INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.
Perspectives on issues programming in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service

Conklin, Nikki Lynn Schafer, Ph.D.

The Ohio State University, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Conklin, Nikki Lynn Schafer. All rights reserved.
PERSPECTIVES ON ISSUES PROGRAMMING
IN THE
OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Dissertation
Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of
The Ohio State University

By
Nikki Lynn Schafer Conklin, B.S., M.S.

The Ohio State University
1990

Dissertation Committee:
J.E. Gritzmacher, Adviser
R.M. Conone
W. Moore, Jr.
K.L. Smith

[Signature]
Adviser
College of Human Ecology
To Bill, Eric, and Sarah
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation goes to Dr. Joan Gritzmaccher for her encouragement and guidance throughout my graduate program. Thanks go to the members of my committee for challenging my thinking: Dr. Ruth Conone, Dr. William Moore, Jr., and Dr. Keith L. Smith. Special appreciation is also extended to Dr. Clarance Cunningham for his professional guidance.

The technical assistance of the following individuals is gratefully acknowledged:

Sandy Krulikoski-Walden
Betty Watkins
Drudy Yoakam
Marie Bouic
Joe Damico
Dr. Thomas Archer
Jeffrey Layman
Christy Fisher-Leeds

To my husband, thank you for showing your love and support by assuming a double load at home. To my children, Eric and Sarah, my sincere hope that you will be inspired to value lifelong learning rather than remembering the times your mother was preoccupied with graduate studies.
VITA

August 18, 1961  ................................... Born - Ashland, Ohio
1973 .............................................................. BS, The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
1977................................................................... MS, The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
1979-Present . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Extension Faculty, Ohio Cooperative
Extension Service, The Ohio State
University

Field of Study

Major Field:       Human Ecology

Major Area of Emphasis: Home Economics Education

Secondary Emphasis: Educational Administration
Department of Educational Policy and Leadership
College of Education
The Ohio State University
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** ................................................................. iii  
**VITA** ......................................................................................... iv  
**LIST OF TABLES** ................................................................. vi  
**LIST OF FIGURES** ................................................................. ix  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION ......................................................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .................................. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>METHOD ................................................................. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .......................................... 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDICES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>......................................................... 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>......................................................... 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>......................................................... 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>......................................................... 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>......................................................... 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>......................................................... 165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Areas of Issues Program Development Computed Using Pilot Data</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Date Survey Returned</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attitude Toward Issue Programming and Week Survey Returned</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Importance of Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Knowledge About Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Areas of Issues Program Development Included on the Survey Instrument</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gender of Respondents</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gender and Program Area Assignment</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Professional Position of Respondents</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>County Chair Appointment and Program Area Assignment</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Years Tenure with the Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prior Educational Employment in Years</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Major Area of Highest Degree Attained by Extension Faculty</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mean Scores for Faculty Perception of Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Attitude Toward Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Attitude and Years Tenure</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Years Tenure in OCES .............................................. 89
20 Attitude and Program Area Assignment .............................. 91
21 Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Program Area Assignment ......................................... 93
22 Attitude and Amount of Training About Issues Programming . 94
23 Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Amount of Training .................................................. 96
24 Attitude and Prior Employment in an Educational Field ...... 97
25 Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Prior Employment in an Educational Field . 98
26 Attitude and Professional Role ............................................. 99
27 Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Professional Role ............................ 101
28 Attitude and Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained .. 103
29 Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement and Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained ................... 106
30 Regression of Attitude Toward Issues Programming with Selected Characteristic Variables (Stepwise Entry) ............. 107
31 Regression of Knowledge of Issues Programming on Selected Characteristic Variables (Stepwise Entry) ................ 108
32 Regression of Ability to Implement Issues Programming on Selected Characteristic Variables (Stepwise Entry) ... 109
33 Regression of Importance of Issues Programming on Selected Characteristic Variables ................................. 109
34 Knowledge and Ability to Implement Discrepancy Scores for Subscales .................................................. 110
35 Rank Order of Discrepancy Scores by Area of Knowledge and Ability to Implement Issues Programming .......... 111
36 High Priority Items for Training Based Upon Knowledge Discrepancy Scores .................................................. 112
37 High Priority Items for Training Based Upon Ability to
Implement Discrepancy Scores ......................................................... 113

38 Sources of Training About Issues Programming Used by Extension Faculty ................................................................. 114

39 Frequency of Use of Sources of Issue Training by Extension Faculty in Descending Order ................................................. 116

40 Additional Sources of Training About Issues Programming Listed by Extension Faculty ......................................................... 117
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Five step issues management model</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public policy process model by Yankeolvich, Skelly, and White (yr)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stages of concern about the innovation (Hall, Wallace, Dossett, 1973)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Extension Service (CES) was created in 1914 with the passage of the Smith Lever Act. Its mission within the land grant university system for 75 years has been to disseminate and to encourage the application of useful and practical knowledge in agriculture, home economics, and related subjects. The populations served by the Cooperative Extension Service, primarily agricultural, have been accessed through informal educational efforts, rather than as students enrolled in the land grant institution (Warner and Christenson, 1984). Hence, the name "extension" indicates a reaching forth into the community. CES has been an agency for individual and group change in local communities (USDA-NASULGC, 1983 cited in Warner and Christenson, 1984).

Much discussion has ensued about the future of the Cooperative Extension Service. Its unique structure and function within the university has allowed it flexibility for programming. The partnership of federal, state and local funding sources has also provided flexibility for states and counties to develop programs and to organize structure to meet the individual needs of clientele. However, the same social, economic, educational, and political forces are now indicating the necessity for change (ECOP Futures Task Force, 1987).
The focus of programs has been based on a blend of reaction to problems or concerns identified by local committees as well as those identified in academic departments, and to emerging priority needs. Programming has been delivered by discipline area or occasionally with multiple disciplines represented in a program, newsletter, or video. However, the disciplines have not worked together to fully integrate concepts in program development. Thus voids have existed in proactive, integrated educational programming directed at problem prevention.

Since 1985, the National Initiatives Coordinating Committee has worked to develop a framework for Extension programming across the U.S. which is proactive, relevant, and integrated not only among disciplines in agriculture and home economics, but in units which have not previously been involved in Extension programming. The organizational structure is determined from program needs. The underlying purpose in this redirection is to provide relevant research based education to improve people's lives. The effect upon the delivery or implementation of such a mission is that the problem or issue defines the audience, the method of implementation, and the configuration of personnel and resources to address the issue (Dalgaard, et al, 1988).

What are the benefits of an issues based approach to educational programming? Program development is based upon broad based community needs assessment. Community issues are identified as the framework in which educational programs are developed. The educational process assists individuals in examining multiple perspectives concerning an issues, by providing research-based information to assist the individual in forming his/her perspective, and in considering individual and/or group actions
that can impact the issue. The information sources to assist the individual could reflect the expertise available throughout the university, not just from narrowly defined departments or colleges. Issues change over time, thus educational programming changes focus to remain relevant. Relevancy motivates adult learner participation in programs (Dalgaard, et al, 1988). Citizens are empowered through education emphasizing public policy processes within the context of the issue (Ewing, 1980). Issues programming focuses upon being proactive rather than reactive, helping learners focus upon the future and assisting them to develop change adoption strategies (Kast, 1980).

Since the early 1970s, Extension has attempted to broaden its audience focus while maintaining the traditional focus as well. What transpired was an ever increasing need for dollars and personnel to function. The 80s have brought a limitation of funding, necessitating the decrease in numbers of professional personnel in response to public needs. The issue paradigm, which mandates a restructuring of priorities, personnel, and resources appears to be futuristic and appealing to funding sources.

Little information exists regarding the application of such a model to an organization like the Cooperative Extension Service. The concept of issues management has been documented as an emphasis in the corporate environment prior to discussion of application in the university setting (Ewing, 1981).

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service has made an organizational commitment to implementation of issues programming. Six areas of focus
that coordinate with the National Initiatives have been identified for the 1989 program year:

1. Family and Economic Well Being
2. Agricultural Profitability
3. Preparing Youth for Responsibility
4. Water Quality
5. Leadership
6. Rural Revitalization

Task forces composed of extension professionals have been established to identify program direction within the issues and to identify in-service training needed for personnel to implement issues programs.

In addition, in an external review of the OCES organizational structure, a recommendation was made that a thorough study and revision of present program development practices be made with increased emphasis upon the issues programming initiatives. Extension administrators were encouraged to expand interdisciplinary action within the university community (OCES Organizational Review, Preliminary Report, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

Organizational change is a complex process. The study of change is further complicated by the lack of a defined theoretical base in educational administration (Vroom, 1983) and the lack of research concerning Cooperative Extension Service administration and leadership behaviors (Boone, 1987).

Change does not occur in an organization because a decision maker announces it. Individual practitioners are adoption and change agents.
Individual behavior is a key indicator of the innovation adoption process (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, and Newlove, 1975).

The concept of organizational climate as an element of organizational culture facilitating change has been studied in higher education by numerous researchers (Clark, Lotto, and Astuto, in Griffiths, 1985; Wolfe, 1985; Goldhammer, Aldridge, Suttle, and Becker, 1967; Bedley, 1982; Heitsmith, 1984).

Organizational climate is composed of the collective perceptions of all who work in an organization. Characteristics of climate can be measured, climate influences individual behavior, climate can change, and climate can be negative, positive, or neutral (Bedley, 1982).

In studies of change within the school environment the primary change facilitators were identified as the principal and the curriculum coordinator. However, when measuring response to change and source of change, it was found that change initiated by teachers was perceived as positive more than twice as often as change initiated from other sources. The findings support the concept of participant involvement and ownership in the change process (Hall, cited in Murphy, 1986). Clark and Melloy (cited in Griffiths, 1985) consider the obstacle to change to be the resistance within individuals.

Numerous studies exist regarding Extension in-service training needs. Leagans has categorized over 300 dissertations at Cornell University from 1948-1970 concerning the topics of adult education and extension education. Researchers in a number of studies sought to document the training needs of Extension personnel regardless of position or job responsibility. Categories of training needs include: communication,
program planning and development, effective thinking, research and evaluation, human development, understanding social systems, Extension organization, technical knowledge, and educational process (Brahee, 1988; Brooks, 1976; Brooks, 1983; Fite, 1973; Hubbard, 1975; McCormick, 1955; Price, 1960; Ussery, 1964; Williams, 1984).

Since the issues paradigm is a new focus of the Extension System nationally, no research has been conducted concerning training needs. A systematic approach to managing the change to issues programming might include: provisions for skill development of staff, recognition by administrators that staff will have strong feelings which need to be expressed, support and leadership from the state to field faculty to change priorities, significant staff development support, and identification of sources of resistance within the organization (Dalgaard, Brazzel, et al., 1988).

**Purpose in the Study**

The purpose in this study was to describe the status of Extension faculty perceptions about issue programming and to determine the perceived ability of Extension faculty to implement issues programming. Secondly, relationships were explored among the variables of knowledge, attitude, importance, and ability to implement issue based programming. Lastly, the researcher will explore which variables best explain the differences among Extension field faculty, state specialists, and district directors concerning perceived training needs, attitudes, knowledge, importance, and ability to implement issues based programming.

**Objectives in the Study**

The primary objectives in this study were twofold: to investigate whether attitude, demographic characteristics, knowledge and importance,
or professional role and prior training explain Extension faculty perceived ability to implement issue programming; and to identify in-service training needs of extension faculty concerning issue programming. Specific objectives include:

1. To describe Extension faculty and District Directors with regard to the characteristics: tenure, program area assignment, and prior training about issues programming.

2. To describe the perceptions of Extension faculty and District Directors about their knowledge of issues programming concepts.

3. To describe the perceptions of Extension faculty and District Directors concerning their attitudes about issues programming.

4. To describe perceptions of Extension faculty and District Directors about their ability to implement issues programming.

5. To describe the relationships among Extension faculty and District Directors concerning their perceptions of knowledge, attitudes, ability to implement, and perceived importance of issues programming concepts, tenure, program area assignment, and prior training.

6. To identify and to rank the training needs of Extension faculty regarding specific concepts of issues programming.

7. To determine sources of information and training utilized by Extension faculty regarding issues programming.

8. To determine which variables: tenure, program area assignment, and prior training about issues programming, best explain the differences among field faculty, specialists, and District Directors concerning perceived training needs, attitude, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming.
Significance of Study

The study involved the population of Extension county, district and state specialist faculty and District Directors who represent all programs areas within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. The data from this study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding training needs and organizational change in the field.

a. The study may serve as a model for other state Extension Services to study issues programming implementation.
b. The data can be used to develop in-service training programs to facilitate issue programming implementation.
c. Administrators will be provided insight concerning variables that influence faculty commitment to organizational change.
d. Faculty can utilize the study to suggest support and/or training needed to further enhance implementation of issues programming.

Assumptions

For purposes in this study, the researcher assumed that:

1. Faculty self report is an appropriate means to measure level of knowledge, attitude, importance, and ability to implement issues programming.

2. Faculty perceived needs are a reliable source for the development of in-service training programs.

3. Issues programming is an important curricular focus of Extension program development and delivery to maintain long term viability of the Extension organization.

4. All faculty will participate in issue based programming.
5. The primary unit of adoption of innovation or change is the individual Extension faculty member.

6. The National Initiatives of the Cooperative Extension Service define issues to be addressed in programming. Thus issues programming as a concept is a necessary area of training for Extension faculty (United States Department of Agriculture, 1988).

**Limitations**

Two limitations were identified concerning the study;
1. The study focused only upon Ohio Extension faculty.
2. The data were based upon individual perception of level of knowledge, attitude, importance and ability to implement issues programming.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions will assist the reader in understanding the study:

**CES**- The Cooperative Extension System, national in focus.

**Extension Faculty**- Faculty members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State University who hold positions as county agents, district specialists, state specialists, department chairs with Extension appointments, and program administrators.

**Inservice Training**- The professional development program offered to Extension faculty by the OCES organization.
Issues Programming- A program development, implementation and evaluation approach with origins in matters of wide public concern, without regard for traditional Extension subject matter, audiences and methods of program delivery (Dalgaard, et al., 1988).

OCES - The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service

Organizational climate - The collective perceptions of all who work in an organization.

Professional Assignment- The professional role of the Extension faculty member. For example: county agent, county chair, district specialist, state specialist, district supervisor, administrator, or department chair.

Program Area- The subject matter assignment of an Extension faculty member, for example: Agriculture, Home Economics, Youth Development, or Community and Natural Resources.

Tenure- Years of service of a CES faculty member, not limited to Ohio.

Skill- Term used to describe the measure of ability to implement an innovation, specifically, issue based programming.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose in this chapter is to present a review of the literature studied related to issues management and issues programming in the Cooperative Extension Service, the organizational change process, and the role of in-service education in organizational change.

Issues Management and Issues Programming

The ECOP Futures Task Force, appointed in 1986, identified several characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service as it currently exists that necessitate organizational change:

1. The organization tends to be a protector of the status quo.
2. CES is too often reactionary rather than proactive.
3. Disproportionate resources are allocated to permanent staff.
4. Some programs do not have a research base.
5. Program delivery is limited by existing club structures.
6. Employees of the Extension System are not cognizant of the perceptions and images of Extension held by clientele and funding sources (ECOP Futures Task Force, 1987).

Extension futurists identify interdisciplinary teamwork and the ability to develop and implement anticipatory planning strategies as an integral part of the organization as critical for innovation and change within the Extension organization (ECOP Futures Task Force, 1987).

Dillman (1985) posed several challenges for the Cooperative Extension Service in terms of change and innovation. He indicated that since
not all geographical areas are changing at the same rate, the change agent must be cognizant of the developmental stage of the community. The community control era in which the agent served as an informational broker should end. In its place, the Cooperative Extension Service must move to information age technologies and educational methods. Dillman also warned that change is a gradual process and should occur systematically.

Patton (1987), in describing a national futures process in Australia, suggested that an organizational culture can be adapted by a process that involves issue based discussion teamed with construction of scenarios with alternatives.

Boone (1987) identified several priority areas of research in the administration of the Cooperative Extension Service:
- How can staff realignments be achieved to sustain a multidisciplinary approach to programming?
- What are the benefits and limitations of particular administrative styles in Extension environments?
- Does effectiveness of the organization and its units increase when employees have more involvement in decision making?
- Do current Extension policies provide a clear path for effective planning?
- Is the structure of the organizational unit conducive to forward planning?
- What factors enhance or impede sound administrative decision making?
- What differences do personal characteristics of administrators make in effectiveness of the organization?
A review of the most recently published summaries of research in Extension did not yield any studies concerning issues programming in Extension (Lee and Cheatham, 1986; Lee and Goode, Jr. 1988). The national movement in the area of issues programming was introduced most recently in 1987, with most publications dated 1988. Thus any formal studies in this area are likely to be conducted concurrently with this research investigation.

The literature concerning issues comes primarily from the fields of public policy and corporate management. Issues are generally viewed as part of corporate public relations. Issues are characterized by the following features:

1. They exist in an external environment...the broad concept of society,
2. They arise from complex human problems, social economic, political, and technological,
3. They often are grounded in conflict and controversy (Bartha, 1984; Ewing, 1980; Morrison, 1984;).

Applied to the Cooperative Extension System, issues may be defined as matters of wide public concern arising out of complex human problems (Dalgaard, et al, 1988). Issues programming is a planned approach to respond to issues. This differs from the traditional Extension programming approach originating from technical subjects or disciplines as defined in Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics at Land Grant Universities.

The issues management process is closely related to institutional strategic planning. Strategic planning focuses upon long range issues,
5 to 20 years in the future. The issues management process is concerned with emerging issues 18-36 months in the future. Where strategic planning is concerned with an organization or institutional future, issues management is concerned with how the public policy process influences the sociopolitical environment (Ewing, 1980).

Several models exist for issues management processes (Bartha, 1984; Ewing, 1980; Heath and Nelson, 1986; Kast, 1980). Most definitions are similar and include the following stages:

- identification of emerging issues,
- issue analysis
- prioritization of issues
- policy development
- supporting program development
- operation implementation/action plan
- communication to appropriate stakeholders
- evaluation of result or impact assessment

Bartha (1984) represents issues management in a five step model (Figure 1). Though an organizational leader is the spokesperson and strategic business planner, corporate external relations is a broad based effort. Staff members must be competent in analyzing and monitoring issues, testing organizational decisions against external sensitivities, and having the capability to maintain communication and contact with the external environment.
1. MONITOR
Behavior, Opinion, and Values of Key Publics

2. ASSESS
Company-relevant External Threats and Opportunities Implications

3. PLAN
Operating and/or Communications Objectives and Strategies

Corporate Position

4. IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS
Decisions

5. EVALUATE
Effectiveness and Efficiency Recycle

FIGURE 1 FIVE STEP ISSUES MANAGEMENT MODEL

The first step of the model involves monitoring the socio-political environment. A staff group with environmental monitoring and analytical capability is essential to yield meaningful information for corporate planning. The second step, assessment, results in a set of implications and guidelines to ensure that the organization's perception of the external environment matches with external evidence. The third step, planning, involves key planners in designing strategic directions with consideration of external implications. Decision making, the fourth step, leads to approval, rejection, initiation, or modification of internal and/or external programs. The fifth and last step, evaluation, is critical for the organization to learn about its effectiveness and efficiency.

Chase (1977) theorizes that public policy management or issues management is a systems approach to management science. He identifies
four process components: issue identification, issue analysis, issue priority setting, and task force issue management. The science of public issues management gains strength from public relations, public affairs, communications, and government relations.

Ewing (1980) described issues management in terms of the Yankelovich, Skelly, and White public policy process model (Figure 2).
The starting point in this model begins with the public feeling of dissatisfaction leading through a route to legislative consideration. An issue does not have to travel the entire route. It can emerge at any point on the model. Not all issues are resolved by law, but by other agreements at various stages of the model. Ewing indicates that the process from emergent issues through legislation can take up to 6 years, affording ample opportunity for concerned organizations to develop policy and supporting programs (Ewing, 1980).

Social involvement and responsibility are at the heart of issues management (Heath and Nelson, 1986). These authors identified four factors central to the future of issues management. The factors include the regulatory climate; the executive philosophy and social vision of organizations; the value of public policy monitoring and advice to corporate planning; and social rewards from ongoing public dialogue.

Applied to educational organizations such as the Cooperative Extension System, the issues management models redefine the educational purpose of the organization from a focus on discipline-based education applied to traditional audiences. The issues based programming focus looks to society to identify issues and to develop knowledge-based education to improve people's lives (Dalgaard et al., 1988).

Resources of the university are applied more broadly in issue centered programs. All colleges of the land grant institution, other universities, colleges, organizations and contract personnel address issues through inter-disciplinary teams, work groups, advisory groups, and coalitions. Issue identification drives audiences, resources, program delivery systems, and organization of resources. Traditionally, problems
are defined in terms of and bounded by subject matter disciplines, traditional audiences, traditional teaching methods, and traditional organization of resources (Dalgaard et al., 1988).

What are the advantages and disadvantages of issues based programming or issues management strategies? Advantages include a proactive stance for the organization, program relevance, broadened support base, ongoing organizational renewal as issues change, integration of resources, linkage of public and private sectors to solve complex human problems, and organizational structure shifts to meet new demands.

Several disadvantages can also be noted. Existing personnel may be at risk due to organizational shifts and redirection. New issues may define the need for staff with different skills and specializations. What happens to those whose expertise is no longer needed? Are current supporters alienated when issue priorities mandate a shift of organizational priorities? Major shifts of personnel and financial resources may occur as priority issues change. The role of specialized personnel becomes less clear cut. The Cooperative Extension System has invested heavily in highly technically educated staff to address problems. What if those technical resources are no longer appropriate for targeted issues? Does the organization dismantle the structure for those resources or does it maintain a basic level in specific critical areas (Dalgaard, et al., 1988; ECOP Futures Task Force, 1987)?

Authors in the area of issues management also describe benefits that have implications for the Cooperative Extension System. A systematic process of identification, analysis, and priority setting among present and emerging public issues allows organizations to capitalize upon oppor-
tunities in a transitional society (Duke, 1983). Demands by stakeholders to be involved in decision making are accommodated (Ewing, 1980). Brown summarized that an issues focus allows an organization to be proactive rather than reactive. An organization has new opportunities for leadership by staying in touch with societal concerns (Brown, 1981).

A key barrier to issues programming for Extension organizations may be internal resistance to change. Educational efforts are needed to raise awareness internally and externally. Training of staff to develop skills appropriate to issues management is critical. Perceptions of staff concerning issues programming will enhance or impede the organizational change process (Dalgaard, et al, 1988).

The Organizational Change Process

The literature in higher education concerning organizational change can be discussed in relation to three central themes:

1. The organizational change process.
2. The role of the individual in organizational change processes.
3. Leadership styles or behaviors related to changing organizations.

The Organizational Change Process

Griffiths (1985), Vroom (1983), and Kerr (1963) described several characteristics of higher education organizations that have implications for change:

1. Autonomy of research and teaching prevails and is well liked by faculty.
2. Faculty in higher education are specialized and know more about what it is they do than administration.

3. Vital processes within the university are in the hands of faculty through governance systems.

4. University goals are rather broad and ambiguous for both leaders and followers.

5. The tenure process adds impetus to the upward influence of faculty.

Griffiths (1985) questioned whether the important element concerning organizational change in higher education is the climate within or the characteristics of the organizational culture. It is suggested that for an educational organization to change, a culture receptive to change must be established. Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (cited in Griffiths, 1985) identified seven characteristics of a department, college or school within the university that has a culture with potential leadership for change:

1. Faculty are committed to work.
2. Mutual expectations of performance exist within the unit.
3. Faculty are prone to action.
4. Leadership is vested in many rather than a few.
5. The unit has focus to its action.
6. A positive work climate exists.
7. "Slack" or a reasonable level of human and material resources exist allowing staff to be efficient yet relaxed.

Note that organizational climate is perceived as an element within the overall organizational culture.
Wolfe (1985) examined the concept of organizational structure as fluid, dynamic, acting and reacting. This concept led to the development of the Synergistic Model which emphasizes the principle of cooperative action. In contrast, classic models of organizational structure are built upon job functions and lines of communication. The determinants of the Synergistic Model are perceived to be related to organizational health, job satisfaction, organizational climate, power distribution, and organizational energy. Wolfe indicated that a key identifier of organizational health is the internal climate. Three major approaches to climate have been traditionally utilized. The perceptual approach suggests climate depends upon the individual's perceptions of the environment. The objective approach relies on an individual's response to the basic organizational elements. The process approach indicates that an individual responds to aspects of an organization in terms of relevancy and mode of communication. Wolfe speculates that his model is appropriate when organizations restructure or change leadership. The relative advantage to the model is that organizational viability remains intact since each individual assists with change.

Many scholars have focused upon organizational climate as a predictor of change. Goldhammer, Aldridge, Suttle, and Becker (1967) attributed change to shifting expectations, internally and externally induced. Complexity of educational change is a result of a struggle between the needs of society and the needs of individuals. The authors challenge educational administrators to provide time, money, and improved communications for staff members to change direction successfully.
An interesting concept was posed by Goldhammer, et al. (1967) concerning the effect of Jeffersonian Agrarianism upon social philosophy. This concept is based upon agrarian democracy, empowering people at the local level to solve their own problems in their own independent way. This fosters fierce, independent spirit, distrust of centralization, and fear of federal control. Many educational organizations developed with a series of checks and balances to insure that no one level became predominant. The authors suggest that this philosophy is no longer appropriate in the US. A leader cannot survive locally today if he/she attempts to interrelate all levels of government. Thus change is thwarted.

Research findings from the field of public education also suggest that organizational climate is a predictor of change. Bedley (1982) identified 12 facets of organizational climate studied in public schools. Key points described include: climate is composed of collective perceptions of all who work in an organization, climate can be measured, climate generates behavior, climate can change easily, and climate can be negative, positive or neutral. Porter (1984) studied employees in two research and development companies to determine the relationship of organizational climate to creative output. The findings support relationships among career development and creativity; posted job opportunities and creative output; clear career paths for supervision and creative output; and job advancement and training with creative output. However, employees did not agree that the organization needed to provide the opportunity to develop skills and abilities that facilitate job advancement.

Heitsmith (1984) studied organizational components of interaction and adaptability. His study identified correlates for levels of adapt-
ability in an organization and the congruence of the organization. System wide congruence had a greater effect upon adaptability than did individual variables.

Merton (cited in Guest, 1962) described organizational change as a response to reduce tension and to achieve objectives, or as Bakke (cited in Guest, 1962) described, to achieve equilibrium. Guest (1962) discussed the concept that an organization may reach a point when it no longer is capable of internal change. He hypothesized that organizational change depends upon:

1. Relationships of the organization as a subunit of a larger organization that must change for the subunit to change.
2. The time component of change is a function of size, levels of hierarchy, number of specialized groups and complexity of technical operations.
3. For a complex organization to change, it is not necessary to alter its structure.
4. The process of successful change will start and continue to the extent that members perceive behavior of all to be in keeping with the norms of the larger culture.

Whitten and Cameron (1985) suggested that as the external environmental forces change in education, they are most critical to the change of the organization. Decreased federal funding, loss of public prestige for universities, and corporate competition with the university are cited as examples of external forces inducing change. Lutz and Arney (1987) agreed with Whitten and Cameron about the importance of external environment to change. They suggested that since a university is an enduring
entity, seeking a homeostatic condition, most change is externally stimulated. Lutz and Arney examined locus of control, need achievement, and professional orientation in regard to change, linking these variables to externally induced change.

The Tri-Partite Theory of Institutional Change suggests that institutions and organizations change in a definite, predictable pattern and can be directed and managed (Shapiro, 1983). Shapiro defined the orientation of the institution in regard to three foci: a. a person oriented or "charismatic" institution, b. a planning oriented institution, and c. a position oriented, status quo organization. The most effective of the three orientations is proposed to be a synergistic combination of the person oriented and planning oriented foci.

Role of the Individual in the Organizational Change Process

In a study of change within the school environment, primary change facilitators were identified by teachers, as well as the reaction to change based upon the source of change. Perceived change facilitators within the school were the principal and curriculum coordinator. However, when measuring response to change and source of change, it was found that change initiated by teachers was perceived as positive more than twice as often as change initiated from other sources. The findings tend to support the concept of participant involvement and ownership in the change process (Hall, cited in Murphy, 1986). These findings are contrary to those suggested by Conway (1984). However, Maier (cited in Conway, 1984) suggested that the use of participatory decision making be maintained for
situations in which quality and acceptance are crucial for the change process.

Clark and Melloy (cited in Griffiths, 1985) considered the obstacle to change to be the resistance within individuals. The organization needs to balance the need to change while creating a stable work environment for people. Thus a climate for change lies in the method of control attempted by leaders.

Three constructs were described by Lutz and Arney (1987) that influence individual response to change within an organization.

1. Locus of control or the individual perception of the source of behavioral reinforcement affects the change process. For those with an internal locus of control, change is resisted when information channels are blocked. Those with an external locus of control resisted change when the purpose of a pursuit was unclear.

2. Need achievement was associated with expectations of success or fear of failure. The success oriented person takes action because he or she is more comfortable with risk taking. Achievement motivation has been linked to economic growth in organizations.

3. Professional orientation refers to the source of individual loyalty and reward. Individuals whose orientation is discipline or career focused may welcome change that may improve the discipline, but resist change that threatens academic freedom. The individual who finds rewards within the organization may resist change for fear that the reward system, prestige, and status may be altered.

Johnson (1988) indicated that the individual needing high approval within the organization must be redirected toward increased autonomy and enhanced functioning. The individual dependent upon approval in a group can foster passivity if this behavior is prevalent. The organization responds by narrowing its focus and becomes compliant, stifling creativity.

Conner and Patterson (1983) identified three phases or degrees of individual support for change:
1. Preparation Stage, which involves the stages of contact about the change and awareness of the change,

2. Acceptance Phase, which includes individual understanding of the change and positive perception about the change,

3. Commitment Phase, which involves installment of the change, adoption, institutionalization and internalization.

Greiner (1967) described organizational change as dependent upon two factors: (a) redistribution of power in an organization toward a process of shared power and (b) a developmental change process. He identified six phases of the developmental process:

1. Pressure and arousal,
2. Intervention and reorientation,
3. Diagnosis and recognition,
4. Intervention and commitment,
5. Experimentation and search,
6. Reinforcement and acceptance.

Hall (1976), Hall and Loucks (1978), and Wallace and Dossett (1973) have developed an extensive theoretical and empirical model of the change process, the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM). The adoption of an innovation by individuals within an organization is perceived as a developmental process. Concerns, feelings, and perceptions of the individual about the innovation are viewed as part of the developmental process. Self concerns precede concerns about the management and impact of the implementation of the innovation. Personal concerns need to be resolved before concerns about the task or its impact can be resolved. Administrative action, in-service education, and resource support were identified as significant factors that contribute to arousal and resolu-
tion of concerns. Seven Stages of concern (SoC) comprise the CBAM model (Figure 3):

0 **AWARENESS**: Little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated.

1 **INFORMATIONAL**: A general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail about it is indicated. The person seems to be unworried about himself/herself in relation to the innovation. She/he is interested in substantive aspects of the innovation in a selfless manner such as general characteristics, effects, and requirements for use.

2 **PERSONAL**: Individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his/her inadequacy to meet those demands, and his/her role with the innovation. This includes analysis of his/her role in relation to the reward structure of the organization, decision making and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Financial or status implications of the program for self and colleagues may also be reflected.

3 **MANAGEMENT**: Attention is focused on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling and time demands are utmost.

4 **CONSEQUENCE**: Attention focuses on impact of the innovation on students in his/her immediate sphere of influence. The focus is on relevance of the innovation for students, evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase student outcomes.

5 **COLLABORATION**: The focus is on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation.

6 **RE-FOCUSBING**: The focus is on exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative. Individual has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form of the innovation.

**FIGURE 3. STAGES OF CONCERN ABOUT THE INNOVATION**
(Hall, Wallace, Dossett, 1973)
Leadership Style and Leadership Behavior

Vroom (1983) has expressed the concern that leadership in higher education is a neglected area of study, thus lacking relevant models. He cited several possible explanations for this void:

a. Business, military and governmental organizations are more numerous and more receptive to research,

b. Leadership study only recently has recognized that the kind of institution or environment may make a difference in its operation.

Several characteristics of higher education organizations that make them unique in organizational structure include broad function with vague goals and objectives, personnel homogeneous in educational level yet highly specialized by task, and tenure systems which enable faculty to wield upward influence.

Goldhammer, et al (1967) suggested that a major problem in educational administration impacting change is that administrators often become leaders by accident rather than by design. Iorio (1986) described differences in leaders related to the means by which they attained their position. Emergent leaders, those earning position by energetic action, tend to be more authoritarian than the leader appointed to position. The appointed nature of educational leadership tends to provide a vested authority and immediate legitimate power base not present with leadership positions acquired through energetic action.

Sergiovanni (1984) posed new leadership values congruent with change in organizations. Purposing is defined as a skill that induces clarity, consensus, commitment, order and direction. Empowerment distributes power
and leadership among others in an effort to gain more in return. Successful leaders are described as those who expect adherence to common values but accept wide discretion in implementation.

House (1971) reiterated these as cultural leadership behaviors of role modeling; image building; articulating and living goals, values, and purposes; exhibiting high expectations; showing confidence; and arousing motivational potential.

Argyris (1965) suggested that a key variable not often examined by researchers studying organizational change is interpersonal competence of leaders, including problem solving effectiveness and commitment to work. Douglas McGregor (cited in Guest, 1962) specified three characteristics of successful leadership for organizational change: collaborative goal attainment, interdependence, and integration.

James MacGregor Burns (1978) described two types of leaders: (a) transacting leaders who approach the followers with an intent to exchange one thing for another; (b) transforming leaders, who, on the other hand, recognize and exploit the need of potential followers' higher needs. The person then is stimulated to become a follower.

Burns also suggested that planning for structural change is the ultimate moral test of decision making leadership. The leader must consider fundamental human needs, wants, aspirations, expectations, goals and values for the change to succeed (Burns, 1978).

How are leaders for the future developed? Baugher and Kellet (1983) highlighted several professional relationships to assist in developing organizational leaders: mentoring, role modeling, and sponsoring relation-
ships. Mentors serve as trusted counselors or guides by providing power to the individual, assisting the professional in by-passing hierarchy, providing reflected power, and fighting for the protege (Kanter, 1983). Often, the mentor-protege relationship is described as parental (Shapiro, 1983). Role models differ slightly from mentors in that the developing professional emulates the behavior, style, or attributes of another. Sponsoring relationships are those that provide training and development opportunities to the developing professional (Kanter, 1983).

Studies of mentoring have focused primarily on males (Kanter, 1983). East (1980) suggested that home economists need mentors, sponsoring relationships, and role models to aspire to leadership positions. The behavioral characteristics of family centeredness and open expression have diverted females from the advancement to management positions, and have hampered females in competitive relationships.

Sashkin (1986) defined effective leadership as that which transforms organizations dependent upon synergism among personnel, situational and behavioral factors. Upon examination of the behaviors of present day leaders in major industry and business, he proposed three aspects considered to demonstrate visionary leadership: effective executive leadership that transforms organizations; leadership to develop long range visions of what the organization can and should become; the ability to identify key elements to direct the organization toward the future; and skills to communicate vision so as to motivate others to make it happen. Several of these behaviors were identified in a study conducted by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas (Justiz, 1985). Effective strategies for introducing change in school
environments include: long term goal setting and planning, clearly communicated standards and expectations for teachers and students, close monitoring of change throughout the process, consultation and collaboration with teachers, decisions based upon the institutional environment, support and guidance, and administrator visibility with teachers and students.

Innovation in an organization goes beyond "doing a good job" to establishing new learning or capacity for the organization. Change is essential. For an innovation to occur, two things are needed: a person in the driver's seat and a source of power. To accomplish change, corporate citizens or professionals within the organization must possess an entrepreneurial spirit to make differences for the organization (Kanter, 1983).


1. Relative advantage or degree to which a new idea or practice is superior to the one it is to replace.
2. Compatibility or the extent to which an innovation fits the individual's views of what ought to be, or what he/she currently does and how.
3. Complexity of the innovation.
4. Ability to try the innovation a little at a time.
5. The extent to which results can be observed.

Organizational survival demands four functions: adapting to change in the environment; attaining goals the clientele want; integrating behavioral actions of people who operate the organization; and maintaining
a pattern of action with respect to adapting, attaining goals and coordinating people’s activities (Sashkin, 1986). Leaders in innovative organizations demonstrate a bias toward entrepreneurial action, stay in close contact with the customer or client, and believe in the overriding importance of people (Peters and Waterman, 1982).

What distinguishes managers and leaders in educational administration? Terence E. Deal (cited in Sheive, 1987) stated that managers solve problems and leaders confront dilemmas. Critical questions facing educational leaders in the future include:

1. How do we encourage meaning and commitment in the educational organization?
2. How does the educational organization deal with loss and change?
3. How can educational leaders shape symbols to convey the essence of the organization within and to the public? (Sheive, 1987)

Many characteristics or behaviors have been projected for leaders in the future who facilitate change. Environmental conditions that facilitate creativity in the modern organization must be identified (Argyris, 1965) Visionary leadership includes the ability to plan long range directions and to communicate in a compelling manner (Sashkin, 1986).

Roles of leaders in organizations are changing. Traditionally, leadership roles were described in terms of the functions of planning, controlling, directing, evaluating, and reporting. New role definitions include the skills of people building, dealing with stakeholders, community relations, and interorganizational flexibility. Other terms cited
include anticipatory behavior, visioning, value congruence, self-understanding and empowerment (Oliver and Scherer, 1987).

Since many predictions about the future of higher education in the 1990s include conditions of decline, it is essential for institutional administrators to identify organizational responses to the conditions (Cameron, 1983). Organizational adaptation is defined as the modification and alteration within an organization or its components to adjust to changes in the external environment with the purpose of restoring balance and achieving equilibrium. This type of change differs from organizational development (OD) which focuses upon planned change initiated from within the organization.

Cameron (1984) reinforced the need for educational organizations to develop adaptation processes because of the influence of the external environment upon higher education.

Role of In-service Education in Organizational Change

Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) suggested several tactics for dealing with individual resistance to change which impact upon in-service education. The tactics include education and communication about the change, participation in the planning of change, facilitation and support of individuals during change, negotiation about implementation of the change, manipulation and cooptation as means to deal with resistance, and coercion to force change.

Buford and Bedeian (1988) categorized four methods to introduce change within an organization. They include task change or job redesign,
structural change of the organization, modification of the way people think and act, and technological change. They suggested that all four methods are interrelated and must be considered when change is introduced within an organization. Organization Development (OD) is viewed as a long range program which emphasizes changing the attitudes and behavior of individuals within an organization. OD is an ongoing and interactive process. Frequently OD utilizes process survey feedback, consultation, team building, intergroup intervention, sensitivity training, socio-technical intervention and grid OD as techniques. Each of these techniques can be integrated into staff development or in-service education programs (Buford and Bedeian, 1988).

Zaltman, Florio and Sikorski (1977) included training, installation and support among five tactics that can be used by the change planner. They indicated that individual innovativeness is related to such factors as activity level, ability level, level of education, and job satisfaction (Knight and Gorth, in Zaltman, 1977). Findings from several studies suggested that maturity of individuals and their experience with innovations are important to change implementation (Baldridge, 1974; Deal, 1975; Denham 1971; Widmer 1975). Tempkin and Brown (1974) stressed that implementation of curriculum change necessitates training. Training tactics which facilitate change supported by research include: subsidizing change; helping the system to generate finances; providing training in preservice classes; in-service classes about the use of an innovation; providing preservice or in-service classes on improved planning skills; providing consultation; providing feedback to monitor systems; setting up temporary systems; and network building.
What is the status of issues programming in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service? In order to answer that question, the knowledge level and attitudes of professional staff involved in its implementation must be assessed. For training programs to be effective, there must be an assessment of the current status in order to determine the needs. Then effective training programs can be developed and implemented. In this study, the researcher sought to identify the current status of professional perceived attitude, knowledge, importance, and ability to implement issues programming as a baseline for development of in-service training.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

In this study, the variables of interest as well as the relationships among the variables in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service population studied are described. Qualitative focus group interviews and quantitative survey research were utilized to answer the research questions.

Research Questions

The primary purposes in this study were twofold: to investigate whether attitude, demographic characteristics, knowledge and importance, or characteristics explain Extension faculty perceived ability to implement issue programming; and to identify in-service training needs of extension faculty concerning issue programming. Nine questions were developed to guide the researcher in the study:

1. How do OCES faculty with differing tenure perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance to professional roles of issues programming concepts?

2. How do OCES faculty with different program area assignments perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?
3. How do OCES faculty with differences in prior training perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

4. How do OCES faculty with differences in prior educational professional experience perceive attitudes, knowledge, importance, and ability to implement issue programming concepts?

5. How do OCES faculty with differences in professional role perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

6. How do OCES faculty with differences in major area of highest degree attained perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

7. What relationships exist among the variables attitude toward issues programming, knowledge, skill, importance, tenure, program area assignment and prior training?

8. What are the training needs of OCES faculty regarding specific concepts of issues programming?

9. What sources of information and training are utilized by Extension faculty regarding issues programming?

Instrumentation

Data to answer the research questions were collected using two methods: focus group interviews and a mail survey.
Focus Group Interviews

The Focus Group Interview (FGI) is a qualitative research method suitable for uncovering information about human perceptions, feelings, opinions and thoughts. A group of people is brought together to discuss issues raised by the leader or moderator, which focus upon the research topic. The analysis of information gathered is utilized to determine trends and patterns that evolve from the discussion (Higgenbotham, 1979).

This methodology has several advantages applicable to this study. First, the FGI assists the researcher in generating hypotheses when little is known about the topic being researched (Higgenbotham, 1979). Secondly, questions regarding new programs or proposals can be investigated in a relatively quick and cost effective manner (Krueger, 1985).

A series of five questions was developed by the researcher to guide the Focus Group Interview process. The interview series consisted of unstructured, semi-structured, and highly structured questions designed to identify the range of attitudes held by Extension faculty about issues programming.

Mail Survey

A questionnaire was developed and used to satisfy the objectives. Writings concerning issues programming, primarily from USDA sources, were utilized to develop the questionnaire.

The mail survey consisted of three parts:

Part I: Attitudes toward issues programming. The attitudinal section of the instrument utilized a 5-point Likert scale for rating attitude from strongly negative to strongly positive. The rating scale
for attitudes ranged from a low of 1 to 5: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Undecided; 4-Agree; and 5-Strongly Agree. Participant ratings were summated and averaged to determine an individual attitudinal rating. Findings are reported as mean attitudinal ratings. Mean ratings of 1 to 1.5 are described as strongly disagree, 1.5 to 2.5 as disagree, 2.5 to 3.5 as undecided, 3.5 to 4.5 as agree, and 4.5 to 5 as strongly agree.

Part II: Perceived Importance to professional role, perceived knowledge, and perceived ability to implement issues programming. This section of the instrument was based upon the needs assessment model developed by Borich (1980).

The Borich Model

The Borich model provides a systematic method for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting survey data. The data collected can be used to assess program effectiveness or to develop an in-service training program (Borich, 1980).

A training need is defined as the discrepancy between an educational goal and the individual's performance in relation to the goal (Borich, 1980). The training need is identified as the discrepancy between "what is" and "what should be". The discrepancies can be ranked for priority by statistical techniques for weighing relative importance of values assigned to survey responses. Priority ranking can also be determined by a panel of trainers with expertise in the area of concern. A framework for program revisions is provided by the ranking of the discrepancies of competencies in descending order.

The researcher utilized the following steps of the Borich model to develop the mail survey instrument:
1. Identify competencies.
Competency statements related to issues programming were based upon literature in that area, program objectives of trainers and administrators, and program materials. The statements were used to construct the instrument.

2. Survey respondents and determine discrepancy scores.
The sample or population surveyed was asked to rate the competencies regarding perceived importance to job role, perceived knowledge level of competency, and perceived skill in implementing the competency. The format appears as follows in Example 1.

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 1</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each competency provided two discrepancy scores per respondent. The scores were used as indicators of program effectiveness in producing knowledge or skill. The Borich model also provides the option to add a third competency, ability to produce pupil learning. The discrepancy scores were then ranked to provide guidance for in-service education. The researcher utilized the discrepancy scores for knowledge and ability
because the shift to issues programming is a recent change in extension programming.

The Borich model provides a discrepancy score for both knowledge and skill. Differences were calculated between:

a. the perceived importance and perceived level of knowledge, and
b. the perceived importance and perceived ability in implementation.

The difference was multiplied by the group mean perceived importance score. The group mean reflected scores of all respondents. Example 2 demonstrates the scoring of the instrument.

Example 2

Competency 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low  High</td>
<td>Low  High</td>
<td>Low  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Importance Mean for Competency 1 = 3.0.

Calculation of Knowledge Discrepancy Score

4 (Perceived Importance rating for respondent 1)
-3 (Perceived Knowledge rating for respondent 1)

\[
\frac{1 \text{ (Importance score for competency 1)}}{3 \text{ (Mean Importance score for group for competency 1)}} \times 3 \text{ Knowledge discrepancy score for respondent 1}
\]
Calculation of Skill Discrepancy Score

\[ 4 \text{ (Perceived Importance rating for respondent 1)} - 4 \text{ (Perceived Skill for respondent 1)} \]

\[ 0 \text{ (Importance Score for Competency 1)} \times 3 \text{ (Mean Importance Score for group for Competency 1)} \]

\[ 0 \text{ Skill discrepancy score for respondent 1} \]

3. Rank Competencies

Competencies were ranked according to discrepancy scores. Highly positive scores have highest priority for identification of in-service education needs.

4. Compare In-service Program Content and High Priority Competencies.

The ranked competencies were used to suggest the in-service education program content.

5. Revise In-service Program or Revise Competency.

Part III: Selected demographic data and sources of training about issues programming. In the last section of the survey respondents were asked to identify program area assignment, gender, tenure in Extension, years professional experience in other educational roles, major area of highest degree attained, and sources of training and number utilized concerning issues programming.

Content Validity

Measurement error was a key threat to internal validity of this study. In an attempt to control this threat, content validity of the instruments was assessed by a panel of experts. Extension faculty knowledgeable in the area of issues programming were asked to review the entire instrument. They included:
Recommendations by the panel were incorporated in the instrument revisions and unclear or inappropriate items were deleted from the final version.

The Focus Group Interview questions were reviewed by Dr. Thomas Archer and Jeffrey Layman, Extension professionals who have studied focus group processes under Richard Krueger and who have conducted numerous focus group interviews for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

Pilot Testing

The mail survey was pilot tested to establish clarity and suitability of the questionnaire. An accessible group of 21 extension professionals and graduate students who were not part of the population to be studied participated in the pilot. These individuals were enrolled Autumn Quarter, 1989, as graduate students at The Ohio State University with emphasis in coursework in Extension Education.

Cronbach’s Alpha model was used to determine internal consistency coefficients for both the attitude scale and training needs scales. Nunally (1967) indicated that reliability of .50 to .60 would suffice for predictor tests in early stages of research.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for Part I, the attitudinal section of the instrument was .89. This exceeded the recommendation by Nunally (1967). Two items were deleted from this section following the pilot to increase the reliability coefficient from .85 to .89. Both items deleted
had negative correlations with attitude as determined through a correlation matrix for the 22 items in the scale.

Table 1 contains coefficients for the 6 subscales of Part II of the instrument. As a result of the pilot, two items were deleted. The coefficients for these two items were very low. In addition, the three subscales with coefficients below the criteria set by Nunally (1967) were revised for inclusion in the final instrument.

Table 1

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Areas of Issues Program Development Computed Using Pilot Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>n=21 Knowledge</th>
<th>Ability to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue Identification (Items 22-27)</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Identification (Items 28-30)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Identification (Items 31-35)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Methods (Items 36-39)</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization (Items 40-44)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (Items 45-47)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population

The participants in this study included a census of the population of Extension faculty employed by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State University, who are assigned the roles of specialist, county agent, district specialist and district director. This population consisted of faculty with responsibility for program coordination and implementation at the county, district, and state level. The participants were identified from the October, 1989 directory of Ohio Cooperative Extension Service personnel. Upon deletion of the names of individuals on leave, 321 potential participants were identified.

Permission to collect data from Extension faculty was sought from the following sources:

a. Human Subjects Review Committee

This process was mandated because the Focus Group Interview process included tape recording of respondent comments. Approval was granted, pending minor revisions (Appendix A).

b. OCES Administrative Review

The OCES Director and Associate Director reserve the right to review any proposed research involving Extension personnel. Their permission was sought and signature obtained on the letter accompanying the survey instrument. Modifications were made in the research proposal as recommended by these reviewers.

Data Collection

Data from the population were collected by Focus Group Interview and Mail Survey.
Focus Group Interviews

Five FGI groups were assembled to include seven to ten participants each. The participants included Extension faculty stratified by professional role: state specialist, field faculty, and district directors. The purpose of the FGI groups was to uncover the diversity of attitudes regarding issues programming and sources of information utilized by Extension faculty about issues programming. The data collected in the early focus groups were utilized in the development of the mail survey instrument.

Five focus group sessions were conducted over a period of time from mid November, 1989 to mid January, 1990. Fifteen state specialists, 13 county and district agents, and five district directors participated in the discussions. The groups were formulated through a process of systematic random sampling and participant availability. Using the current directory of Extension personnel, the researcher systematically sampled the list of state specialists. Each potential participant was called using a prescribed invitation process (Appendix B). Those individuals accepting the invitation for the dates identified composed the focus group. The procedure varied slightly for county and district faculty, in that counties were grouped based upon geographical convenience to the focus group sites prior to sampling.

The focus group composed of district directors was conducted by telephone conference call. Since the population of directors is small (5), the researcher wanted the entire population to participate. After several attempts to schedule a face to face focus group, the alternative
of a telephone conference call was selected. The telephone conference call and face to face focus group discussions followed the same format.

Two additional focus groups of field faculty were scheduled but not conducted. One was cancelled due to weather conditions. The other was cancelled when a minimum of five participants was not attained.

The Systematic Notification Process was utilized to maximize participation of individuals who consented (Krueger, 1985). The process included:

1. Personal contact from the researcher, by telephone, inviting the participant to attend the focus group session. Upon full disclosure of the process, the individual was given an opportunity to participate or not to participate.

2. A letter of confirmation to the participant after his/her acceptance of the invitation.

3. A telephone call reminder 24 hours in advance of the focus group discussion.

Other procedures were used as recommended by Krueger (1988) and Higgenbotham (1979).

The focus group sessions held off campus were conducted in rented facilities rather than in meeting rooms in Extension offices. This helped the participants to feel that their participation was kept confidential from co-workers. In addition, the environment was more relaxing, enabling the participants to focus upon the discussion. The campus based sessions for state specialists were held in conference room facilities available on campus.
Though Krueger recommends the use of incentives for participants, the researcher chose not to offer incentives due to expense. Refreshments and a relaxed environment were provided instead. OCES administration did, however, allow participating faculty to claim travel expenses for participation.

Pressure zone microphones were used to record proceedings on audio tape. An assistant moderator was recruited to monitor taping and to take written notes in event of recording failure.

Prior to participation, each individual received a letter of consent, Form HS-027, as recommended by the Human Subjects Review Committee. The researcher explained that the session was to be tape recorded and indicated the disposition of the tapes following the session. Participants signed consent forms and the researcher maintained a file for official record. In addition, as indicated in the Human Subject Review Protocol, the recorded tapes were destroyed following transcription of the content.

Each focus group session proceeded for a maximum of 1 hour 15 minutes. The moderator provided an overview of the procedure and asked each participant to read a brief definition of issues programming. The definitions were collected prior to discussion to minimize the chance of individuals paraphrasing the definition during the discussion. Five discussion questions were utilized in all five focus group sessions (Appendix B). For the first questions, participants were asked to respond in a round-robin fashion, having each individual in the group respond in seating order. For the remaining questions, discussion was allowed to proceed in a spontaneous fashion. The moderator spoke only to clarify
points, present questions or instructions, and to close the session. The moderator role was defined to avoid leading discussion in a particular manner.

The tape recordings of the sessions were transcribed using a program for the microcomputer called ETHNOGRAPH, available from Qualis Research Associates in Littleton, Colorado. The program uses keywords identified by the researcher to sort and reduce the transcribed data. The researcher then identified recurring topics of discussion for the summary.

Mail Survey

The following procedures were used to encourage faculty participation in the study: (a) the survey cover letter, supporting participation in the study, was co-signed by the Director and Associate Director of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, (b) a small incentive was included with each survey, and (c) a stamped, self addressed envelope was enclosed for return of the survey. Berdle, Anderson, and Niebuhr (1986) indicated that some researchers have found small incentives such as a packet of coffee, a pencil, or a raffle increase response rate in mail surveys. Faculty members each received a small notepad. The surveys were coded to facilitate follow-up of non-respondents. In addition, surveys were coded by date of return for analysis of early and late respondents.

Three hundred twenty seven surveys were mailed on Friday, December 15, 1989. Extension weekly mail packets were used to save postage. Faculty were asked to return the questionnaire by December 30, 1989. Those who did not respond by that date were sent a reminder letter. Those who had not responded by January 8, 1990 received a reminder letter and
a second copy of the survey. By January 15, 294 surveys had been returned. No additional contacts were made at that time since several surveys had been sent to the same population by other researchers.

Data collection ended January 15, 1990. Five surveys were eliminated from the study for the following reasons: two surveys were returned with notes that the faculty members did not know anything about issues programming; one survey was eliminated because the faculty member was on international assignment; two additional surveys did not contain Part III, making statistical analysis of some of the data meaningless. Two hundred ninety eight of the original 326 surveys mailed were returned, representing a 91.4% rate of return. Two hundred eighty nine surveys were considered valid responses, representing 88.6% of the surveys mailed. Three questionnaires were received after the close of the data collection period, and were not included in the data analysis.

Surveys were coded with the date of return as received. Six categories were determined:

1: Surveys returned the first week after mailing.
2: Surveys returned the second week after mailing.
3: Surveys returned the third week after mailing.
4: Surveys returned the fourth week after mailing.
5: Surveys returned the fifth week after mailing.
6: Surveys returned the sixth week after mailing.

Over half of the respondents (57%) replied within the first week. By the end of the third week, 82% of the respondents had replied. Beyond the third week, the number of respondents steadily declined weekly (Table 2).
Table 2

**Date Survey Returned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Returned</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The return category was utilized to compare early and late responders. Crosstabulation and Chi Square analyses were completed for each of the return categories and the variables gender, position, program area assignment, number of issues training sources utilized, tenure, prior educational experience, major area of highest degree, attitude, knowledge, importance, and ability. The mean scores for attitude, knowledge, importance and ability were categorized in order to perform the analysis. The categories were defined as follows:

1. Lowest mean to 1.9999,
2. 2.0 to 2.9999,
3. 3.0 to 3.9999,
4. 4.0 to 5.0(high).

The analyses resulted in cell frequencies too small to provide meaningful results. Upon recommendation of a statistical consultant,
categorizations of week of return and mean ratings were adjusted. Week of return was changed to reflect two categories: Week 1 and Weeks 2-6. Mean rating categories were reduced from four to three: Low - 2.9999, 3-3.9999, and 4-5.

The statistical consultant recommended completion of the Chi Square analyses for week of return and each of the following variables: attitude, knowledge, importance, and ability to implement issues programming.

**Attitude and Week of Return**

The results of the Chi Square analysis of attitude toward issues programming and week of return are reported in Table 3. The variables attitude and week of return were found to be independent, $X^2=(2,n=288)=3.8253$, $p=.15$.

**Table 3**

**Attitude Toward Issue Programming and Week Survey Returned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Week Returned</th>
<th>Lo-2.9999</th>
<th>3.0-3.9999</th>
<th>4.0-5(High)</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2-6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=(2,n=288)=3.83$, $p=.15$

**Knowledge and Week of Return**

The variables knowledge and week of return were also found to be independent, $X^2=(2,n=284)=.5839$, $p=.75$. The summary of the analysis is reported in Table 4.
Table 4

Importance of Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Week Returned</th>
<th>Lo-2.9999</th>
<th>3.0-3.9999</th>
<th>4.0-5 (High)</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(2, n=284)=1.86, p=.40$

Importance and Week of Return

The variables importance and week of return were found to be independent (Table 5). The Chi Square analysis yielded $X^2=(2, n=284)=1.8550, p=.40$.

Table 5

Knowledge About Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Week Returned</th>
<th>Lo-2.9999</th>
<th>3-3.9999</th>
<th>4-5 (High)</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(2, n=284)=.58, p=.75$
Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Week of Return

The Chi Square analysis of the variables ability to implement issues programming and week of return is reported in Table 6. The variables were found to be independent, $X^2=(2,n=284)=-.3055, p=.86$.

Table 6

Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Lo-2.9999</th>
<th>3.0-3.9999</th>
<th>4.0-5 (High)</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>47 54.7</td>
<td>99 57.9</td>
<td>16 59.3</td>
<td>162 57.0</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2-6</td>
<td>39 45.3</td>
<td>72 42.1</td>
<td>11 40.7</td>
<td>122 43.0</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86 100</td>
<td>171 100</td>
<td>27 100</td>
<td>284 100</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(2,n=284)=-.31, p=.86$

Data Analysis

Focus Group Interviews

The qualitative data from the Focus Group Interviews were handled two ways:

1. A complete transcript of the audio tapes was prepared, masking identity of the participants through use of grouped data.

2. The transcribed data were reduced using micro computer software, ETHNOGRAPH, to sort by major topic. Relevant quotes were reported without identification of the respondent. Interpretation, judgments, and recommendations were reported in narrative and list form.
Mail Survey

Data were coded onto floppy disk using the Wordperfect word processing program as surveys were returned. The files were transferred to the mainframe computer at the Instructional Research Computer Center at the Ohio State University. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSx) computer package was used to analyze the data.

Cronbach's Alpha model was used to estimate reliability for both the attitudinal scale and the needs assessment scale. The reliability coefficient for the attitudinal scale was .86 (n=289). Reliability coefficients for the 6 subscales of the needs assessment section are reported in Table 7. All coefficients were .66 or above (n=289).
### Table 7

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Areas of Issues Program Development Included on the Survey Instrument*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Ability to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues Identification ((Items 22-27))</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Identification (Items 28-30)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Identification (Items 31-35)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Methods (Items 36-39)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization (Items 40-44)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (Items 45-47)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive and correlational statistics were used to answer the questions of the study. The techniques that were used to analyze each question are listed below:

1. **How do OCES faculty with differing tenure perceive their attitudes, knowledge, skill, and importance as to professional roles of issues programming concepts?**

   *-frequencies*
2. How do OCES faculty with different program area assignments perceive their attitudes, knowledge, skill and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?
- frequencies
- percents
- mean, median, mode
- standard deviation
- crosstabulation

3. How do OCES faculty with differences in prior training perceive their attitudes, knowledge, skill and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?
- frequencies
- percents
- mean, median, mode
- standard deviation
- crosstabulation

4. How do OCES faculty with difference in prior educational professional experience perceive attitude, knowledge, importance to professional role, and ability to implement issues programming concepts?
5. How do OCES faculty with differences in professional role perceive their attitudes, knowledge, importance to professional role, and ability to implement issues programming concepts?
   - frequencies
   - percents
   - mean, median, mode
   - standard deviation
   - crosstabulation

6. How do OCES faculty with differences in major area of highest degree attained perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?
   - frequencies
   - percents
   - mean, median, mode
   - standard deviation
   - crosstabulation

7. What relationships exist among the variables attitude toward issues programming, knowledge, skill, importance, tenure, program area assign-
ment, prior educational experience, area of highest degree and prior training?
  - multiple regression

8. What are the training needs of OCES faculty regarding specific concepts of issues programming?
  - rank order of areas according to mean discrepancy scores

9. What sources of information and training are utilized by faculty regarding issues programming?
  - frequencies
  - percents
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes the presentation and discussion of the findings. The chapter is organized into two major sections:

I. Focus Group Interview Findings and Discussion

II. Mail Survey Findings and Discussion

Within each section, the findings and discussion are organized according to the questions to be answered in the study. Data pertaining to the characteristics of the population studied are presented first, followed by information specific to the questions in which differences related to these characteristics are examined.

Part I: Focus Group Interview Findings and Discussion

In this section the findings from five Focus Group Interviews conducted from mid November, 1989 through January, 1990 are addressed. The purpose of conducting the Focus Group Interviews was twofold. First, the findings of the first three interview sessions were used to provide additional content validity for the attitudinal scale in the mail survey. The breadth of attitudes that surfaced in the discussions served as a basis for the refinement of the attitudinal items in the survey. The findings are summarized by the five questions used in all of the interview sessions.
Each Focus Group Interview session was tape recorded and later transcribed, removing any identification of individual participants. Using ETHNOGRAPH, a software program for the personal computer, the transcripts were coded, sorted and reduced to produce the summary which follows.

**Question 1: Describe one characteristic of issues programming in your own words.**

The following characteristics were identified by the Focus Group Interview participants:
- involves pulling together, teamwork
- cooperative
- involves networking with community organizations
- unites the Extension organization nationwide
- market driven approach to programming
- addresses human problems
- deals with issues of vital concern to clientele
- happens outside the organization
- interdisciplinary
- timely, current
- audience could be almost anybody
- "capitalizes on opportunity and needs as arise"
- "source of an issues is from outside the Extension Service, not issues identified inside the organization"
- "framework for success; a lot of programs can contribute to issues"
Among the characteristics surfaced several questions. What is an issue? Are issues locally based or national in origin? Are all issues national in scope?

The terms "interdisciplinary" and "multi-disciplinary" were frequently used interchangeably. The difference in the definitions was not debated, rather the concept of combining expertise as a characteristic of issues programming was emphasized.

Overall, the groups identified many of the characteristics of issues programming. Two very important characteristics of issues programming were not mentioned at this point of questioning: the controversial or multiple perspective nature of issues and the public policy or social action components of issues programming. These were implied during one of the sessions at a different point in the questioning route, but were acknowledged as key characteristics. In addition, participants tended to equate problems and issues.

Question 2: How do you perceive that issue based programming differs from the way you currently program?

Responses to this question can best be summarized by grouping into categories: effect upon personnel, issues identification, political impacts, clientele, and miscellaneous.

Effect Upon Personnel

A great deal of discussion surrounded how issues programming impacts upon personnel. Several differences noted involved the teamwork concept and how that could be implemented. Comments ranged from "not much different from what we do now" to "involves new risks and challenges, especially
in networking with other agencies". Concerns were raised that people and other organizations may get "on the bandwagon" for an issue for different reasons than we intend, with potential for controversy.

Some respondents indicated that issues programming is an "arm twisting" approach to make people work together in a university system. Others indicated that Extension should have been multi-disciplinary long before now. There was some concern about inconsistent goals and expectations among those involved, both within Extension and externally.

Issues Identification

A second area of lengthy discussion concerned the determination of issues. Is an issue a need? Who identifies issues? One individual described issues programming as a "pulling together or synthesis rather than analysis or taking apart to address concerns or problems".

Much of the discussion focused upon whether issues were determined locally or more globally. The consensus appeared to be that issues should be determined locally, since an issue in one area may not be critical in another.

Political Impacts

Issues programming was described as different from current programming based upon political motivation. For instance, some perceived the emphasis to be based upon legislative priority and described the focus as "politically driven from USDA" or a public relations strategy. This viewpoint probably exists because the impetus to redirect Extension toward issues programming has initiated from Extension Service-USDA sources. The
majority of the publications discussing issues programming have also originated from the federal level. What Extension faculty fail to realize is that the initial influence for ES-USDA to promote issues programming came from recommendations of Extension supporters, professionals, and non-users. In addition, some perceive that the national initiatives or issues promoted with federal legislators were identified based upon legislative priority rather than driven by priority needs of clientele across the nation.

There was concern that issues programming would make it harder for Extension to get funding, particularly since county commissioners still want traditional programming along with the new issues programming focus. Extension professionals tended to assume that local political priorities were in conflict with national priorities. The suggestion by faculty that issues programming is "politicized" was frequently documented.

Clientele

Respondents identified the fact that issues programming would lead to a more diverse clientele base and potentially larger audience for Extension programming. It was recognized that professionals would need to take extra steps to involve new people in programming.

Miscellaneous Comments

Several participants indicated that 4-H and Home Economics already operate with an issues based philosophy.

Another difference identified was the benefit of a more focused research base to address issues.
Concerns were raised that issues programming created a need for a reward system responsive to collective credit as well as individual credit. The concern was expressed in terms of the university environment as well as the community environment where organizations work collectively.

Additional themes in the discussion pointed to the view that issues programming is a "top down" emphasis as it is being proposed and that creates tension in the Extension organization. "No one likes to be told what to do", was a frequently documented response. Several participants described their perception as a "new name for what we already do" or "skeptical" of its impact.

Though the participants identified a few differences between discipline based programming and issues programming, discussion emphasized questions and concerns. The primary areas of concern related closely to why the Cooperative Extension Service wanted to redirect toward issues programming and what benefits the redirection would have for them as individual faculty members rather than the benefits of a redirection for clientele.

**Question 3: What are the disadvantages/barriers to issues programming?**

Nine major areas of disadvantage were identified from the responses. Each will be addressed separately. They include: disciplinary focus, clientele, teamwork, reward, issues identification, public relations, resources, personnel, and priorities.
Disciplinary Focus

Considerable attention was given to the topic of subject matter areas or disciplinary structure of the organization. Various terms were used to describe the disadvantages: turf issues, hierarchy or structure, cooperation or lack of it, and potential controversy with the pooling of viewpoints to address issues. Participants were concerned about real or artificial barriers that exist in obtaining the subject matter resources to address issues adequately. Since the faculty at the state specialist level are allied with academic departments, a discipline basis for programming is well established. The boundaries of knowledge created by the departmental structure appear to be viewed as limitations to access and even barriers to communication for interdisciplinary programming to occur.

Clientele

Access to non-traditional clientele was mentioned as a concern by several participants. Closely related was the concern that Extension professionals may lack the ability to relate to non traditional clientele effectively. Some individuals were concerned that the potential clientele for issues based programs may be apathetic and not interested in our efforts.

Others offered concern about how to cope with "emotionally charged" topics that may be among the basic elements of issues programs. Some indicated that Extension needs both traditional and new clientele, but how do we meet the needs of both?

Historically, Cooperative Extension Service programs were targeted to rural clientele only. Broadening of that target audience has been a point
of controversy whenever the mission of the Extension System has been debated. Perhaps some faculty who function in the "rural based" philosophy have more difficulty with the issues programming concept which inherently has no target audience boundaries.

Teamwork

This subject was discussed from many angles. Some indicated the strong need for teamwork to be built among existing personnel. Suggested was administrative coordination of task forces and teams from the district and state levels. Another disadvantage suggested was that networking both inside Extension and in the community creates competition. Will some other organizations be threatened as Extension moves into issues programming? Are we entering their turf? How can coalitions be built successfully, with appropriate credit given to all involved?

Extension faculty have frequently worked with other organizations to plan and conduct educational programs. The concern of sharing credit is not new and is emotionally charged due to the negative experiences some faculty members have faced.

Reward

Reward systems came into the discussion at numerous points. Each time the emphasis was upon how the university promotion and tenure system fails to give credit for interdisciplinary teamwork. One individual did place the responsibility on Extension faculty to "interpret the university criteria more broadly". Often individuals blamed the criteria rather than the interpretation of it.
Issue Identification

Disadvantages surrounding issues identification included such questions as:

- Will Extension broaden new resources to meet issues identified?
- When an issue is resolved, does the organization die?
- How does one identify when to move away from an issue?
- Who will identify the issues?
- How does one identify specifics (subject matter components) to address within an issue?
- Who will decide what Extension faculty can address?

The inability to answer these questions made participants perceive them as disadvantages.

Public Relations

Three disadvantages surfaced surrounding public relations. Some indicated that Extension has a rural image barrier concerning who we serve. Will that interfere with the organization's ability to be effective with issues programming? Others perceived that a loss of organizational identity could come from the coalition approach to issues programs. In conclusion, the need for direct marketing of programs was perceived as a barrier.

Resources

The overriding disadvantage in this area concerned the need for more research to adequately address problems. Extension would need to pull together existing resources from throughout the university. Some identi-
fled examples in the area of water quality where the research base is not yet available. Questions were asked whether the Extension organization will obtain additional resources needed to address issues identified locally. Others questioned whether issues programming would distribute resources of personnel, time, and research more broadly than could be serviced.

Personnel

Barriers were discussed that can be described as internal to the personnel within the Extension organization. Are we "hung up" on tradition? Do we create our own professional barriers? Are our own attitudes toward risk taking interfering with issues programming implementation? Do agents deny that issues exist in their counties? Are we fearful of non-acceptance by different clientele? Some were concerned that issues programming is not in keeping with individual professional training and specialization. Does issues programming accommodate the specialized individual?

Two organizational barriers cited included: who will take leadership for issues programming; and how does the organization address conflict between organizational expectations and what the individual wants to accomplish professionally?

Priority

The concept of priorities was indicated as a barrier or disadvantage. Some perceive issues programming as an "add on" to an already heavy load of programming. Others asked for guidance concerning what to give up,
indicating "we haven't been told what to give up" or "the county doesn't allow us to give this up".

The disadvantages which surfaced raised many questions about which faculty appear to be uncertain concerning the administrative viewpoint within the Extension organization.

**Question 4: What are the benefits/advantages of issues programming?**

The list of advantages identified was sparse compared to the dialogue on disadvantages. Four areas surfaced that overlapped with areas of disadvantage: personnel, public relations, organizational role, and impact.

**Personnel**

A benefit to issues programming identified was the concerted effort of several professionals to the solution of problems, rather than the "shot-gun" approach of targeting one part of a problem. Some indicated that the change would cause growth among Extension professionals. The forced outreach or networking implied in issues programming would provide a growth experience for many. An issues focused approach should serve as a source of ideas for applied research. Issues provide a framework for setting priorities for professionals rather than working for pressure groups.

**Public Relations**

Though Extension's rural image was mentioned as a barrier, the forced change of that image, as a result of focusing on issues, was perceived as
Organizational Role

Several participants described benefits for the role of the Extension organization. One said, "it would be great to be ahead of rather than behind the horse as Extension often is." Other descriptions include: get Extension back on focus, make Extension look outward, programs would gain relevance to life situations and problems, and would address problems rather than departmentally determined focus.

Impact

Some of the same items indicated as disadvantages were indicated as advantages in the area of political impact. Those who perceived issues programming as a political liability may also be the individuals who perceive the focus as a top down emphasis. Those individuals also may not recognize that issues programming is based upon critical needs of people at the local level.

Several participants perceived that a focus on issues programming would have positive state and national political impact. It was suggested that an issues programming emphasis may raise funding support. Another benefit cited was that of impact upon legislation because of the issues education process.
Question 5: How would you approach your job if you were told that in 1991 you were to spend 50% of your time doing issues programming?

Initially, nearly every group responded to this question with the response "I don't like being told to do anything". Once the groups moved beyond the phraseology of the question, responses varied. Some indicated they already do more than 50% issues programming. Others suggested that present programming can be "twisted" into issues. Several suggested the need for thorough needs assessments and program reviews within the community to identify issues. Others indicated the needs for "attitude re-adjustment" within our own ranks first.

Several sub-questions were utilized to get participants to focus on individual roles within the issues programming framework. The responses to those questions follow.

What would clientele do?

Some were fearful that a move to issues programming meant abandonment of traditional clientele. Others brought out the point that traditional clientele would benefit from the issues approach and might prefer it. Potential roles suggested for traditional clientele included involving them with more responsibility in programming through leadership. Another described the need for Extension professionals to develop the "itch" for issues programming that Extension can "scratch". There were those who felt that clientele would not recognize any difference between what we do now and an issues programming approach.
What would be the agents' roles?

Responses varied from "no change" to "I hope it is different", though little description followed. Several voiced concern that barriers to working individually and independently would need to be broken down. Turf issues and program area boundaries were cited among the barriers to teamwork. Again, reward systems were mentioned with no specific suggestions.

What would be the specialist's role?

Agents perceived that the specialists' role would change, primarily because specialists were viewed as being concerned about their disciplines rather than people's problems. Specialists suggested that their roles might include interpretation of issues based upon research, marketing of the concept to the "troops", and stay grounded in discipline to provide specificity in problem resolution. Several specialists indicated that their role changed less in an issues programming framework than did the county agent role. Questions were raised concerning what happens to specialty areas that are not identified under an issue? How can the Extension administration foster multi-state structures to expand specialist resources?

General Comments

Several general comments surfaced, such as how does one implement and evaluate issues programming? How is an individual's contribution to an issue defined? Can one contribute data/information to a task force or must one be actively involved in the workings of the team addressing the
issue? How does one define what to quit doing to provide time for issues programming? OCES administration need to tell personnel what they can quit doing.

Summary

The indication of concerns as both advantages and disadvantages implied the need for organizational clarification concerning such issues as how disciplines work within an issues programming focus, motivation and reward in promotion and tenure for interdisciplinary work, how issues will be identified, the interpretation of clientele base within the organizational mission, and how issues programming alters traditional programming.

Part II: Mail Survey Findings and Discussion

Gender and Program Area Assignment

The majority (62%) of the respondents were males, with Agriculture (43%) as a program area assignment. Faculty with 4-H as a program area assignment composed 26% of the respondents and were nearly equally divided by gender. Nearly 23% of the respondents held Home Economics program area assignments and were all female (Table 8). Faculty with the position Community and Natural Resource Development (CNRD) composed 5% of the respondents. All but one of this group were male. A small percentage (3.5%) indicated a program area choice of "other". This group included individuals with administrative assignments or special program area assignments (Table 9).
Table 8

**Gender of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

**Gender and Program Area Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th>All Cases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

|               | 109   | 100.0 | 178   | 100.0 | 287      | 100.0 |
Professional Position

The majority of the respondents (75%) were field faculty with county assignments (87%). Thirteen percent of the field faculty held district specialist positions. Slightly less than half (43%) of the county agents also held the title of county chair. Approximately 23% of the respondents were state specialists. District specialists (13.36%) and district directors (1.73%) composed the remainder of the respondents (Table 10).

Table 10

Professional Position of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Faculty</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>75.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Specialists</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Directors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-nine of the 217 field faculty responding to the survey also held the position of county chair. The largest group of chairs (39%) was composed of Agriculture agents. The proportion of 4-H agents (34%) and Home Economics agents (22%) holding county chair positions was similar.
Those chairs who indicated "Other" as program area assignment represent county chairs in urban settings who hold minimal program area assignments (Table 11). Two thirds of the county chairs were male.

Table 11
County Chair Appointment and Program Area Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure

The mean tenure in a position with the Cooperative Extension Service was 11.70 years. Respondents were nearly equally distributed among four of seven categories of tenure (Table 12). All four of the categories represented employment of 20 years and under. Two categories, 5 years and under (22.6%) and 11 to 15 years (23.1%) were nearly equal in number of respondents. Categories of employment 20 years and over accounted for 14% of the respondents.
Table 12

**Years Tenure with the Cooperative Extension Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and under</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 11.70  
Median = 11.00  
Mode = 11.00  
SD = 7.00  
Range = 0 to 34

**Prior Educational Employment**

Nearly half (48%) of the respondents did not hold employment in an educational field prior to employment by the Cooperative Extension Service. Thirty percent indicated 1 to 5 years prior educational employment. The mean prior educational employment for the respondents was 3.11 years, ranging from 0 to 26 years (Table 13).
Table 13

Prior Educational Employment in Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 years</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean = 3.11
*SD = 5.141
*Range = 0 to 26

*Calculated Using Raw Data

Major Area of Highest Degree Attained

A high percentage (43%) of Extension faculty held their degrees in education. The next most prevalent group held majors in agriculture (27%). Table 14 contains data on academic major of highest degree attained.
Table 14

Major Area of Highest Degree Attained by Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Major</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>43.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Sources of Issues Training Utilized

The number of sources of issue training utilized by respondents ranged from 0 to 7, with a mean of 2.68 and standard deviation of 1.52. The maximum possible number of sources to indicate was 9.

The sources of training utilized are discussed in the section of the findings pertaining to Question 9.

Attitude Toward Issues Programming

Part I of the survey instrument (Appendix C) included 21 items to measure faculty perceived attitudes toward issues programming. The response categories on a Likert type scale ranged from a low of 1 for
"strongly disagree" to a rating of 5 for high or "strongly agree". The mean attitudinal rating for the respondents was 3.40, which is categorized as "undecided". Means ranged from a low of 1.43 to a high of 4.67 with a standard deviation of .50. A table summarizing the mean attitude ratings for each item of the scale is included in Appendix C.

Perceived Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Part II of the survey instrument included 25 items. Respondents rated each statement using three scales: importance to professional role, perceived knowledge about the concept, and perceived ability to implement the concept. Each rating scale ranged from 1=Low to 5=High. Mean ratings for the scales measuring importance, knowledge, and ability were calculated for each scale. Additional means were calculated for six sub-scales:

1. Issues Identification (Items 22-27)
2. Audience Identification (Items 28-30)
3. Resource Identification (Items 31-35)
4. Delivery Methods (Items 36-39)
5. Organization (Items 40-44)
6. Evaluation (Items 45-47)

Mean importance rating for the respondents was 3.92, with a range of 1.00 to 5.00, and a standard deviation of .61. The mean knowledge rating was 3.32, ranging from 1.46 to 5.00, and a standard deviation of .55. The mean ability to implement was the least of the three at 3.25. The range was from 1.00 to 4.88 and a standard deviation of .59 (Table 15).
Table 15

Mean Scores for Faculty Perception of Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>a Importance</th>
<th>a Knowledge</th>
<th>a Ability to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X  SD</td>
<td>X  SD</td>
<td>X  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues Identification</td>
<td>3.96 .65</td>
<td>3.38 .63</td>
<td>3.38 .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Identification</td>
<td>4.10 .74</td>
<td>3.44 .72</td>
<td>3.41 .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>4.00 .74</td>
<td>3.24 .66</td>
<td>3.14 .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Methods</td>
<td>3.71 .71</td>
<td>3.23 .64</td>
<td>3.17 .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.83 .72</td>
<td>3.40 .65</td>
<td>3.26 .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>3.93 .89</td>
<td>3.17 .82</td>
<td>3.00 .88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.92 .61</td>
<td>3.32 .55</td>
<td>3.25 .59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range

1.00-5.00  1.46-5.00  1.00-4.88

a
1=low
2=mod. low
3=moderate
4=mod. high
5=high
Though Extension faculty rated mean importance of issues programming as moderately high, they perceived their level of knowledge and ability to implement issues programming at a lower level, best described as moderate. This may be because most training to date has emphasized explanation of the concept of issues programming rather than analysis of its characteristics and application to program implementation. Much of the training may be described as self directed rather than required. Perhaps the motivation of the professional to pursue professional development in the area of issues programming has impact. Learning style of the individual may also have been a factor. Several of the sources of training emphasized independent reading or viewing without discussion. Other methods emphasized human interaction without a prerequisite of reading or study.

The same pattern was observed with sub-scale means. Mean importance ratings were slightly higher than mean knowledge ratings. Mean ability to implement ratings were less than mean knowledge ratings (Table 15). In all areas, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming, the group means represented ratings in the moderate to moderately high range.

Attitude Toward Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned

Each survey was coded as to the date of return. The return dates were analyzed by the week the survey was returned. In Table 16 mean attitude ratings by week of return are summarized.

Over half (57%) of the respondents replied within the first week. More than 84% had replied by the end of the third week. With the exception
of the third week, the number returned each week steadily declined. The mean attitude rating (3.56) was highest for respondents who replied the fifth week. The lowest mean attitude rating (2.96) was observed the last week.

The fact that mean attitude declined with later weeks of return may suggest that individuals responded because of perceived obligation to do so rather than because they wanted to provide input. Several other surveys had been administered by other researchers to this same population in a matter of several weeks. The respondents may have been tired of responding as well.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week Survey Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a \) 1=Strongly Disagree
2=Disagree
3=Undecided
4=Agree
5=Strongly Agree
Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned

Mean knowledge ratings (3.45) and mean ability ratings (3.40) of respondents were highest during Week 5. Respondents during Week 3 rated importance the highest with a mean of 4.02. Respondents replying during Week 6 rated knowledge (3.01) and importance (3.47) the lowest. Week 2 and week 6 respondents rated ability (3.14) equally low (Table 17).

Table 17

Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Week Survey Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Survey Returned</th>
<th>Importance*</th>
<th>Knowledge*</th>
<th>Ability*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Low
   2 = Med. Low
   3 = Moderate
   4 = Mod. High
   5 = High
Question 1: How do OCES faculty with differing tenure perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

Of the 289 respondents, tenure data were available for 280. Tenure was rounded to the nearest year, based upon records in the OCES personnel files as of July 1, 1989. The average tenure of the respondents was 11.7 years. Eleven years was also the median and mode, with a standard deviation of 7 years. Respondent tenure ranged from less than 1 year to 34 years.

Tenure and Attitude

Though all group means for attitude can be described as undecided, the mean attitude rating (3.5) was highest for respondents with 11-15 years tenure (Table 18). The lowest mean attitude (3.25) rating was indicated for respondents with 16 to 20 years tenure. The mean attitude rating became steadily more positive as tenure increased from 0 to 15 years. The mean decreased the greatest between the tenure categories of 11 to 15 years and 16 to 20 years.
Table 18

Attitude and Years Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Tenure</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Strongly Disagree
  2 = Disagree
  3 = Undecided
  4 = Agree
  5 = Strongly Agree

Tenure and Importance

Mean importance ratings ranged from a high of 4.44 for the respondents with more than 25 years tenure, and a low mean of 3.78 for the respondents with 0 to 5 years tenure. The greatest difference among mean ratings occurred between the 20 to 25 years tenure group and the over 25 year group (Table 19). The over 25 year group rated importance higher than the 20 to 25 years tenure group. The group with the greatest amount of experience was a very small group, reflecting less diversity of response than the larger group of 20 to 25 years tenure. By checking the data list, the researcher determined that the respondents in the over 25 year group were all from the program area Agriculture. Though respondents
from the Agriculture group rated importance of issues programming lowest among program area categories (3.69), the group representing the longest tenure rated importance at a higher level (4.44). This may reflect a greater recognition by long term faculty of the potential benefit of issues programming. Long tenured faculty have observed many changes in Extension over time and may recognize the need for change more readily than those less experienced.

**Tenure and Knowledge**

Respondents in the 25 years and over tenure category rated their knowledge about issues programming lowest with a mean of 2.85 (Table 19). The mean rating of respondents with 6 years to 25 years tenure did not vary greatly, only .04 across the groups. Respondents with 20 to 25 years tenure rated perceived knowledge the highest (3.38). This may represent a phenomenon of one's perception of one's own competence increasing with experience. The low mean knowledge rating of faculty with tenure over 25 years represents a group of people from one program area, agriculture. The researcher was able to determine the program area assignment of the respondents in the highest tenure group from the data list. Knowledge ratings of this tenure group (2.85) were lower than that of the Agriculture program area group (3.22). This tenure group may have participated less in training because of impending retirement.
Table 19

Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Years Tenure in OCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Low
  2 = Mod. Low
  3 = Moderate
  4 = Mod. High
  5 = High

Tenure and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Faculty in the over 25 years tenure category rated ability to implement issues programming (3.31) the highest of all tenure groups while rating importance the lowest among tenure groups. The 11-15 year group (3.29) followed closely behind. The mean ability ratings varied less across tenure groups than did importance, knowledge, and attitude (Table 19). Again, the more tenured faculty may exhibit the most confidence in their own ability, thus rating ability to implement at a higher level than less tenured faculty. Perceived importance may have varied more than ability to implement due to a combination of effects of professional roles.
Question 2: How do OCES faculty with different program area assignments perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

Program Area Assignment and Attitude

Two groups of faculty, "Other" and "CNRD", indicated the highest mean attitude ratings for the respondents, 3.79 and 3.71 respectively. Home Economics faculty (3.53) and 4-H faculty (3.52) indicated nearly equivalent mean attitude ratings. The mean ratings for these groups could be described as close to the agree rating. The Agriculture faculty indicated the lowest mean rating, 3.20, indicating undecided (Table 20). The pattern among these groups may reflect a philosophical basis of individuals who lead those program areas. The program areas of CNRD, Home Economics, and 4-H emphasize a social science, human problem approach to programs. The clientele are viewed as individuals, families or organizations. The Agriculture area emphasizes service to the industry of farmers or groups of agriculturally oriented industries, such as food processors, landscape nurseries, fruit growers, etc.

Nearly half of those indicating Other as program area assignment were individuals who serve as District Directors. One would anticipate that this group would demonstrate a more positive attitude since those positions in the organization are to provide leadership among field faculty.
Table 20

Attitude and Program Area Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Undecided  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

Program Area Assignment and Knowledge

CNRD, Home Economics, and 4-H faculty were nearly equal in mean rating of knowledge about issues programming (Table 21). Agriculture faculty rated knowledge lowest (3.22). This may be explained by the orientation toward natural sciences of many Agriculture specializations. CNRD, Home Economics, and 4-H program area roles are more oriented to a social science perspective from which issues programming is derived. Prior educational training of faculty in undergraduate programs as well as graduate programs may have impacted these ratings.
Program Area Assignment and Importance

Four of the five program area categories reflected ratings on importance of issues programming nearly equal to or above the mean rating of 4.05 (Table 21). These ratings can be described as moderately high. As with attitude, faculty indicating Agriculture as program area assignment rated importance lowest (3.69), in the range described as moderately high. Mean importance ratings for faculty by program area represented a greater spread than for mean ratings of knowledge and ability (Table 21).

Since the Agriculture program area has a larger number of faculty members, particularly among the state specialists, these faculty members have been able to function with more subject specialization emphasis than faculty within other program areas. Therefore, the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to programming may be less of a concern. In program areas with less faculty, the needs of clientele must be addressed through a more efficient approach that maximizes resources.

Program Area and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

4-H faculty (3.32) followed closely by CNRD (3.29) and Home Economics (3.28) rated ability to implement issues programming slightly above moderate (Table 21). Again, Agriculture faculty rated the variable lowest of the program area groups (3.19). The greatest deviation within program area groups was indicated for faculty in the "Other" category. Both the 4-H and CNRD program areas have traditionally involved multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary teamwork. CNRD also has had a public policy focus. These points may provide insight concerning why these groups of faculty
rate ability to implement issues programming slightly higher than do Agriculture faculty.

Table 21

Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Program Area Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Low
  2 = Mod. Low
  3 = Moderate
  4 = Mod. High
  5 = High

Question 3: How do OCES faculty with difference in prior training perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

Number of Sources of Training Utilized and Attitude

Mean attitude ratings increased as the number of sources of training utilized increased, with the exception of 5 and 7 sources (Table 22). Faculty members who utilized 3-6 sources tended to rate attitude toward issues programming above the mean of 3.40. The highest mean attitude rating was observed for faculty utilizing 6 sources of training. One would hypothesize that the more one has been exposed to a subject, the
more clearly one could formulate an attitude concerning the subject, positive or negative.

Table 22
Attitude and Amount of Training About Issues Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Sources of Training Utilized</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Undecided  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree

Number of Sources of Training Utilized and Importance

Faculty rated importance of issues programming progressively higher as the number of sources of training utilized increased (Table 23). The mean importance rating overall for the respondents can be described as moderately high. Those faculty who utilized 7 sources rated importance closest to the rating described as high of any group (4.85). Perhaps the frequency with which one is exposed to a concept facilitates the
individual’s ability to determine the relevance to his or her professional role.

**Number of Sources of Training Utilized and Knowledge Ratings**

Mean knowledge ratings increased as sources of issues training utilized increased, with the exception of 5 sources (Table 23). Faculty utilizing 4 or more sources of training rated perceived knowledge above the mean of 3.44. Knowledge can best be described as moderate to moderately high for Extension faculty, with those who utilized 6 and 7 sources as closest to moderately high. These findings were anticipated. It would seem logical that the more methods one uses to learn, the more likely one is to utilize methods appropriate to his/her learning style, and thus increase knowledge.
### Table 23

Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Amount of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Sources of Training Used</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Importance*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Low  
  2 = Mod. Low  
  3 = Moderate  
  4 = Mod. High  
  5 = High

### Number of Sources of Training Utilized and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Ability to implement issues programming ratings increased consistently as sources utilized increased with the exception of 5 sources (Table 23). Those faculty who utilized 4 or more sources tended to rate ability to implement issues programming above the mean of 3.38. Ability to implement issues programming can be described as ranging from moderate to moderately high, depending upon the number of sources of training utilized. It appeared that as the frequency of exposure to a concept increases, one can better determine how to utilize the concept.
Question 4: How do OCES faculty with differences in prior educational experience perceive attitudes, knowledge, importance, and ability to implement issues programming concepts?

Prior Employment in an Educational Field and Attitude

The respondents were nearly equally divided on the characteristic prior educational employment. Those faculty with no prior educational employment appeared to rate attitude slightly higher (Table 24).

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Employment</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Strongly Disagree
  2 = Disagree
  3 = Undecided
  4 = Agree
  5 = Strongly Agree

Prior Employment in an Educational Field and Knowledge, Importance, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

As with attitude, faculty with no prior educational employment rated knowledge, ability, and importance slightly higher than faculty with prior employment (Table 25). The group means differed the most on the variable importance, though the spread was less than .10.
Table 25

Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Prior Employment in an Educational Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Employment</th>
<th>Importance*</th>
<th>Knowledge*</th>
<th>Ability*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Low
  2 = Mod. Low
  3 = Moderate
  4 = Mod. High
  5 = High

The concept of issues programming did not evolve from the field of education. Rather it developed in the public policy area of study. Thus those individuals with prior employment in an educational field may not have had exposure to the concept. One would expect that if a high percentage of the respondents had prior employment in a public policy oriented field, the attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming would have differed based upon this variable.

Question 5: How do OCES faculty with differences in professional role perceive their attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

Professional Role and Attitude

Among the respondents, district directors (X=3.58) and the one respondent indicating "other" (X=3.62) as professional role demonstrated the most positive attitude toward issues programming, which can be described as agree. One would expect that the District Directors would rate attitude more positively than district specialists and county agents.
since their professional role involves providing leadership and facilitation of change among field faculty. Overall mean attitude ratings were in the range of undecided (Table 26). District specialists rated attitude slightly higher than county agents. State specialists clearly rated attitude as undecided as indicated by a mean rating of 3.28. The state specialists may have difficulty identifying how a high degree of subject matter specificity applies to an issues programming framework. Program determination from an issues perspective appears to use inductive rather than deductive reasoning. Deductive reasoning is the more common paradigm among research oriented faculty. Extension specialists as a group tend to be more research oriented than field faculty by nature of the professional role and affiliation with academic departments.

Table 26

Attitude and Professional Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Role</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Agent</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Specialist</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Specialist</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 - Strongly Disagree
  2 - Disagree
  3 - Undecided
  4 - Agree
  5 - Strongly Agree
Professional Role and Importance

Importance mean ratings followed a pattern similar to knowledge mean ratings. District directors and "other" rated importance highest, in the moderately high to high range. The state specialist mean rating (\( \bar{x} = 3.77 \)) was lowest, though also near moderately high. District specialists rated importance slightly higher than did county agents (Table 27). Since district specialists work in the same offices as district directors, there may be an influence coming into play because of frequency or nature of contact.

Professional Role and Knowledge

As with attitude, the district directors (\( \bar{x} = 3.47 \)) and "other" (\( \bar{x} = 4.19 \)) indicated the highest perceived knowledge about issues programming of all groups. Their perceived knowledge can be described as moderate to moderately high. County agents perceived knowledge was slightly higher than district specialists, though both can be described as moderate. Again, state specialists (\( \bar{x} = 3.26 \)) rated the variable at the lowest level among the groups (Table 27).
Table 27

Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming and Professional Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Role</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Agent</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Specialist</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Specialist</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Low
2 = Mod. Low
3 = Moderate
4 = Mod. High
5 = High

Professional Role and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Ability to implement mean ratings were very similar to knowledge ratings. District directors and "other" rated ability to implement highest and state specialists rated ability to implement the lowest among the groups. All mean ratings were close to the moderate level, except for the one respondent "other" whose rating was moderately high (Table 27). As indicated in the focus group interview findings, state specialists seem to be unsure whether they are to become generalists in an issues programming framework or how to utilize their specializations.
Question 6: How do OCES faculty with differences in academic major of highest degree attained perceive attitudes, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance to professional role of issues programming concepts?

Six response categories were included for respondents to indicate the academic major of the highest degree attained. The defined response categories included:

A. Education, including Extension Education, Agricultural Education, Home Economics Education, Environmental Education, Adult and Continuing Education or General Education.

B. Home Economics, including Nutrition, Family Resource Management, Clothing and Textiles, Home Furnishings, Equipment, or Family Relations and Human Development.

C. Agriculture, including Animal Science, Dairy Science, Poultry Science, Agronomy, Horticulture, and Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Economics or Economics.

D. Natural Resources or Biology, including Entomology, Biochemistry, Plant Pathology, Forestry, or Ecology.

E. Social Sciences, Rural Sociology, Sociology, Psychology, Community Development, or Youth Studies.

F. Other (please specify)

Fifteen respondents utilized the "other" category. Among the academic majors specified were: Fisheries, Parks and Recreation Administration, Veterinary Medicine, Educational Communications, Political Science, Public Administration, Counseling and Personnel Administration, Allied Medicine, Public Policy Management, and Vocational Education.
Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained and Attitude

When categorized by major of highest degree attained, 70% of the respondents indicated mean attitude ratings below the overall group mean of 3.51 (Table 28). This 70% was composed of two groups with highest degrees in Education and Agriculture. Their attitude can best be described as undecided.

Those respondents indicating "other" as academic major rated attitude highest, at the agree level. Social Science majors indicated the second highest mean rating. Faculty with Natural Resources and Home Economics as majors included one third of the respondents. They rated attitude as undecided, slightly above the overall mean (Table 28).

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>43.21</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group with highest perceived attitude, Other, indicated several academic majors closely allied to public policy and political science, areas in which issues programming originated. Those with a Social Science
major may also have been educated with a philosophical base similar to the public policy area, emphasizing human needs and problems.

Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained and Importance of Issues Programming

The respondent category Other contained the highest mean importance rating of all categories (Table 29). Little variation was indicated among over 60% of the respondents with academic majors in Education, Home Economics, and Social Sciences, though the mean ratings slightly exceeded the overall group mean of 3.96. Again, those respondents indicating a major area of Agriculture rated importance lowest. Perhaps individuals with a background in Agriculture have a philosophical base less oriented to human problems than toward economic enterprise related to agricultural products: livestock, agronomic crops, poultry, dairy animals, horticulture, etc.

Of the three variables, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement, importance was rated highest (x=3.96). This rating can be described as moderately high (Table 29). This rating may indicate a recognition by faculty that issues programming is a viable, possibly futuristic programming emphasis about which they currently are less knowledgeable and thus, insecure about implementing.

Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained and Knowledge

Respondents with Home Economics as a major rated perceived knowledge about issues programming higher than any other group. Education majors and Natural Resources majors were similar to one another in ratings. More
than one third of the respondents, i.e., those indicating majors of Agriculture, Social Sciences, or Other rated knowledge below the mean of 3.31 (Table 29). It may be that Home Economics faculty have been exposed to concepts in their educational background that contribute to the perceived knowledge. For example, content about the social action process or public policy education models would contribute to understanding of issues programming.

Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Respondents with Home Economics as a major area indicated the highest mean ability to implement issues programming rating ($x=3.38$) (Table 29). Respondents categorized as Agriculture and Other rated ability to implement the lowest, below the overall mean of 3.24. Fifty three percent of the respondents, grouped into Education, Natural Resources, and Social Sciences, indicated ratings that clustered near the overall mean (Table 29). Home Economists may perceive their ability to implement at a higher level because their programming focuses upon human problems. These faculty may already identify current programming as issues programming. Though faculty in the Other category rated attitude highest, they may be less confident concerning implementation. The Agriculture faculty may have difficulty identifying any current program emphases with the issues programming focus. Thus issues programming is perceived as more difficult to implement.
Table 29

Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement and Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>43.82</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.21</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Low  
2 = Mod. Low  
3 = Moderate  
4 = Mod. High  
5 = High

Question 7: What relationships exist among the variables attitude toward issues programming, knowledge, ability to implement, importance, tenure, program area assignment, prior training about issues, prior experience in an educational field, and major area of highest degree attained?

One question in the study was to determine the relationships among selected characteristic variables and attitude, knowledge, ability to implement, and importance. Multiple regression analysis was selected as a means to analyze the collective and separate contributions of the independent variables attitude, knowledge, ability to implement, importance, tenure, program area assignment, prior training about issues programming, prior educational experience, and major area of highest degree attained. Dependent variables were attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement.
The Stepwise Model was selected to use since no theoretical basis existed for considering any independent variable prior to any other. This process is designed to select the one independent variable at each step that makes the largest contribution to $R^2$. Since this model was applied to a population rather than a sample, the probabilities will not be presented.

Relationship of Attitude and Selected Characteristic Variables

Two characteristic variables were found to have low, positive associations with Attitude toward issues programming. The variables Training ($r=.20$) and Program Area Assignment ($r=.15$) each provided statistically significant contribution to $R$ for the dependent variable Attitude (Table 30).

The other characteristic variables were not included in the equation, thus they did not contribute to $R^2$. Approximately 16% of the variance is accounted for by these two variables.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Assignment</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.0234</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training About Issues</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.0405</td>
<td>.0331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship of Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement to Selected Characteristic Variables

Training was the only variable found to contribute to $R$ for the three dependent variables importance, knowledge, and ability to implement. They were all low, positive associations (Tables 31-33). The strongest association exists among the variables knowledge and training (.33). The associations among ability and training ($r=.26$) (Table 32) and importance and training ($r=.25$) (Table 33) were nearly equal. Training accounted for approximately 33% of the variance of knowledge, 26% of the variance of ability to implement, and 25% of the variance of importance. Therefore, training may serve as a predictor of attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming in studies using a sample of a population.

Table 31

Regression of Knowledge of Issues Programming on Selected Characteristic Variables (Stepwise Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R$ Increment</th>
<th>$b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.1068</td>
<td>.1033</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32

Regression of Ability to Implement Issues Programming on Selected Characteristic Variables (Stepwise Entry)  
\[n=289\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>(R)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.0672</td>
<td>.0636</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

Regression of Importance of Issues Programming on Selected Characteristic Variables  
\[n=289\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>(R)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.0599</td>
<td>.0563</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8: What are the training needs of OCES Extension faculty concerning specific concepts of issues programming?

The knowledge and ability to implement discrepancy scores for the six sub-scales of issues programming are listed in Table 34. The areas with the top three discrepancy scores for knowledge and ability to implement issues programming are listed below. The rankings are the same for both knowledge and ability to implement issues programming. These are
high priority areas for Extension faculty training about issues programming.

Knowledge and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

1. Resource Identification
2. Evaluation of Issues Programming
3. Audience Identification

Table 34

Knowledge and Ability to Implement Discrepancy Scores for Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Knowledge Discrepancy X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Ability to Implement Discrepancy X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues Identification</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Identification</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Identification</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Delivery Methods</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Issues</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Issues Programming</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge and Ability to Implement Discrepancy Scores for individual items in each area can be found in Appendix D.

"Organization of Issues Programming" and "Program Delivery Methods" had the lowest discrepancy scores for knowledge and ability to implement. The rank order on these two categories was reversed for ability to implement discrepancies. The rank order of all areas by discrepancy scores from high to low is listed in Table 35.
Table 35

**Rank Order of Discrepancy Scores by Area of Knowledge and Ability to Implement Issues Programming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues Identification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Identification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Delivery Methods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. for Issues Prog.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Highest
6 = Lowest

Selecting areas with the highest discrepancy scores is one way to begin organizing a training program for Extension faculty. Another way would be to examine individual items within all areas that had high knowledge or ability to implement discrepancy scores. The 25 items on the questionnaire were ranked in descending order according to knowledge and ability to implement discrepancy scores. Thirteen items with knowledge discrepancy scores above the median were selected as high priority items for organizing a training program. The same process was utilized for ability to implement discrepancy scores. Priority items for training based upon the knowledge discrepancy scores are presented in Table 36 and those based upon ability to implement discrepancy scores are in Table 37.
Table 36

High Priority Items for Training Based On Knowledge Discrepancy Scores

Area/Item

Issues Identification

23. Strategies to prioritize issues.
25. Anticipatory planning processes to identify emerging critical issues.

Audience Identification

29. Marketing strategies to maximize program accessibility to clientele.
30. Methods/procedures to involve people in issues programming.

Resource Identification

32. Obtaining financial resources to support issues programming.
34. Utilization of total university research base to address issues.
35. Identification of networks or coalitions to enhance issues programming.

Delivery Methods

37. Design of delivery methods appropriate for issue content and goals.
38. Public policy education process as it addresses issues.

Evaluation

45. Assessing impact of issue based programming.
46. Communication to stakeholders regarding issues programming.
47. Evaluation methodologies appropriate for issues programming.
Table 37  

**High Priority Items for Training Based On Ability to Implement Discrepancy Scores**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Item #</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Anticipatory planning processed to identify emerging critical issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Role of clientele in issues identification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Marketing strategies to maximize program accessibility to clientele.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Obtaining financial resources to support issues programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Utilization of total university research base to address issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Identification of networks or coalitions to enhance issues programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Public policy education process as it addresses issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Strategies to facilitate interdisciplinary teamwork.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Flexibility of staffing patterns to address issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Assessing impact of issues based programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Communication to stakeholders regarding issues programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluation methodologies appropriate for issues programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 9: What sources of information and training are utilized by Extension faculty regarding issues programming?

Respondents were asked to check all sources of training they had utilized concerning issues programming. Eight sources were listed as well as one indicated "other" for respondents to designate sources utilized. The eight categories and frequencies of use are summarized in Table 38. Frequencies of use of the sources are summarized by professional position and totals for all respondents (Table 38).

Table 38
Sources of Training About Issues Programming Used by Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Training</th>
<th>Field Faculty</th>
<th>District Dir.</th>
<th>State Spec.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 217</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 65</td>
<td>n = 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District In-Service</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4 80.00</td>
<td>6 9.23</td>
<td>155 53.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association Meetings</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3 60.00</td>
<td>10 15.38</td>
<td>113 39.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Investing in America's Future&quot; Videotape</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4 80.00</td>
<td>14 21.54</td>
<td>99 34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading USDA Publications</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5 100.00</td>
<td>40 61.54</td>
<td>116 40.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues Teleconference</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4 80.00</td>
<td>7 10.77</td>
<td>71 24.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Worker's Orientation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 40.00</td>
<td>7 10.77</td>
<td>33 11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1011</td>
<td>13 20.00</td>
<td>28 9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Coursework</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6 9.23</td>
<td>20 6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Conference with Kathy Dalgaard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>20 30.77</td>
<td>36 12.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though District In-service was the most frequently cited source of issues training among all Extension faculty, only slightly more than half of the respondents used this method of training (Table 38). District
inservice was cited most frequently by field faculty who have a greater opportunity to participate in such programs than do state specialists.

Reading USDA publications was the second most frequently cited source of training, utilized by 40% of all respondents. It was utilized by faculty in all positions, with state specialists citing it nearly twice as often as field faculty. All district directors indicated reading USDA publications (Table 39).

National Association Meetings, used by 39% of the respondents, ranked third as a source of training. It ranked second for field faculty, who referred to this source three times more often than did state specialists. A higher proportion of district directors cited national meetings as a source of training than any other group (Table 39).

Ranked fourth was the ES-USDA videotape "Investing in America's Future". Slightly more than a third of the respondents have viewed the video. District Directors used this source proportionately more than other faculty (Table 39).

The fifth ranked source, Issues Teleconference, was used by about one fourth of the respondents. District Directors, followed by field faculty, were more inclined to have used this resource (Table 39).

All other sources of training were used by 13% or less of the respondents. Table 39 contains the nine sources of training in descending order for Extension faculty by position.

Several additional sources of training about issues programming were cited by respondents. Those sources are listed in Table 40.
Table 39

Frequency of Use of Sources of Issue Training by Extension Faculty in Descending Order

All Faculty

1. District In-service
2. Reading USDA Publications
3. National Association Meetings
4. "Investing In America's Future" Videotape
5. Issues Teleconference
6. OSU Conference with Kathy Dalgaard
7. New Worker's Orientation
8. Other
9. University Coursework

Field Faculty

1. District In-service
2. National Association Meetings
3. "Investing In America's Future" Videotape
4. Reading USDA Publications
5. Issues Teleconference
6. New Worker's Orientation
7. Other
8. University Coursework
9. OSU Conference with Kathy Dalgaard

District Directors

1. Reading USDA Publications
2. "Investing In America's Future" Videotape
   OSU Conference with Kathy Dalgaard
   Issues Teleconference
   District In-service
3. National Association Meetings
4. New Worker's Orientation

State Specialists

1. Reading USDA Publications
2. OSU Conference with Kathy Dalgaard
3. "Investing In America's Future" videotape
4. Other
5. National Association Meetings
6. Issues Teleconference
   New Worker's Orientation
7. District In-service
   University Coursework
Table 40

Additional Sources of Training About Issues Programming Listed by Extension Faculty

**Listed by Field Faculty:**
- OCES Water Quality Task Force
- Publications
- Listening to what is happening
- Youth at Risk Regional Conference
- Volunteer work in the community
- 1989 Annual Conference (3)
- ES/USDA Annual Conference
- Informal agent discussions
- Reading *Journal of Extension* and professional association magazines
- Material from OSU and Director of Extension

**Listed by State Specialists:**
- From magazines and journals (2)
- Talk with peers nationally
- Annual Conference
- National 4-H Specialists Invitational Conference
- Discussion with peers in Ohio (2)
- Regional committee
- Focus Group (3)
- On the job training
- National Issues Program participation
- National 4-H Executive Development Institute

Upon examination of the combination of sources of training utilized by field faculty compared to state specialists, the two sources most used by field faculty emphasized dialogue. The two sources used most frequently by specialists emphasized independent thinking and analyzing. Perhaps these learning preferences have implications for the variables studied. One would anticipate that training methods that incorporate dialogue would enhance critical thinking, analysis, and synthesis of thought. Perhaps particular groups of faculty, such as specialists, have
less opportunity to participate in conferences that involve dialogue concerning Extension program development. The academic discipline focus of the specialist may promote involvement in associations with less Extension program orientation.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Both the survey method and the qualitative Focus Group Interview method were used in this descriptive, comparative, correlational study to examine attitudes toward issues programming and issues programming training needs of Ohio Extension faculty. The Borich Model of Needs Assessment was used to collect, analyze, and report the quantitative data. The Focus Group Interview transcriptions were analyzed using computerized sorting and data reduction techniques. Thirty three Extension faculty participated in Focus Group Interview sessions from mid November, 1989 through mid January, 1990. Three hundred twenty seven surveys were mailed during December, 1989. Two hundred ninety eight of the original surveys mailed were returned, representing a 91.4% rate of return. After eliminating incomplete questionnaires, two hundred eighty nine were considered valid for analysis.

Characteristics of the faculty and perceived attitudes, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming were described using frequencies, percents, and measures of central tendency. Chi Square analyses were used to compare early and late respondents. Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was selected to examine variance of the collective and separate contributions of the independent variables attitude, importance, knowledge, ability to implement, tenure, program area assignment, prior training about issues programming, prior educational
experience, and major area of highest degree attained. Training needs were determined by calculating knowledge and ability to implement discrepancy scores for competency items in issues programming (see Borich Model in Chapters 3 and 4).

Focus Group Interview Summary

Though participants could describe many characteristics of issues programming, two components were not clearly identified: the controversial nature of issues and the public policy component of issues programming. Participants raised many concerns about issues programming. Advantages and disadvantages were not clearly discernable. Many concerns were identified as both advantages and disadvantages. Examples include: how will disciplines work within issues programming; what motivation and reward exists in promotion and tenure for interdisciplinary work; how issues are to be identified; who composes the clientele base within the organizational mission; and how issues programming alters traditional programming.

Characteristics of Extension Faculty

The majority of the participants in the study were male with Agriculture as a program area assignment. Approximately 60% of the females were assigned as home economists. Seventy five percent of the respondents were field faculty, the majority of whom held county assignments. About one third of the field faculty held county chair appointments. The mean tenure in Extension of the respondents was 11.70 years. The group was nearly equally divided on the variable prior educational employment. The mean number of years of prior employment in an educational field was 3.11. A high percentage (43%) of the respondents hold their highest degrees in
education. The mean number of sources of training concerning issues programming utilized by the participants in the study was 2.68 of a possible 9 sources.

The mean attitudinal rating for the respondents was 3.40, which is categorized as undecided. Perceived importance of issues programming was 3.92, described as moderately high. Perceived knowledge was rated as moderate with a mean rating of 3.32. Perceived ability to implement issues programming was rated the lowest, 3.25 or moderate. Whether analyzed by sub scales or overall, mean importance ratings were slightly higher than mean knowledge ratings. Mean ability to implement ratings were less than mean knowledge ratings.

Though mean attitude ratings declined with the week of survey return, mean ratings of importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming did not repeat the overall pattern.

Tenure and Attitude, Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Respondents with 11-15 years tenure rated attitude at 3.5, slightly higher than the overall mean of 3.4. Mean importance and mean ability to implement were rated highest by respondents with more than 25 years tenure. Faculty with 20 to 25 years tenure rated perceived knowledge highest among the tenure categories.
Program Area Assignment and Attitude, Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

The two program area groups representing the smallest numbers of faculty, CNRD and Other, indicated the highest mean attitude ratings of all respondents. Mean importance ratings for faculty by program area represented a greater spread than for mean ratings of knowledge and ability. CNRD, Home Economics, and 4-H faculty were nearly equal in ratings of knowledge and ability to implement issues programming. The Agriculture faculty indicated the lowest mean ratings of all program area groups for attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming.

Prior Training and Attitude, Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Mean attitude ratings increased as the number of sources of training utilized increased, with the exception of 5 and 7 sources. The highest mean attitude rating was observed for faculty utilizing 6 sources of training. Mean importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming also tended to increase as the number of sources of training utilized increased. It appeared that faculty who utilized 4 sources of training rated all of the variables at or above the mean.

Prior Employment in an Educational Field and Attitude, Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Faculty with no prior educational employment appeared to rate attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues
programming slightly higher than did faculty with prior educational employment.

Professional Role and Attitude, Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Among the categories of professional role, District Directors and those indicating "Other" rated attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming the highest among the groups. State specialists' ratings were consistently the lowest for each variable.

Academic Major of Highest Degree Attained and Attitude, Importance, Knowledge, and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

Those faculty with degree areas of Social Science and "Other" rated attitude highest. Among the academic majors indicated as "Other" were several areas closely allied to public policy and political science, the fields in which issues programming originated. Respondents with Agriculture as a major area consistently rated attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming lowest. Faculty with Home Economics listed as the highest degree attained perceived knowledge and ability to implement highest among the groups.

Relationships Among Attitude, Importance, Knowledge, Ability to Implement and Selected Characteristic Variables

Two characteristic variables were found to have low, positive associations with attitude toward issues programming:
training and program area assignment when stepwise multiple regression was run. Training was also found to have a low, positive association with importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming.

Training Needs of Extension Faculty

Knowledge and ability to implement discrepancy scores were calculated for six sub scales composing the issues programming scale. High discrepancy scores indicated the following three areas as high priority for training:

Knowledge and Ability to Implement Issues Programming

1. Resource Identification
2. Evaluation of Issues Programming
3. Audience Identification

Sources of Information and Training Utilized by Extension Faculty

Among all faculty, district in-service, reading USDA publications, and national professional association meetings were the three most frequently used sources of training. Reading of USDA publications and viewing the USDA videotape "Investing in America's Future" were consistently among the top four choices of faculty of all professional positions. The sources listed most frequently by field faculty can be described as including dialogue. Those utilized by Extension specialists focused upon independent thinking and analysis.
Conclusions

The researcher found that ratings of attitude, importance, knowledge and ability to implement issues programming did not differ based upon the time frame in which the mail survey was returned. Therefore, the following conclusions can be drawn concerning the population of Extension faculty studied:

1. Attitude toward issues programming of Ohio Extension faculty is neutral.

2. Extension faculty perceive issues programming as relatively important, though they do not perceive their knowledge and ability to implement this emphasis as very high.

3. Faculty are utilizing a variety of sources of training about issues programming.

4. Faculty have training needs in the areas of resource identification, evaluation of issues programming, and audience identification.

5. The variance in faculty training needs and their perceived attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming can be explained by the amount of training utilized. The variance in attitude can also be explained by program area assignment.

6. As the number of sources of training utilized increases, perceived attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming is rated higher.

7. Faculty with program area assignments in Agriculture consistently perceive attitude, importance, knowledge, and ability to implement issues programming at a lower level than do faculty in other program area categories.
Implications

This research has implications for those who plan to administer issues programming as a programming emphasis for Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as well as for those who develop in-service education programs. The findings in this study suggest that future training efforts should be focused on areas such as evaluation, resource identification, and audience identification. These were the competency areas in which faculty training needs were greatest. If issues programming is to become a major focus for the planning and implementation of Extension programs, then Extension administrators need to consider the neutral attitude of faculty. Administrators may need to clarify questions concerning promotion and tenure, how discipline or subject matter specialization interfaces with issues programming, how issues are to be identified and by whom, who are the priority clientele groups for Extension, and how will issues programming as an emphasis be implemented with traditional programming. Training may also need to emphasize the public policy focus and controversial nature of issues, since those were characteristics not readily identified by faculty. Administrators may also need to consider that among present faculty, the majority are agriculturally oriented and they perceive issues programming less favorably than other faculty. If the organizational emphasis is to shift toward issues programming, the agricultural faculty may need to be a target group for training. In addition, as new personnel are hired, attention may need to be given to recruitment of individuals with background in public policy, political science, or social sciences. Specialists may also be a target group for in-service training emphasizing how disciplinary specialization is applied.
to issues programming. Since that group of faculty tended to utilize more independent means of training, perhaps opportunities to foster dialogue are needed. It may be that networks of specialists across discipline boundaries would be beneficial.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The following recommendations are based upon the findings of the study:

1. This study be conducted with Extension professionals in other states after minor revisions are made in the instrument.

2. This study be repeated with samples of Extension faculty in Ohio after in-service training has been provided in the areas of resource identification, evaluation, and audience identification.

3. A study be conducted using both cognitive measures of knowledge of issues programming concepts and knowledge discrepancy scores to confirm the accuracy of discrepancy scores with this population.

4. The attitudinal section (Part I) of the instrument be re-administered over time to measure change of Extension faculty attitude toward issues programming.

5. A longitudinal study be developed to examine the degree to which issues programming is implemented by Extension faculty.
APPENDIX A
BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE (HSRC)
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Date November 3, 1989

RESEARCH PROTOCOL:

89B0156 ISSUE PROGRAMMING TRAINING NEEDS OF OHIO EXTENSION FACULTY,
Joan Gritzacher, Nikki L. Conklin, Home Economics Education

presented for review by the Behavioral and Social Sciences Review Committee
to ensure proper protection of the rights and welfare of the individuals
involved with consideration of the methods used to obtain informed consent
and the justification of risks in terms of potential benefits to be gained,
the Committee action was:

____ APPROVED            _____ DEFERRED*
____ APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS* _____ DISAPPROVED
____ NO REVIEW NECESSARY

*CONDITIONS/COMMENTS:

Subjects were deemed NOT AT RISK and the protocol was unanimously APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. Revise the initial phone script as follows and provide a copy to the Committee:
   a. State that participation is completely voluntary and
      that no records will be kept as to identify
      participating or non-participating subjects.
   b. Clarify disposition of the tapes upon completion of the study.

2. Revise the letter from the Office of the Director as follows and provide a copy to the Committee:
   a. Identify Dr. Gritzacher as the principal investigator
      (second paragraph).
   b. Restate third and fourth paragraphs to assure subjects
      that participation is completely voluntary. Delete
      "cooperation is critical."

3. Provide a copy of the final questionnaire, when available.
If you agree to the above conditions, PLEASE SIGN THIS FORM IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW AND RETURN WITH ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED TO ROOM 205, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTER, 1314 KINNEAR ROAD, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212, within one week. Upon such compliance, the approval form will be mailed to you. (In case of a deferred protocol, please submit the requested information at your earliest convenience. The next meeting of the Committee will be two weeks from the meeting date indicated above.)

DATE: 12/29 Signature(s):

HS-025A (Rev. 3/85)
(CONDITIONS/COMMENTS)
I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

ISSUE PROGRAMMING TRAINING NEEDS OF OHIO EXTENSION FACULTY

Dr. Joan Griesmacher or his/her authorized representative has (Principal Investigator)
explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: _____________________ Signed: ____________________ (Participant)

Signed: _____________________ Signed: ____________________
(Principal Investigator or his/ her Authorized Representative) (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: _____________________

HS-027 (Rev. 3/87) — (To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
Dear [Name],

I am pleased you are interested in participating in a Focus Group Interview to discuss Issue Programming. The session in which you agreed to participate is scheduled for:

Date: [Date]
Time: [Time]
Location: [Location]

As indicated in our phone conversation, the session will last no longer than 1 1/2 hours. Directions to the meeting site are enclosed.

FOCUS GROUP PROCEDURES

The intent of the Focus Group Interview is to provide descriptive information regarding Extension faculty concepts of issues programming and perceived advantages and disadvantages of its implementation. The session will focus upon a maximum of 7 questions.

To enable me to accurately transcribe the focus group discussion, it will be necessary to tape record the proceedings. A typewritten transcription will be prepared immediately following the focus group. Individual identities will be linked to comments by numbers to maintain anonymity. Once the tape is transcribed and checked for accuracy, the tape will be destroyed. Your comments will be confidential. At any time you may choose whether or not to respond.

The information collected will be utilized two ways:

1. To provide a description of perceptions of issues programming. The information obtained in all seven focus groups will be summarized by major themes.

2. To provide a basis to review a survey instrument concerning faculty attitude toward issues programming for content validity.

I do appreciate your willingness to participate. I will call to remind you of our meeting a day ahead. If you should have questions, concerns, or a change of plans, please feel free to contact me at work or home. My office phone numbers are: Columbus 614-292-6182 or Union County 513-644-8117. Home is 614-666-1631.

Sincerely,

Nikki L. Conklin
Doctoral Candidate
Home Economics Education
SYSTEMATIC NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE
FOCUS GROUP TELEPHONE INVITATION

Telephone invitation 10-14 days in advance of scheduled meeting.

Hello. This is Nikki Conklin, doctoral candidate in the Department of Home Economics Education, The Ohio State University. I would like to ask you to contribute to a study designed to determine the "Issues Programming Training Needs of Ohio Extension Faculty".

Your name was identified through a random selection process. I will be conducting several Focus Group Interviews to discuss faculty concepts of issues programming, the advantages, and disadvantages of its implementation in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

The Focus Group Interview is a small group discussion that enables one to explore a previously un-researched subject. The activity lasts 1-1 1/2 hours maximum. Would you please check your calendar to see if you could join a focus group at ____________________________ (location) on ____________________________ (date and time)?

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS ENTIRELY VOLUNTARY.

(If individual is not available, thank him/her for his/her time and move to the next randomly selected name. If the individual is available, proceed with the explanation.

I am pleased you will be able to participate. I will be sending you a letter including the procedures for the focus group, a confirmation of the date, time and location of the session, and directions to the location. You will also be reminded by phone 1 day in advance of the session.

Thank you for your time. I am looking forward to our interview.
FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW
QUESTIONING

ICE BREAKER: SMALL TALK AND REFRESHMENTS

1. Describe one characteristic of issues programming in your own words.

2. How do you perceive that issues based programming differs from the way you currently program?

3. What are the disadvantages/barriers to issues programming?

4. What are the benefits/advantages to issues programming?

5. How would you approach your job if you were told that in 1991 you were to spend 50% of your time doing issues programming?

(sub questions used only if points not brought out in discussion)

a. What would be the agent's role?
b. What would be the content of the programs?
c. What would the clients do?
d. How would agents and clientele interact?
e. What would be the specialist's role?
APPENDIX C
December 1, 1989

Dear Extension Professional:

Issues programming is a new focus of the Cooperative Extension System nationally. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service has made a commitment to allocate the resources of faculty time and financial support to issues programming.

In order to assist faculty in the implementation of issues programming, it is important to identify training needs to direct future in-service education programs. Nikki L. Conklin, doctoral candidate, Department of Home Economics Education, is conducting a study to identify "Issues Programming Training Needs of Ohio Extension Faculty". Dr. Joan Gritzmecher, Department of Home Economics Education, College of Human Ecology, is the principal investigator and graduate advisor.

You have been identified to offer input. YOUR IDENTITY WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. The commitment will require no longer than 20 minutes of your time. If you have questions concerning the survey, contact Nikki Conklin directly at 614-292-6182 or in Union County, 513-644-8117.

Please complete the survey and return it in the envelope provided by December 30, 1989. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.
A token of appreciation is enclosed.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser
Director

Keith L. Smith
Associate Director

Joan E. Gritzmecher
Graduate Advisor

Ohio Cooperative Extension Service
January 2, 1990

Dear Extension Professional,

As you sorted through the stack of mail that accumulated over the holidays, you may have come across a letter and survey entitled "Perspectives on Issues Programming in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. In order to complete the research for my doctoral degree, I need as many replies as I can obtain. Since Ohio Extension agents and specialists are my population, I would like my research to truly represent the thoughts of that group.

If you have set aside the survey with intentions of completing it later, please take time now to respond. If you did not receive the survey or have misplaced it, please contact me for another copy.

I would be happy to answer any questions or concerns that you have about how the information will be utilized. Please feel free to call me at 614-292-6182 or at home, 614-666-1631.

If you have already returned the survey, thank you for your input!

Sincerely,

Nikki L. Conklin
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Home Economics Education
The Ohio State University
Dear Extension Professional,

A few weeks ago, you received a packet from me containing a survey about "Perspectives on Issues Programming in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service". This study is being conducted as part of my doctoral program. IF YOU HAVE ALREADY COMPLETED AND RETURNED THE SURVEY, PLEASE DISREGARD THIS REQUEST. IF YOU HAVE NOT RETURNED THE SURVEY, PLEASE READ ON.

Issues programming is a new focus of the Cooperative Extension System nationally. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service has made a commitment to allocate the resources of faculty time and financial support to issues programming.

You have been identified to offer input. YOUR IDENTITY WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. The commitment will require about 20 minutes of your time. The survey is designed to examine faculty attitudes and in-service training needs in the area of issues programming.

If you have questions concerning the survey, contact me at 614-292-6182. Please complete the survey and return it in the envelope provided by JANUARY 16, 1990. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mikki L. Conklin
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Home Economics Education
The Ohio State University

January 10, 1990
PERSPECTIVES ON ISSUES PROGRAMMING IN THE OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Department of Home Economics Education
College of Human Ecology
The Ohio State University
December, 1989
INTRODUCTION

Please respond honestly and accurately following the instructions provided for each section. It is extremely important that you answer all of the questions in this booklet. Your responses are very important and will be kept confidential. The questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope.

PART I

Instructions - On the following pages are listed 22 statements that describe possible attitudes of Extension professionals about issues programming. Even if you are not yet implementing issues programming, you are aware of this as a focus in the Cooperative Extension System. For purposes of this study, the following definition is being utilized:

ISSUES PROGRAMMING identifies human problems in their own context—that is, outside the Extension organization—without prior regard for traditional Extension subject matter, audiences, and methods of program delivery.

In Part I, the following scale is used to measure ATTITUDE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD=Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>D=Disagree</th>
<th>U=Undecided</th>
<th>A=Agree</th>
<th>SA=Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Briefly reflect on what you think and how you feel about issues programming, and then respond to the following general statements about yourself, your work setting, and the Cooperative Extension Service.

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling one response following each statement.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I am satisfied with my job.  

In this case, the circled response indicates Agreement with the statement.
1. A shift to issue programming is a progressive change for Extension.  

2. Issues programming enables Extension educators to facilitate significant community change.  

3. Issues programming should replace program area emphases.  

4. Issues programming is a temporary fad.  

5. I am confident about how my professional role contributes toward issues programming.  

6. Issues programming has the potential of broadening the resource base for Extension.  

7. I am apprehensive about my role in issues based programming.  

8. An issues programming orientation will displace present Extension personnel.  

9. Issues programming is inconsistent with the Land Grant mission.  

10. The content of most issue based programs is not relevant to my clientele.  

11. Issues programming will not provide information to clientele that is any different than disciplinary programming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CIRCLE ONE)
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Issues programming will facilitate coalition building to support Extension.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Issues programming is more responsive to societal concerns than disciplinary programming.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Resources should be reallocated to provide more emphasis on issues programming.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Issues programming will enhance funding support for Extension.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Issues programming will help Extension position itself as organization widely relevant to society.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Issues programming alienates traditional Extension audiences.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Issues programming will broaden the available expertise.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>To be futuristic, Extension must address issues programming.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Issues programming is more comprehensive, flexible, and responsive to change than disciplinary programming.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Issues programming will not cause changes in clientele that are any different from those caused by disciplinary programs.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II:

Each of us has a variety of educational needs to improve our effectiveness as Extension educators. The following is a list of competencies that may benefit you as you pursue issue programming.

You are asked to rate each competency according to three areas:

IMPORTANCE- How important is this competency to you in your present professional role?

KNOWLEDGE- At what level would you rate your knowledge in the competency described?

ABILITY TO IMPLEMENT - At what level would you rate your ability to implement the described competency in your present professional role?

Please respond to all three areas for every item. Rate your perception of importance, knowledge, and ability to implement by circling the number that corresponds to the appropriate level.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Ability to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of priority community issues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance Low</td>
<td>Knowledge Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Needs assessment strategies to identify issues of wide public concern.

23. Strategies to prioritize issues. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

24. Criteria for selecting issues. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

25. Anticipatory planning processes to identify emerging critical issues. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

26. Statement of issues in terms not bounded by traditional program areas. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

27. Role of clientele in issue identification. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

28. Identification of target audiences. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

29. Marketing strategies to maximize program accessibility to clientele. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

30. Methods/procedures to involve people in issues programming. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

31. Identification of subject matter resources to support issues programming. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

32. Obtaining financial resources to support issues programming. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

33. Problem solving and critical thinking skills to address issues. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

34. Utilization of total university research base to address issues. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |

35. Identification of networks or coalitions to enhance issues programming. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Ability to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Determination of program strategies for specific target audiences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Design of delivery methods appropriate for issue content and goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Public policy education process as it addresses issues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Use of electronic technologies in program delivery.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Strategies to facilitate interdisciplinary teamwork.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Flexibility of staffing patterns to address issues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Task force management skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Role of volunteers in issues program development and implementation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Purpose of advisory committees in issues program development.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Assessing impact of issues based programming.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Communication to stakeholders regarding issues programming.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluation methodologies appropriate for issues programming.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by circling the letter corresponding to the most appropriate response for each.

48. In what Extension program area do you spend the greatest portion of your time? (circle one)

1. 4-H
2. AGRICULTURE
3. HOME ECONOMICS
4. COMMUNITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
5. OTHER (please specify) _________________________________

49. Gender

1. FEMALE
2. MALE

50. Professional Position

1. COUNTY AGENT
2. DISTRICT SPECIALIST
3. STATE SPECIALIST
4. DISTRICT DIRECTOR
5. OTHER__________

3A. If a state specialist, how long have you held an Extension appointment? (Specify Years) __________

51. Did you hold a position in education prior to your employment with Extension?

____ yes ______ no

If yes, for how long? ________________ (specify in years)
52. What sources of training about issues programming have you utilized? 
(Check all that apply)

___ Reading USDA publications about Issues Programming
___ Viewed "Investing in America's Future"- ES-USDA Issue
   Overview Videotape
___ Participated in OSU Conference on Issues Programming by Kathy
   Dalgaard, 9/88
___ Issues Teleconference, March, 1989
___ National Association Meetings sessions
___ New Worker Orientation
___ District In-service
___ University Coursework
___ Other (please indicate) _________________________

53. What was your academic major in your highest degree? 
(circle one)

A. Education, including Extension Education, Agricultural 
   Education, Home Economics Education, Environmental Education, 
   Adult and Continuing Education or General Education

B. Home Economics, including Nutrition, Family Resource 
   Management, Clothing and Textiles, Home Furnishings, 
   Equipment, or Family Relations and Human Development

C. Agriculture, including Animal Science, Dairy 
   Science, Poultry Science, Agronomy, Horticulture, and 
   Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Economics or 
   Economics

D. Natural Resources or Biology, including Entomology, 
   Biochemistry, Plant Pathology, Forestry or Ecology

E. Social Science, Rural Sociology, Sociology, Psychology, 
   Community Development, or Youth Studies

F. Other (please specify): _________________________
PLEASE RETURN BY **DECEMBER 20** TO:

Nikki L. Conklin  
Ohio Cooperative Extension Service  
The Ohio State University  
Room 4, Agriculture Administration Building  
2120 Fyffe Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

THANK YOU

___ CHECK HERE IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY.
PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ADD ANY COMMENTS YOU MAY HAVE IN THE SPACE BELOW.
Table 41
Response to Individual Items on Attitudes Scale by Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A shift to issues programming is a progressive change for CES.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Issues programming enables Extension educators to facilitate significant community change.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Issues programming should replace program area emphases.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Issues programming is a temporary fad.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am confident about how my professional role contributes toward issues programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Issues programming has the potential of broadening the resource base for CES.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am apprehensive about my role in issues based programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An issues programming orientation will displace present CES personnel.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Issues programming is inconsistent with the Land Grant mission.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The content of most issue based programs is not relevant to my clientele.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = 3.40 \]
\[ SD = 0.50 \]
\[ Range = 1.43-4.67 \]
## Table 41 (continued)

**Response to Individual Items on Attitudes Scale by Extension Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Issue programming will not provide information to clientele that is any different than disciplinary programming.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Issue programming will facilitate coalition building to support CES.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Issue programming is more responsive to societal concerns than disciplinary programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Resources should be reallocated to to provide more emphasis on issue programming.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Issue programming will enhance funding support for CES.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Issue programming will help CES position itself as a progressive organization.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Issues programming eliminates the need for discipline based programming.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Issues programming alienates traditional Extension audiences.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Issue programming will broaden the available expertise.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To be futuristic, CES must address issues programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Issue programming is more dynamic, flexible, and responsive to change than disciplinary programming.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 42

**Response to Individual Items on Knowledge Scale by Extension Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Needs assessment strategies to identify issues of wide public concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Strategies to prioritize issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Criteria for selecting issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Anticipatory planning processes to identify critical issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Statement of issues in terms not bounded by traditional program areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Role of clientele in issue identification.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUDIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Identification of target audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Marketing strategies to maximize program accessibility to clientele.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Methods/procedures to involve people in issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Identification of subject matter resources to support issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Identification of financial resources to support issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>n=289</td>
<td>Md.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Problem solving and critical thinking skills to address issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Utilization of total university research base to address issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Identification of networks or coalitions to enhance issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERY METHODS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Determination of program strategies for specific target audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Design of delivery methods appropriate for issue content and goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Public policy education process as it addresses issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION OF RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Strategies to facilitate interdisciplinary teamwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 42 (continued)

**Response to Individual Items on Knowledge Scale by Extension Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. Task force management skills.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Role of volunteers in issue program development and implementation.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Purpose of advisory committees in issue program development.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Assessing impact of issues based programming.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Communication to stakeholders regarding issue programming.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluation methodologies appropriate for issues programming.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall**                                                            | 3.32| 3.32| .55 |
Table 43

Response to Individual Items on Importance Scale by Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Needs assessment strategies to identify issues of wide public concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Strategies to prioritize issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Criteria for selecting issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Anticipatory planning processes to identify critical issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Statement of issues in terms not bounded by traditional program areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Role of clientele in issue identification.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUDIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Identification of target audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Marketing strategies to maximize program accessibility to clientele.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Methods/procedures to involve people in issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Identification of subject matter resources to support issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Identification of financial resources to support issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43 (continued)

Response to Individual Items on Importance Scale by Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. Problem solving and critical thinking skills to address issues.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Utilization of total university research base to address issues.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Identification of networks or coalitions to enhance issue programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELIVERY METHODS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Determination of program strategies for specific target audiences.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Design of delivery methods appropriate for issue content and goals.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Public policy education process as it addresses issues.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Role of electronic technologies in program delivery.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATION OF RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Strategies to facilitate interdisciplinary teamwork.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Flexibility of staffing patterns to address issues.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43 (continued)

Response to Individual Items on Importance Scale by Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. Task force management skills.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Role of volunteers in issue program development and implementation.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Purpose of advisory committee in issue program development.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Assessing impact of issues based programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Communication to stakeholders regarding issue programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluation methodologies appropriate for issues programming.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>n=289</td>
<td>Md.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Needs assessment strategies to identify issues of wide public concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Strategies to prioritize issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Criteria for selecting issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Anticipatory planning processes to identify critical issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Statement of issues in terms not bounded by traditional program areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Role of clientele in issue identification.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUDIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Identification of target audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Marketing strategies to maximize program accessibility to clientele.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Methods/procedures to involve people in issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Identification of subject matter resources to support issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Identification of financial resources to support issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44

Response to Individual Items on Ability to Implement Scale by Extension Faculty
### Table 44 (continued)

**Response to Individual Items on Ability to Implement Scale by Extension Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. Problem solving and critical thinking skills to address issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Utilization of total university research base to address issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Identification of networks or coalitions to enhance issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELIVERY METHODS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Determination of program strategies for specific target audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Design of delivery methods appropriate for issue content and goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Public policy education process as it addresses issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Role of electronic technologies in program delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATION OF RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Strategies to facilitate interdisciplinary teamwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Flexibility of staffing patterns to address issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44 (continued)

Response to Individual Items on Ability to Implement Scale by Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n=289</th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. Task force management skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Role of volunteers in issue program development and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Purpose of advisory committees in issue program development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th></th>
<th>Md.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Assessing impact of issues based programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Communication to stakeholders regarding issue programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluation methodologies appropriate for issues programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Knowledge Discrepancy Score</td>
<td>Ability Discrepancy Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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