR) were summarized in Table 40. As indicated in the summary of results, only two of the independent variables emerged as significant predictors of the dependent variable (OAR). These significant predictors were 'perceptions of assessment center' which accounted for 11 percent of the variance in OAR, and 'number of years in extension' which accounted for an additional five percent of the variance in OAR. Together, the two independent variables explained 16 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, 'OAR'. The remaining independent variables: job satisfaction, role clarity, initiating structure, age, gender, and major area of program responsibility were not significant predictors of the
overall assessment rating. The optimal prediction model was presented in Table 40.

To further examine the underlying constructs of the assessment dimensions, stepwise regression of the independent variables on the two identified factors was executed (factor 1 denoted an executive function while factor 2 represented planning and interpersonal relations). The results indicated that the variables 'perceptions of assessment center' and 'number of years in extension', were the only significant predictors of factor 1. Together, the two variables accounted for 15 percent of the variance in factor 1. Forced entry of the dummy coded areas of major area into the regression model indicated that an additional two percent of variation in factor 1 was explained by major area. No independent variables emerged as significant predictors of factor 2.

An examination of the data revealed constrained variance on the independent variables. This might explain the low amounts of variance accounted for in the regression models. Further explanation might be due to the independent variables of the study not really being important in predicting the overall assessment rating.

Objective 8

The eighth objective of the study was to determine if assessee differences on the independent variables significantly affected their performance on the assessment center as measured by the overall assessment rating (OAR). Since stepwise multiple regression indicated that only two independent variables, 'perceptions of assessment center', and 'number of years in extension' were significant predictors of OAR, the decision was made to run a oneway analysis of variance on these two
Table 40

Stepwise Regression of Independent Variables on Overall Assessment Rating (OAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step of Entry</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Overall $R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$ (Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of assessment center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Regression Equation

$Y = .38X_1 + .23X_2$

where: $Y = $ overall assessment rating

$X_1 =$ perceptions of assessment center

$X_2 =$ number of years in extension

Table 41

Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance for Overall Assessment Rating (OAR) by Major Area of Program Responsibility

<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>.1579</td>
<td>.0788</td>
<td>.1056</td>
<td>.8999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55.9578</td>
<td>.7461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56.1154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p > .05$
variables. Also, because major area of program responsibility (4-H and Youth, and Home Economics) entered the prediction model as significant predictors of 'written communications' and 'planning and organizing', the decision was made to further test to see if there were significant differences in OAR due to major program area of responsibility.

**Analysis of Differences in Mean OAR Scores by Major Area of Program Responsibility**

As can be seen from Table 41, county chairpersons with major area of program responsibility in home economics received a higher mean 'overall assessment rating' score ($\bar{X}=2.89$) than county chairpersons with major area of responsibility in agriculture ($\bar{X}=2.79$), and 4-H and Youth ($\bar{X}=2.77$). A oneway analysis of variance performed on the means showed that there was no significant difference between the means of the three groups. The administration group was dropped out of the ANOVA analysis because there were only two people in that group.

**Analysis of Differences in Mean OAR Scores by Number of Years in Extension**

On 'number of years in extension', the findings indicated that county chairpersons who had been with the extension organization for more than 20 years received higher mean 'overall assessment rating' score ($\bar{X}=2.88$) than county chairpersons who had been with extension for 10 to 20 years ($\bar{X}=2.85$), and less than 10 years ($\bar{X}=2.64$). Oneway analysis of variance performed on the means indicated that there was no significant difference between the means of the three groups. The results from this data were presented in Table 42.
Table 42
Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance for Overall Assessment Rating (OAR) by Number of Years of Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 &lt; 10 (n=14)</th>
<th>Group 2 10-20 (n=41)</th>
<th>Group 3 &gt; 20 (n=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean OAR Score</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.88</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>.5738</td>
<td>.2869</td>
<td>.3877</td>
<td>.6799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56.9762</td>
<td>.7400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79a</td>
<td>57.5500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p > .05
Analysis of Differences in Mean OAR Scores by Perceptions of Assessment Center

With regard to 'perceptions of assessment center', the results indicated that there was significant difference between the means of the two groups (low and high) on overall assessment rating. A t-test of significance was used to test for significant differences between the two means. The results were summarized in Table 43.
Table 43
Means, Standard Deviations, and t-test for Overall Assessment Rating (OAR) by Perceptions of Assessment Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Perception</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Perception</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among selected personal and job-related variables of county chairpersons, and assessment center performance. Furthermore, the study sought to determine the best predictors of assessment center performance from the independent variables of the study.

The specific objectives established to direct this study were:

1. To describe assessees in terms of the following characteristics: age, gender, major area of graduate study, number of years in the Cooperative Extension Service, and number of previous jobs.

2. To describe assessees on the following job-related variables: job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, perceptions of assessment center, extension program area of major responsibility, and overall assessment rating.

3. To describe the relationship between the independent variables (age, gender, extension program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years in the cooperative extension service, number of previous jobs, job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, and perceptions of assessment center), and the dependent variable (overall assessment rating).
4. To describe the inter-relationships among the variables of the study.

5. To determine the best predictors of each of the sixteen dimensions of the assessment center.

6. To determine the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (overall assessment rating) explained by each of the independent variables.

7. To determine the best predictors of the dependent variable, 'overall assessment rating'.

8. To determine if assessee differences on the independent variables significantly affected their performance on the assessment center.

Methodology

Population

The population for this study was the extension county chairpersons in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (N=88). A census was conducted of all county chairpersons who participated as asessees (N=83) in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service assessment center. All extension county chairpersons were expected to attend the assessment center unless they were near retirement. Five people did not attend the assessment center for this reason. Assessees were randomly assigned to groups during the assessment center.

Research Design

The research design was descriptive-correlational in nature, allowing the researcher to describe the asessees on the variables of the
study and also to determine the nature and strength of relationships between variables.

Instrumentation

A five-part questionnaire was utilized in the collection of data in this study.

Part one of the questionnaire consisted of 14 items designed to measure job satisfaction on a five-point, Likert-type scale. This part of the instrument was a modified version of the Brayfield-Rothe "Job Satisfaction Index" as modified by Warner (1973), and previously used with Extension agents in Ohio by Kitrell (1980) and Igodan (1984).

Part two of the questionnaire included 10 items designed to measure leader initiating structure on a five-point, Likert-type scale. The third part of the questionnaire measured role clarity. This independent variable was measured using an index of role clarity developed by McEnrue (1984). Responses were made on a 7-point, Likert-type scale that ranged from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. Part four of the questionnaire measured perceptions of asessees of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center. Ten items comprised this scale and responses were made on a 5-point, Likert-type scale.

Part five of the questionnaire consisted of six sections collecting demographic information on age, gender, extension program area of major responsibility, major area of graduate study, number of years in extension, and number of professional full-time job positions held before joining the Extension Service. Data on the performance of asessees on the assessment center was obtained unobtrusively from personnel files at
the State Cooperative Extension office with permission for the Leader, Personnel Development.

Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

Face validity of the instrument was determined by the researcher with help from faculty and graduate students. Although parts of the instrument had been previously content-validated and used, copies of the entire research questionnaire were submitted to a panel of four experts in the subject area of extension personnel development and evaluation to be evaluated for content validity. The panel of experts determined that the subscale contents had been adequately sampled.

Reliability coefficients were computed for the following independent variables subscales: 'job satisfaction', 'initiating structure', 'role clarity', and 'perceptions of the assessment center'. 30-day test-retest reliabilities were also established for the 'initiating structure', and 'perceptions of assessment center' subscales. Reliability coefficients were also reported for 'job satisfaction' and 'role clarity' from previous research. The subscale reliabilities were in the .7 to .8 range. Thus all items were determined to be contributing to the measurement of the appropriate domain.

The content validity of the videotape instrument was based on the job analysis from which the interviews arose. As reported by Jaffee and Sefcik (1980), assessment centers developed on the basis of a job analysis were inherently content valid.
Data Collection

The data for this study were collected between April and June 1986. Three methods; 1) mail questionnaires, 2) videotapes, and 3) examination of personnel records; were used for data collection. Ninety six percent of the mail questionnaires were received after two mailings and double-dipping of non-respondents. All 15 assessors returned the assessor's rating sheets. Personnel records were examined for assessment center performance data on the 16 assessment dimensions, and on the overall assessment rating (OAR). Early and late respondents were compared using t-tests of significance. Reliability and test-retest reliability analyses were done on independent variable subscales.

Data Analysis

The statistical package SPSSX.21 available at the Instruction and Research Computer Center (IRCC), The Ohio State University was utilized for managing, analyzing and displaying the data in this study. Descriptive statistics, involving measures of central tendency, frequencies and percentage distributions were computed to describe assessees. The data was tested for linearity. Correlational and regression techniques were used to determine the nature and strength of relationships between the variables of the study. These techniques included Pearson correlation coefficients and step-wise multiple regression. Oneway analysis of variance and t-tests of significance were used to compare groups on selected variables. Factor analysis was conducted on assessment center performance data to see if the conceptually separate assessment center domains were empirically independent.
Summary and Implications of Findings

A summary of the results of this study, conclusions, and related implications are presented in the following section.

Objective One:

Describe assesses in terms of: age, gender, major area of graduate study, and number of years in the Cooperative extension Service, and number of previous jobs.

Age

Of the 80 county chairpersons, two were between the age group 21 to 30 years, 34 were between the ages of 31 and 40 years. Twenty-two were within the age range 41-50 years old, while another 22 were older than 51 years. The average age was 44 years.

Gender

Fifty-nine of the county chairpersons were male, and 21 were female establishing an almost three to one male to female ratio.

Major Area of Graduate Study

The majority of the county chairpersons (n=50) majored in agricultural education or home economics education for their Masters degree. Eighteen majored in other areas in agriculture such as animal science while nine indicated that they majored in other areas such as textiles and clothing.

Number of Years in Extension

Fifty-five county chairpersons indicated they had served 20 years or less in extension. Thirteen had been extension employees for 21-25 years
whereas 12 had served for more than 26 years. The average number of years served in Extension was 17 years.

**Number of Previous Jobs**

The average number of previous jobs held was one. Thirty of the county chairpersons did not hold any full-time professional jobs before joining Extension. Twenty-six held one job while 20 had held two previous jobs before joining Extension. Only four people had worked at three or more previous jobs.

**Objective Two:**

Description of assesses on job satisfaction, initiating structure, role clarity, perceptions of assessment center, extension program area of major responsibility, and overall assessment rating.

**Job Satisfaction**

Ninety-five percent of the respondents indicated they "agreed" to "strongly agreed" with the items measuring the domain of job satisfaction. This was consistent with findings made by Igodan (1984) who reported a 90 percent "agreed" to "strongly agreed" job satisfaction response for extension agents in the state of Ohio. The mean score for job satisfaction was 4.30. The maximum obtainable score was 5. The results indicated a high level of job satisfaction among county chairpersons.

**Initiating Structure**

On initiating structure, county chairpersons indicated average to high structure. Ninety-seven percent of them had this opinion. The mean
score of 3.44 for the initiating structure subscale was in the average range. The two items rated lowest and highest respectively were 'stress being ahead of competing work groups' and 'emphasize meeting of deadlines'. The results indicated high definition and structuring of roles among county chairpersons.

**Role Clarity**

In response to items on role clarity, most county chairpersons (75%) indicated 'slight agreement to 'agreement'. This trend was interpreted by the researcher as an indication that county chairpersons did not perceive much ambiguity in their roles. The role clarity item ranked highest by respondents was, "I know what my responsibilities are", whereas the item ranked lowest was, "I am not sure how others evaluate my performance as a county chairperson". The overall mean score for this subscale was 5.21 with a standard deviation of 0.96. McEnrue (1984) reported a mean and standard deviation of 4.67 and 1.29 respectively for lower level managers in a public utility organization.

**Perceptions of Assessment Center**

County chairpersons generally reported a positive attitude towards the assessment center. Seventy-three percent indicated they 'agreed' or strongly agreed' with items measuring this domain, while 26 percent were undecided in their responses. This trend of responses was interpreted as a high positive attitude towards the assessment center. The two items rated highest and lowest, respectively, were "the assessment center staff were cooperative during the entire session", and "I had adequate informa-
tion to understand what the assessment center was all about before I agreed to attend it".

Program Area of Major Responsibility

More than half of the county chairpersons (59%) indicated they had major program responsibility area in Agriculture. Twenty-three percent had major program responsibility in Home Economics. Sixteen percent of the respondents had 4-H and Youth as their major program responsibility area while three percent indicated administration as their major area.

Overall Assessment Rating

The assessors rated 24 percent of assessees as "expected to exceed normal management expectations". Forty percent were rated as "should meet normal management expectations". Thirty-one percent were considered to be able to meet normal management expectations with development, whereas meeting management expectations was questionable for five percent of the county chairpersons. This distribution was interpreted to mean that the majority of county chairpersons were considered competent and expected to meet normal management expectations without further development.

Objective Three:

To describe the relationships between the independent variables of the study and the dependent variable (overall assessment rating).

Negligible relationships were found between the dependent variable (overall assessment rating, OAR) and the following independent variables: job satisfaction, gender, major area of responsibility (agriculture, home
economics and 4-H and Youth). The negligible relationship between 'gender' and 'OAR' was consistent with earlier findings made by Ritchie and Moses (1983), who reported that differences in management potential were far more attributable to individual rather than sex differences.

The negligible relationship between 'OAR' and 'job satisfaction' was not totally unexpected since previous researchers had addressed the elusive covariation of satisfaction and performance (Herzberg et al. 1957, Schwab and Cummings, 1970, Brayfield and Crockett, 1955).

Low positive associations were found between 'OAR' and the following independent variables: role clarity, initiating structure, age, major area (administration), number of years in extension, and number of previous jobs. The positive relationship between 'role clarity' and 'OAR' indicated that candidates with clearer understanding of their job roles performed higher on the assessment center as reflected by their overall assessment ratings. This relationship was consistent with an earlier relationship reported by McEnrue (1984). Using data from 340 lower level managers, McEnrue reported a low clarity-performance association of .26.

The relationship between 'OAR' and 'number of years in extension' suggested that county chairpersons who had served longer in extension received higher overall assessment rating scores. This was attributed to longer experience on the job and was consistent with some reported findings in literature, e.g., Giniger, Dispenzieri, and Eisenberg (1983) demonstrated that experience rather than age determined performance. This finding, however, contradicted findings by Fiedler (1970) who did
not find support for the hypothesis that the number of years of supervisory experience would correlate positively with leadership performance.

A moderate positive association was found between 'perceptions of assessment center' and 'overall assessment rating'. This was interpreted to mean that favorableness of attitude toward the assessment center enhanced a candidate's performance on the assessment exercises. The reason for this may be attributed to possible enthusiasm which accompanied positive attitude and encouraged or motivated candidates to perform to the best of their ability.

Objective Four:

To describe the inter-relationships among the variables of the study.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction had significant relationships with 'role clarity', 'initiating structure', and 'number of previous jobs'. These relationships were moderate and positive between job satisfaction and role clarity and between job satisfaction and initiating structure. However, the relationship was low and positive for job satisfaction and number of previous jobs held. The above findings indicated that county chairpersons who were high on role clarity, and initiating structure were also more satisfied on the job. This was consistent with role theory which hypothesized that role ambiguity (lack of role clarity) was negatively related to job satisfaction. County chairpersons who had held more previous jobs before joining extension were more satisfied with their present job. This could be due to transferrable experience they brought
with them from previous jobs. Although positive correlations were found between job satisfaction and the following variables; age, gender, and number of years in extension, these associations were not significant.

**Role Clarity**

Role clarity was positively related to both age, and initiating structure. Thus, county chairpersons who were high on role clarity tended to be high on initiating structure. Also, older county chairpersons had less role ambiguity. This could be due to the fact that in the study the older county chairpersons were also the more experienced in terms of the number of years they had worked in extension. Since assessment center exercises were based on previous job analysis and elicited job-related responses, it was not surprising to find that role clarity was positively related to the number of years in extension.

The positive relationship between role clarity and initiating structure may be taken to mean that less role ambiguity favored the ease with which county-chairpersons were likely to define and structure their role and those of their subordinates toward the achievement of OCES goals.

**Perceptions of Assessment Center**

Older county chairpersons perceived the assessment center less favorably than their younger counterparts. Similarly, longer serving county chairpersons had a less favorable perception than those who had not served as long. The relationships between perceptions of assessment center and both age, and number of years in extension were, however, not significant. The tendency for more experienced county chairpersons to
view the OCES assessment center less favorably may be due to wrongful
perceptions of the assessment center as an open challenge to their
abilities.

Females county chairpersons were found to have a significantly more
favorable attitude toward the assessment center than did their male
counterparts. Also, county chairpersons with major area of responsi-
bility in agriculture perceived the assessment center more favorably than
did county chairpersons whose major area was not in agriculture.

Initiating Structure

When county chairpersons were high on job satisfaction and role
clarity, they tended to also be high on initiating structure. Thus with
increasing role clarity (decreasing role ambiguity), county chairpersons
increased on initiating structure and subsequently on job satisfaction.
This interpretation was consistent with role theory.

Age

Older county chairpersons had also worked longer with the extension
service and, therefore, experienced less ambiguity in understanding their
roles. Although performance on the assessment center increased with age,
the relationship between assessment center performance and age was not
significant. This finding was, however, worthy of note as it was incons-
sistent with the hypothesized view of the decremental theory of aging
(Botwinick, 1978; Welford, 1962). Male county chairpersons tended to be
older than their female counterparts.
Gender

There were significantly more male county chairpersons than there were females. There were, however, significantly more females in home economics than there were males. Male county chairpersons were found to have served significantly longer in extension than their female colleagues. This finding was consistent with the suggestion by Larwood and Wood (1977) that until recently women were under-represented in managerial jobs.

Number of Years in Extension

Role clarity and age were both found to increase as the number of years county chairpersons had been in extension increased. Thus, older extension county chairpersons had worked longer with the organization and accumulated experience which reduced role ambiguity, or those persons who had experienced ambiguity had previously resigned.

Number of Previous Jobs

This variable showed significant correlation with only job satisfaction. The positive relationship indicated that job satisfaction increased as the number of jobs held prior to joining extension increased. This may be attributed to the accumulation of a wealth of job-related experiences over different jobs, over time, which made it easier for county chairpersons to handle their new job roles.

Objective 5:

To determine the best predictors of each of the sixteen assessment center dimensions from the independent variables of the study.
Age and initiating structure were not found to be significant predictors of any of the sixteen dimensions of the assessment center. The variable 'perceptions of the assessment center' was the only significant predictor of performance on the following dimensions: 'oral communication', 'development of coworkers', 'behavioral flexibility', 'objectivity', 'perception', 'sensitivity', 'evaluation and management control'. 'Written communication' was best predicted by 'major area (4-H and Youth)', 'gender', and 'job satisfaction'. 'Leadership' was best predicted by 'perceptions of assessment center' and 'number of years in extension' while 'initiative' was best predicted by 'role clarity' and 'number of previous jobs'. The independent variables 'number of years in extension' and 'major area (home economics)', emerged in the optimal stepwise regression model as the only significant predictors of 'planning and organizing', whereas 'number of years in extension' and 'perceptions of assessment center' were the significant predictors of 'organizational sensitivity'. 'Assertiveness' was best predicted by 'number of previous jobs' and 'number of years in extension'.

Objective 6:

To determine the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by each of the independent variables of the study.

Twelve percent of the variance in the overall assessment rating (OAR) was explained by county chairpersons perceptions of the assessment center. This was the most variance explained in the dependent variable by a single independent variable. Age, role clarity and number of jobs each accounted for two percent of the variance in OAR while job satisfac-
tion and gender accounted for negligible variance in the dependent measure.

Objective 7:

To determine the best predictors of overall assessment rating (the dependent variable) from the independent variables of the study.

Two independent variables were determined to be significant predictors of the dependent variable, OAR. These predictors were perceptions of assessment center, which accounted for 11 percent of the variance in OAR, and number of years in extension which explained an additional 5%. Together the two independent variables explained 16 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, OAR. The remaining independent variables of the study were not significant predictors of OAR. For age and gender these findings were consistent with several other reported research findings e.g., Hall (1976), and Parker (1980) found no relationship of age and OAR in the different populations they studied. Moses and Boehm (1975), and Ritchie and Moses (1983) reported equal assessment center validities for men and women.

Objective 8:

To determine if assessee differences on the independent variables significantly affected their performance on the dependent variable, OAR.

No significant differences in performance (OAR) was found between county chairpersons on the basis of their major area of program responsibility. Also, there was no significant differences in performance between groups constituted on the basis of the length of time they had
served in the extension service. Significant difference on OAR, however, existed between the two groups constituted on the basis of their perceptions of the assessment center. The absence of a significant relationship between groups on the basis of the number of years they had served in extension was not consistent with the proposition that more experience would be reflected in better performance (Arvey and McGowen, 1980).

CONCLUSIONS

1. The majority of county chairpersons in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) were satisfied with their jobs.

2. The results indicated high definition and structuring of roles among county chairpersons towards the attainment of OCES goals.

3. In general, county chairpersons in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service did not perceive much ambiguity (lack of role clarity) in their roles as chairpersons.

4. Overall perceptions of the OCES assessment center were very favorable among county chairpersons.

5. The majority of county chairpersons were considered competent and expected to meet normal management expectations without further development.

6. County chairpersons perceptions of the assessment center was significantly related to their performance on the assessment center.

7. Job satisfaction, gender, and major area of program responsibility, were not related to assessment center performance.

8. Age, role clarity, initiating structure, number of years in extension, and number of previous jobs before joining extension, had low associations with assessment center performance.
9. As clarity of role increased among county chairpersons, the likelihood to define and structure their role, and their job satisfaction increased.

10. Older extension county chairpersons experienced less role ambiguity (had higher role clarity) than their younger counterparts.

11. Female county chairpersons perceived the OCES assessment center more favorably than male county chairpersons.

12. There were significantly more male county chairpersons in the OCES than females.

13. The majority of county chairpersons agreed that the OCES assessment center had face validity.

14. Perceptions of the assessment center, and number of years in extension were the best predictors of county chairpersons performance on the assessment center.

15. The independent variable perceptions of assessment center explained the most variance in most of the assessment center dimensions.

16. There were no significant differences in assessment center performance among county chairpersons irrespective of their major area of program responsibility.

17. Male and female county chairpersons did not perform significantly different on the OCES assessment center.

18. County chairpersons who had a high favorable perception of the assessment center performed significantly higher (as reflected by their overall assessment rating scores), than their counterparts who perceived the assessment center less favorably.
19. Essentially, there were two highly correlated factors underlying the assessment center dimensions. One factor denoted an executive function while the other represented planning and interpersonal relations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made based on the findings from this study and ideas and suggestions arising out of this study.

1. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service needs to provide more information to assesses prior to their participation in the assessment center. This was recommended because, despite their positive attitude towards the assessment center, the two items ranked lowest on their perceptions of the assessment center indicated that they would want more prior information before they attend the assessment center.

2. The OCES should prepare a special brochure on the OCES assessment center using information derived from this and other studies for dissemination to all county chairpersons and agents as part of the general information (education) effort.

3. This study should be replicated in the Cooperative Extension Service in other states having assessment centers (e.g., Alabama) to evaluate the extent to which results would be similar.

4. Further research involving a replication of this study but using different independent variables (e.g. motivation, locus of control, evaluation apprehension, burnout, self-perceived ability, and supervisor-perceived ability) may be conducted to see how well they predict assessment center performance.
5. Assessment center feedback information should be evaluated to establish the extent to which former assesses perceive the benefits of the assessment center.

6. Research should be conducted to establish the training value of serving as an assessor. This should be part of a total assessor evaluation effort of assessors.

7. Because of the high positive inter-correlations among assessment dimensions, and also between the two underlying factors from factor analysis, further recommendation is made to examine the dimensions to possibly reduce the number of dimensions represented on the assessment center. This will reduce the pressure on assessors as they try to observe too many dimensions across the exercises. This recommendation, if carried out, should make for more valid ratings, reduced cost as a result of reduced duration of assessment centers, and reduced redundancy of dimensions.

8. Because of the established face and content validity and high reliability of the OCES assessment center, a recommendation is made that the assessment center be retained and efforts made to extend it to all extension agents in the state of Ohio.

9. Finally, cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken to estimate the extent to which the assessment center is cost effective.
APPENDIX A

PANEL OF EXPERTS WHO REVIEWED INSTRUMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. J. Cunningham</td>
<td>Professor, Associate Director, Coop Extension State. Professor Agricultural Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. V. Tilburg</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Leader, Evaluation, The Ohio Coop. Extension State.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 21, 1986

Dear Extension County Chairperson:

We would like to invite you to participate in a study we are conducting. The purpose of this study is to gain greater insight into some selected factors and their relationship with overall performance of Extension County Chairpersons in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center.

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center has been developed to assist in the analysis of current managerial abilities and future training needs of employees in supervisory positions. To achieve its purpose as a valid and reliable diagnostic procedure, the Assessment Center must be evaluated with respect to participants' responses. This is important in view of the need to thoroughly understand personnel and to accurately diagnose each individual's unique needs and capabilities.

Your response to this questionnaire is critical to the successful completion of the study. All information requested in the questionnaire will be kept in strict confidence. The code number, plainly displayed at the right-hand corner of the questionnaire, is to assist us in identifying those questionnaires that have not been returned so as to initiate follow-up with specific individuals without having to recontact all those involved in the study.

Please respond to every item on the questionnaire. We thank you in advance for your prompt and honest responses. If you have any questions or concerns as you complete the questionnaire, please call Joe Kwarteng at (614) 422-6181 (leave a message if you need to and your call will be returned). Please return the completed questionnaire to Dr. Keith L. Smith, Leader, Personnel Development, at the above address, by April 30th, 1986.

Thank you again for your valuable time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Joseph Kwarteng
Graduate Student

Keith L. Smith
Leader, Personnel Development
April 21, 1986

Dear Assessor:

We would like to invite you to participate in a study we are conducting. This study is part of continuing efforts to improve the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Assessment Center. This Assessment Center has been developed to assist in the analysis of current managerial abilities and future training needs of employees in supervisory positions. To achieve its purpose as a valid and reliable diagnostic procedure, the Assessment Center must be evaluated with respect to participants' responses (both assessors and assesses). This is important in view of the need to thoroughly understand personnel and to accurately diagnose each individual's unique needs and capabilities.

You will recall that you participated as an assessor in our first Assessment Center. That Assessment Center is the focus of our present study and once again we are calling on you to help us. Your response to this videotape instrument is very critical to the successful completion of the study. All information requested on the rating booklet will be kept in strict confidence. The code number, plainly displayed at the right-hand corner of the rating booklet, is to assist us in identifying those rating booklets that have not been returned so as to initiate follow-up with specific individuals without having to recontact all those involved in the study.

Please read the instructions in the rating booklet before viewing the tape. We certainly thank you in advance for your prompt and honest responses. If you have any questions or concerns as you view the videotape and complete the rating booklets, please call Joe Kwarteng at (614) 422-6131 (leave a message if you need to and your call will be returned). Please return the videotape and the completed rating booklet to Dr. Keith L. Smith, Leader, Personnel Development, at the address above by April 30th, 1986.

Thank you again for your valuable time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Joseph Kwarteng
Graduate Student

Keith L. Smith
Leader, Personnel Development
May 5, 1986

Dear Extension County Chairperson:

This is our second questionnaire to you. Our records indicate that the first questionnaire we mailed to you was not filled out and returned to us. This is not unusual because of the busy schedule of county chairs and also due to probable loss in the mail.

As indicated in our first letter to you, this study is part of an ongoing effort to evaluate and improve the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service assessment center. The important role of participants (county chairs) in this effort cannot be overemphasized. The need to thoroughly understand personnel and be able to accurately interpret the results of the study makes it necessary to have your responses to the items on this questionnaire.

Please let us assure you once again that all information requested in the questionnaire will be kept in strict confidence. The code number, plainly displayed at the right-hand corner of the questionnaire, is to assist us in identifying those questionnaires that have not been returned so as to initiate follow-up with specific individuals without having to recontact all those involved in the study.

Please respond to every item on the questionnaire. We thank you in advance for your prompt and honest responses. If you have any questions or concerns as you complete the questionnaire, please call Joe Kwarteng at (614)422-6181 (leave a message if you need to and your call will be returned). Please return the completed questionnaire to Dr. Keith L. Smith, Leader, Personnel Development, at the above address by May 15th, 1986.

Thank you again for your valuable time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Joseph Kwarteng
Graduate Student

Keith L. Smith
Leader, Personnel Development
June 23, 1986

Dear Extension County Chairperson:

Thank you for your prompt attention to our first questionnaire. This short follow-up questionnaire (which will require only about five minutes of your time) is part of our continuing effort to ensure the reliability of all instruments used in our studies.

You are once again assured that all responses will be accorded the strictest confidence. Please return the filled-out questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation with this study.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Smith
Leader, Personnel Development

Joseph Kwarteng
Graduate Student

Enclosures
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT
CORRELATES OF COUNTY CHAIRPERSON PERFORMANCE ON THE OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE ASSESSMENT CENTER
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please respond to this questionnaire in terms of your most sincere opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. The response categories differ from page to page. Please read the instructions at the top of each page carefully before responding to the questionnaire items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.  
7. I definitely dislike my work.  
8. I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.  
9. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.  
10. Each day of work seems like it will never end.  
11. I like my job better than most Extension Agents do.  
12. My job is pretty uninteresting.  
13. I find real enjoyment in my work.  
14. I am disappointed that I ever took this job.
PART II - INITIATING STRUCTURE

This section of the questionnaire describes initiating structure. Each statement refers to your behavior. For each statement circle the response that most nearly represents the frequency with which you experience the situation described by each statement.

Please use the following rating scale to indicate your opinions:

- 1 = Always
- 2 = Often
- 3 = Occasionally
- 4 = Seldom
- 5 = Never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Criticize poor work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assign people in the work group to particular tasks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meet with the group at regularly scheduled times.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. See to it that people in the work group are working up to capacity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Try out your own new ideas in the work group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Encourage slow-working people in the work group to work harder.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING RATING SCALE TO INDICATE YOUR OPINIONS**

1 = Always  
2 = Often  
3 = Occasionally  
4 = Seldom  
5 = Never  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. Offer new approaches to problems. | 1 2 3 4 5  
| 8. Talk about how much should be done. | 1 2 3 4 5  
| 9. Stress being ahead of competing work groups. | 1 2 3 4 5  
| 10. Emphasize meeting of deadlines. | 1 2 3 4 5  

-
PART III - ROLE CLARITY

Some jobs are more clearly defined than others. Please circle the response following each statement that best describes your opinions about your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I know what my responsibilities are.

2. I pretty much know how my performance is judged compared to others at the same level in the organization.

3. It is unclear what I'm responsible for as a county chairperson.

4. I am not sure how others evaluate my performance as a county chairperson.

5. I know exactly what is expected of me.
PART IV - PERCEPTIONS OF ASSESSMENT CENTER

The following section describes your perceptions of the assessment center. For each of the statements below indicate your level of agreement by circling the response that corresponds most to your opinions.

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

1. I had adequate information to understand what the assessment center was all about before I agreed to attend it.
2. The assessment center program schedule was executed efficiently.
3. Adequate materials were on hand to carry out the program.
4. The location (Agricultural Administration Building) did not impair my performance in the program.
5. I wanted very much to attend the assessment center.

Level of Agreement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

-6-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I would recommend to a good friend at about the same level in the organization that he or she attend an assessment center program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Overall, the assessment center measures important qualities required of Extension county chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The assessment center staff were cooperative during the entire session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The setting (rooms) for the assessment sessions were appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Adequate instructions were provided at each session to aid in understanding of information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART V - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

The information requested in this part of the study is for use in the interpretation of the results of the study.

1. Please indicate your age at your last birthday.


YEARS

2. Your gender: (Please circle only one)
   a. MALE
   b. FEMALE

3. In which Extension program area is your major responsibility? (Please circle only one)
   a. AGRICULTURE
   b. HOME ECONOMICS
   c. 4-H AND YOUTH PROGRAMS
   d. COMMUNITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
   e. ADMINISTRATION
4. What was your undergraduate or graduate major area of study? Please circle one response for each degree that applies to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major Field of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S./B.A.</td>
<td>a. Agricultural Education or Home Economics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Other area in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S./M.A.</td>
<td>a. Agricultural Education or Home Economics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Other area in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D.</td>
<td>a. Agricultural Education or Home Economics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Other area in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What is the number of years you have been an employee of the Cooperative Extension Service?

_____ YEARS

6. How many professional full-time job positions did you hold before joining the Cooperative Extension Service:

_____ FULL-TIME JOB POSITIONS

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED, SELF-ADDRESS ENVELOPE PROVIDED
PLEASE WRITE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW.

COMMENTS:

THANK YOU!
APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP 30-DAY TEST RETEST INSTRUMENT
ASSESSMENT CENTER:

FOLLOW-UP #2
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire is a follow-up of the first one. Please respond to the items in terms of your most sincere opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. The response categories differ from page to page. Please read the instructions at the top of each page carefully before responding to the questionnaire items.
PART I - INITIATING STRUCTURE

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING RATING SCALE TO INDICATE YOUR OPINIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. Criticize poor work.             | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Assign people in the work group to particular tasks. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Meet with the group at regularly scheduled times. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. See to it that people in the work group are working up to capacity. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Try out your own new ideas in the work group. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Encourage slow-working people in the work group to work harder. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Offer new approaches to problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. Talk about how much should be done. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. Stress being ahead of competing work groups. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. Emphasize meeting of deadlines. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
PART II - PERCEPTIONS OF ASSESSMENT CENTER

The following section describes your perceptions of the assessment center. For each of the statements below indicate your level of agreement by circling the response that corresponds most to your opinions.

SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I had adequate information to understand what the assessment center was all about before I agreed to attend it.
   SA A U D SD

2. The assessment center program schedule was executed efficiently.
   SA A U D SD

3. Adequate materials were on hand to carry out the program.
   SA A U D SD

4. The location (Agricultural Administration Building) did not impair my performance in the program.
   SA A U D SD

5. I wanted very much to attend the assessment center.
   SA A U D SD
Level of Agreement

6. I would recommend to a good friend at about the same level in the organization that he or she attend an assessment center program.

7. Overall, the assessment center measures important qualities required of Extension county chairs.

8. The assessment center staff were cooperative during the entire session.

9. The setting (rooms) for the assessment sessions were appropriate.

10. Adequate instructions were provided at each session to aid in understanding of information.
PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED, SELF-ADDRESS ENVELOPE PROVIDED

THANK YOU!
APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON THE SIXTEEN

ASSESSMENT CENTER DIMENSIONS
### TABLE 44

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'ORAL COMMUNICATIONS'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.79  SD = .81  Median = 4.00  Range = 3.00

### TABLE 45

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.65  SD = .78  Median = 4.00  Range = 3.00

Mode = 4.00
### TABLE 46
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'LEADERSHIP'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.41  SD = .91  Median = 3.00  Range = 4.00  Mode = 3.00

### TABLE 47
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'INITIATIVE'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.40  SD = .89  Median = 3.00  Range = 4.00  Mode = 3.00
### TABLE 48

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'PLANNING AND ORGANIZING'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.68  
SD = .85

Median = 4.00  
Range = 3.00

Mode = 4.00

### TABLE 49

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'DECISION MAKING/JUDGEMENT'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.49  
SD = .89

Median = 4.00  
Range = 4.00

Mode = 4.00
### TABLE 50
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'DEVELOPMENT OF COWORKERS'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.49  
SD = .96  
Median = 4.00  
Mode = 4.00

### TABLE 51
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'BEHAVIORAL FLEXIBILITY'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.34  
SD = .83  
Median = 3.00  
Mode = 3.00
### TABLE 52
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'ORGANIZATIONAL SENSITIVITY'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean  = 3.80  
Median = 4.00  
SD  = .74  
Range = 3.00

### TABLE 53
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'ASSERTIVENESS'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean  = 3.31  
Median = 3.00  
SD  = 1.06  
Range = 4.00
### TABLE 54

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'OBJECTIVITY'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 80 100.0

- **Mean** = 3.54
- **SD** = .90
- **Median** = 4.00
- **Range** = 4.00
- **Mode** = 4.00

### TABLE 55

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'PERCEPTION'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 80 100.0

- **Mean** = 3.45
- **SD** = .87
- **Median** = 3.50
- **Range** = 3.00
- **Mode** = 4.00
### TABLE 56
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'SENSITIVITY'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.54  
Median = 4.00  
Mode = 4.00  
SD = .94  
Range = 4.00

### TABLE 56
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'MANAGEMENT CONTROL'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.59  
Median = 4.00  
Mode = 4.00  
SD = .72  
Range = 3.00
### TABLE 58

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE 
ON 'COLLABORATIVENESS'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.55
SD = .95
Median = 4.00
Mode = 4.00

### TABLE 59

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ASSESSEES PERFORMANCE ON 'EVALUATION'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.44
SD = .78
Median = 3.00
Mode = 3.00

Range = 3.00
APPENDIX F

Rank Order of Questionnaire Items by Subscales
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN (X)</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely dislike my work.*</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often bored with my work.*</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am disappointed that I ever took this job.*</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is pretty uninteresting.*</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.*</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my work.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each day of work seems like it will never end.*</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems that my friends are more interested in their job than I am.*</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my work rather unpleasant.*</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fairly well satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my job better than most extension agents do.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*items that were reversed during scoring.
TABLE 61

RANK ORDER OF ITEMS FOR 'INITIATING STRUCTURE' AS SCORED BY ASSESSEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN  ( (X) )</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet with the group at regularly scheduled times.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize meeting of deadlines.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See to it that people in the workgroup are working up to capacity.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer new approaches to problems</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign people in the workgroup to particular tasks</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try out your own ideas in the work group.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about how much should be done.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage slow-working people in the work group to work harder.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress being ahead of competing work groups.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize poor work.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 62

RANK ORDER OF ITEMS FOR 'ROLE CLARITY' AS SCORED BY ASSESSEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN (X)</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know what my responsibilities are.</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unclear what I'm responsible for as a county chairperson.*</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know exactly what is expected of me.</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pretty much know how my performance is judged compared to others at the same level in the organization.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure how others evaluate my performance as a county chairperson.*</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*items that were reversed during scoring.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN (X)</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessment center staff were cooperative during the entire session.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assessment program schedule was executed efficiently.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate materials were on hand to carry out the program.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The location (Agricultural Administration Building) did not impair my performance in the program.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The setting (rooms) for the assessment sessions were appropriate.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend to a good friend at about the same level in the organization that he or she attend an assessment center program.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate instructions were provided at each session to aid in understanding of information.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the assessment center measures important qualities required of Extension County chairs.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted very much to attend the assessment center.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had adequate information to understand what the assessment center was all about before I agreed to attend it.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF REFERENCES


