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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

Since their founding in the latter half of the nineteenth century, land-grant institutions have constituted a unique educational system. Over a 50-year period of federal and state legislation the land-grant idea developed to include the three central functions of: resident instruction (both undergraduate and graduate); research (basic and applied); and public service (primarily through the Cooperative Extension Service) to all people of a state not enrolled as university students.

According to Justin S. Morrill, author of the Morrill Act of 1862, the fundamental ideal behind the land-grant university was "...to offer an opportunity in every state for a liberal and larger education to larger numbers, not merely to those destined to sedentary professions, but to those much needing higher instruction for the world's business, for the industrial pursuits and professions of life", (Rhodes, 1987, p. 2). Morrill wanted land-grant universities to be people colleges where formal classroom instruction would be provided to children of "ordinary" people. More importantly, land-grant institutions were to
make "...all human endeavors legitimate subject matter for scientific investigation", (McDowell, 1988, p. 18). By blending the roles of teaching, research, and public service, the fundamental mission of the land-grant university was established to provide educational service to both the students and the general public.

In several ways, the 1862 Morrill Act failed to accomplish its intended purpose. While the land-grant institutions provided classroom training in a variety of new areas to the college age students, there was little practical research and no means of disseminating information to the general public. Information on scientific farming was limited until the Hatch Act of 1887 established agriculture experiment stations. However, results of the new agriculture research did not reach the farmers because they did not go to the universities to visit the research stations. The land-grant institutions did not have a complete system for achieving the three fold mission until the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service through the 1914 Smith-Lever Act. This act provided for the formal dissemination of useful and practical information in the subjects of agriculture, home economics, and rural energy. The congressional charge to Cooperative Extension, through the Smith-Lever Act states "...to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects related to Agriculture,...home
economics, and rural energy and to encourage the application of the same", ("Basic Charter", 1986).

The Cooperative Extension Service has had considerable success during its 75 years of existence in carrying out the mandate from the Smith-Lever Act. It has served as the primary means by which land-grant institutions provide public service to the people of each state. However, recent increased financial pressures have forced Extension to take a closer look at its mission, organizational structure, and programs.

The charge to serve rural America, particularly the farmer, is considered by many somewhat narrow in scope with only three percent of the population being directly involved with production agriculture. According to E. G. Schuh (1987), Extension must broaden its outreach capability if it is to remain an integral part of the land-grant university system. Schuh further stated, that it is important to the future of the organization that Extension serve as the instrument to bring the total resources of the land-grant university to aid in solving the problems facing the general public.

Blanton (1986), indicated that the vulnerability of Extension, in terms of funding at the state and federal level, will continue if the programs offered by the organization are not reformed. Schuh (1987), suggested that Extension could improve its present status if it were to
lessen the one-on-one technical assistance and move toward greater development of continuing education programs. The programs offered should be sequential and additive, providing the basic skills and principles needed by the clientele to perform the application. If this concept were implemented, it could have far reaching implications for organizational staffing and cooperation with academic departments throughout the land-grant institutions.

G. R. McDowell (1988, p. 19), reported that "...in recent years it has been difficult if not impossible for Cooperative Extension to produce a sustained flow of benefits to either old or new clients or for those clients to generate the resources needed to support their own scholarly agenda".

For many land-grant institutions, the process of determining the best ways to serve society has been going on for years. With the increased pressure to contribute to statewide economic development, many institutions are beginning to examine new ways the Cooperative Extension Service can contribute to the public service educational programs. The possibilities exist for the development of linkages between Extension and university teaching hospitals, computer centers, research stations, and all subject matter departments of the university. With the established networks that Extension has in the counties across every state, developing linkages with all areas of
the university could only serve to expand the scope of all
color service programs and the types of technology being
transferred to the general public. If this approach were
employed, it would position the Cooperative Extension
Service as the center for all public service educational
programs of the land-grant university system.

The Cooperative Extension Service and the research
component of the land-grant institutions need a closer
linkage if researchers are to develop a better understanding
of the educational and technological needs of the general
public. E. G. Schuh (1987), criticized the land-grant
institutions for losing sight of the research mission.
Today, however, the Extension faculty at many land-grant
universities are considered "out of step" rather than "on
the cutting edge". The conflicts are so bad that, in some
instances, major institutional changes, such as separate
Extension departments or tenure systems, have been created
to protect Extension faculty from the standards of the
teaching and research faculty (McDowell, 1988). Such
arrangements serve only to further separate researchers from
the Extension faculty and contact with the real-world needs
of clientele groups. This separation from the various
clientele groups also prohibits the researchers from
performing the analysis needed to determine the relevance of
their work. These compromised arrangements accomplish
little in addressing the land-grant issue of how to
influence research to better meet the needs of the general public.

In the immediate future, Extension must seek to more effectively influence the research agenda by defining and describing problems facing society where researchers can make a distinct contribution. Yet, when researchers fail to participate in the applied research activities, the Extension faculty should have the skills needed to conduct their own research and develop materials which aid in addressing the current problems and issues facing the people of their state. Speaking specifically to Cooperative Extension, E. W. Eddy (1989, p. 5), stated that the organization should: "Grab the chance to change before it is forced on you. It is not too late to control your own destiny, but the opportunity won't be around much longer."

If the Cooperative Extension Service is to maintain an important position within the land-grant university system, the organization's leaders must examine how to address the major socioeconomic issues of the future. The Extension organization should be expanded or reorganized to fully incorporate the changing demographic and contemporary needs of the general public. Also, the research efforts must be conducted with the idea of being relevant to public needs and concerns; with the results of research being integrated into resident instruction and public service, equally available to all individuals.
In order to better serve clientele, establish credibility with on-campus university faculty, and aid in defining research directions, Extension must develop some type of reorganization plan to provide opportunities for personnel to keep pace with modern technology. "Because human resources represent the largest cost item in the budget of an Extension Service, management must have current and systematized information on all jobs in order to produce services efficiently", (Buford and Bedeian, 1988, p. 92).

Warner and Christenson (1984, p. 129), in their national assessment of the Cooperative Extension Service stated that:

> Given present budgetary constraints, it is unlikely that there will be a substantial increase in the number of Extension staff. In fact, we are likely to see declines in personnel numbers. Therefore, it will be incumbent upon administrators to allocate resources and staff time in the most effective and efficient way possible. One thing is clear, decisions on staffing arrangements are complex. At a minimum, they require a consideration of budgetary impacts, programming priorities, and the roles of county and specialist staff.

The availability of new technologies and information systems may lead to entirely new schemes of staffing arrangements and communication methods throughout the Cooperative Extension Service (Warner and Christenson, 1988). While the county has always been the focal point for Extension programming, budget constraints and the need to provide clientele with greater expertise in all program areas will have major impact on staffing arrangements throughout the nation. As Extension moves to issues
programming, the question of how to reallocate staff time to meet the new demands of the organization will also be a major concern. While organizational change generally presents a threat to staff members, Extension administrators must work to identify appropriate staffing patterns, provide training opportunities for all staff members, and reorganize program delivery systems to effectively address the issues of primary concern.

Statement of the Problem

The Cooperative Extension Service nationally, as well as, the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) is undergoing change in programs and structure to meet current needs of clientele. Over the past twenty years, many comments and suggestions have been made regarding the need for changes in Extension and the land-grant university systems. "As early as the 1950's suggestions were being made that some type of organizational changes be initiated to better serve clientele", (Pittman, 1974, p. 2). Moore (1973), indicated that there was an increasing need in Extension for the utilization of specialists in many areas of study in order to bring more in-depth, up-to-date information to the general public.

The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) Future's Committee publication entitled, "Extension in Transition -- Bridging the Gap Between Vision and
Reality" (1987), provided recommendations related to needed changes in organization and staffing within the Extension system. These recommendations include:

- The system must transcend former boundaries of program areas and disciplines, as well as, county and state lines in the delivery of issue-oriented programming. (p. 7)

- The Extension Service should develop interdisciplinary issue response teams both at state and multi-county and/or district levels. (p. 10)

- Extension should provide clientele access to specialized staff assistance through the effective use of multi-county staff and specialists. (p. 13)

- Staff development opportunities should be strengthened in order to achieve the specialization and updating that is needed by Extension staff to remain current and productive. (p. 13)

In order to provide the best information available to clientele, the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service considered the idea of a clustered staffing pattern to allow agents the opportunity to specialize in areas of interest that are needed within a two, three, or four county area. The idea behind the effort was to provide clientele with higher quality information, reduce the duplication of services between counties, and allow some cost savings. The increased level of specialization in county personnel allows for the development of stronger, more in-depth programs. Specialization also allows for the development of county personnel through their participation in in-service training programs and other educational opportunities. By developing a greater level of specialization, county personnel could
increase their creditability with on-campus faculty. With a
greater level of understanding in a specialty area, county
personnel would be better able to identify research needs
and influence the research efforts of campus faculty.

As Ohio, and other states, move toward instituting a
clustered staffing pattern, Extension administrators have an
obligation to compare this pattern with other staffing
patterns which could be utilized. The questions and
concerns which arise when making major staffing changes
should be dealt with prior to implementation. A new
staffing pattern should be evaluated in relation to how
effectively it will allow the organization to address
societal issues. When changes of this magnitude are
implemented, the faculty and staff should be surveyed to
determine their level of commitment to the concept and to
allow their input into the new staffing plan. With little
information available on the subject of clustered staffing,
the need for a study of this nature was great. The faculty
and staff of OCES needed the opportunity to compare the
staffing pattern options available and identify major
concerns which should be addressed prior to the
implementation of a new staffing pattern. According to
Buford and Bedeian (1988), attitude surveys can be very
revealing and useful as an organizational development
technique. The results can be fed back for analysis and
interpretation in order that staff members can assist in
Purpose of the Study

The primary focus of this study was to describe the attitudes of the OCES faculty and staff (excluding clerical staff) concerning the clustered staffing pattern. The study was also conducted to examine the association between the perceptions of the population in terms of the three staffing pattern options (i.e. clustered staffing, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing) and their attitude toward clustering. Concerns of the population were then obtained regarding the implementation of clustered staffing in Ohio.

Variables and Objectives of the Study

The following dependent variables and antecedent characteristics were utilized in the study:

Dependent Variables:

A. The three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the OCES county faculty and staff toward the clustered staffing pattern concept

B. The three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the OCES state/district faculty and staff toward the clustered staffing pattern concept
Antecedent Characteristics:

A. The perceived success of OCES to conduct various components of the Extension program when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns

B. The perceived importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns

C. Current Position Within OCES

D. Primary Program Area Assignment

E. Highest Academic Degree Obtained

F. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree

G. Length of Service with Extension

H. Gender

I. Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering

The following research objectives were formulated as a guide for the study:

1. To describe the faculty and staff of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service on the following selected antecedent characteristics:

A. The perceived success of OCES to conduct various components of the Extension program when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns
B. The perceived importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns

C. Current Position Within OCES

D. Primary Program Area Assignment

E. Highest Academic Degree Obtained

F. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree

G. Length of Service with Extension

H. Gender

I. Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering

2. To describe three measures of the attitude of OCES state/district personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept across levels of the following selected antecedent characteristics:

A. Current Position Within OCES

B. Primary Program Area Assignment

C. Highest Academic Degree Obtained

D. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree

E. Length of Service with Extension

F. Gender

G. Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering

3. To describe three measures of the attitude of OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern
concept across levels of the selected antecedent characteristics identified in Objective 2

4. To determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options

5. To determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES state/district personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options

6. To describe the major concerns of OCES faculty and staff toward the implementation of the clustered staffing pattern in Ohio

7. To describe the concerns of OCES faculty and staff toward the relationship between Extension and county funding sources if the clustered staffing pattern was implemented in Ohio
Definition of Terms

The following terms used in this study were operationally defined as follows:

Academic Major (Major Area of Study) - The field of study in the highest academic degree of the respondents.

Agent Specialization - This is a staffing arrangement wherein county Extension personnel direct up to 25 percent of their time to specific subject matter areas. Agents share expertise via presentations, serving on issue task forces, and developing written materials for use beyond the county boundary lines (OCES Administrative Cabinet, 1989).

Clustering (Clustered Staffing Pattern) - This staffing pattern involves two or more counties with staff members from each county working together in conducting the Extension programming efforts. Each agent would have responsibility for a program area(s) in a home county and, in addition, identify an area of specialization in a primary and possibly a secondary specialty area. An agent would serve as a resource and teacher in his/her specialty area(s) for all counties within the cluster. A county chair would remain located in each county, with a program coordinator
identified for the cluster to facilitate programming efforts, particularly Issues Programming (OCES Administrative Cabinet, 1989).

**Conventional Staffing** - The staffing pattern which generally includes three county agents - one each in Agriculture, Home Economics, and 4-H. One agent serves as the county chair with another identified as the CNRD coordinator. Educational programs in a conventionally staffed county are conducted within the borders of that county. Outside agent assistance comes generally from state and district specialists.

**County Chair** - The administrative leader of a county Extension office. This individual is responsible for the program and staff supervision of the county unit.

**County Personnel** - For this study, the term county personnel was used when referring to county Extension agents, Extension associates, and program assistants.

**Current Position** - The self-reported position which respondents hold within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
Highest Academic Degree - The highest academic degree received by the respondents and operationally defined as: a) Bachelor's Degree; b) Master's Degree; c) Doctoral Degree.

Issues Programming - Extension's plan for "...locating program origins in matters of wide public concern; identifying human problems in their own context, without prior regard for traditional Extension subject matter, audiences, and methods of program delivery", (Dalgaard, et al., 1988, p. 5).

Length of Service - The self-reported number of years respondents had been employed by the Cooperative Extension Service as of July 1, 1989.

Multi-County Staffing - The method of staffing which involves the sharing of an agent's time between two counties. The agent takes primary responsibility for the same major program area (either Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, or CNRD) in each county. The multi-county agent is generally assisted by an Extension associate and/or program assistant who coordinates activities in the county in which they are permanently located (OCES Administrative Cabinet, 1989).
Perceived Level of Knowledge - The self-reported degree of understanding respondents had concerning the clustered staffing pattern concept.

Primary Program Area Assignment - The Extension program area reported by respondents as the area to which they devote the greatest portion of their time. Respondents selected from the areas of: Agriculture, 4-H, Home Economics, Community and Natural Resource Development, or Other.

Primary Specialty Area - Program areas from the broad categories of Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, CNRD, or Program Development which were selected by agents as major responsibilities in their specialization work within the cluster counties.

Program Coordinator - Individual identified to organize and coordinate all Issues Programming efforts for an entire cluster unit.

Receiving - For this study, Receiving represents the initial category of the attitude toward clustering of the OCES personnel. Receiving was a measure of the willingness of the members of the population to become aware and learn about clustering.
Responding - For this study, Responding represents the second category of the attitude toward clustering of the OCES personnel. Responding was a measure of the willingness of the members of the population to comply with the clustered staffing pattern if implemented.

Secondary Specialty Area - Program areas from the broad categories of Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, CNRD, or Program Development which are selected by agents as secondary (minor) responsibilities in their specialization work within the cluster counties.

State/District Personnel - For this study, the term state/district personnel was used when referring to state specialists, district specialists, state Extension associates, and district Extension associates.

Valuing - For this study, Valuing represents the third category of the attitude toward clustering of the OCES personnel. Valuing was a measure of the willingness of the members of the population to accept and promote clustering.
Limitations of the Study

A key limitation of the study was that the use of a mail questionnaire would only reveal the perceptions of the respondents toward agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing. However, the use of self-report instruments have commonly been used in job analysis procedures because other methods of collecting information proved to be impractical and costly.

A second limitation of the study was the lack of clearly defined parameters for the two antecedent characteristics - level of success and level of importance. The success of Extension to conduct various program components and the importance of various methods of support for Extension program delivery when utilizing the three staffing methods under consideration was based completely on the perceptions of the respondents. While the definitions of level of success and level of importance may vary considerably from one respondent to another, no definitions were developed for these variables. These variables were not defined in order that respondents would have the opportunity to provide information based on their perceptions of the staffing patterns, utilizing their personal definitions of level of success and level of importance.

Another limitation of the study was the varying levels of knowledge respondents had about the three staffing
patterns. The knowledge level of respondents may have created a bias toward a certain staffing method. Respondents may have favored one staffing pattern over the other two because they were more familiar with the method, even though the other staffing patterns may be equally effective. A higher or lower level of knowledge about a particular staffing pattern may create a bias toward the pattern.

To reduce the effects of these limitations, definitions and brief descriptions of clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county agent staffing were included in the questionnaire. Providing information on each staffing pattern under consideration in the study was an attempt to inform respondents about each pattern in order that they might make non-biased, knowledgeable decisions. The descriptive information on the clustered staffing pattern provided somewhat greater detail than the descriptive information on agent specialization and multi-county agent staffing. This additional information was provided to subjects because of their limited exposure to the clustered staffing pattern. The agent specialization and multi-county staffing patterns were formally utilized in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service prior to the study, while clustered staffing had not been formally employed in the organization. Therefore, the additional information provided on clustered staffing was not to produce a bias
toward this staffing process; but, to equalize the knowledge level of the subjects on clustered staffing with their knowledge of agent specialization and multi-county staffing.

**Basic Assumptions**

For this study an assumption was made that the clustered staffing pattern in Ohio would involve two or more counties with staff members from each county working together to conduct the Extension programming efforts. Agents may select primary and secondary specialty areas from the broad categories of Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, and CNRD. Agents may also select primary or secondary specialty area(s) from the category of Program Development, including such areas as leadership, program planning, teaching methodology, and evaluation.

Once specialty areas are selected and agreed upon by Extension administration, agents would develop and maintain a high level of knowledge in their subject matter area(s) to serve as the cluster specialists in the selected specialty area(s). Clustering permits agents to work across county lines in their area(s) of specialization and also includes an individual or individuals who serve as cluster program coordinators to facilitate the issues programming efforts. State and district specialists' roles would change somewhat in order to provide more training programs to county personnel in their selected specialty areas and in
developing teaching materials for agents to utilize in their county and cluster work.

A second assumption made for this study was that the Cooperative Extension Service must have up-to-date programs to meet the ever changing needs of the citizens of Ohio. One of the major tools utilized in providing these programs is Issues Programming. Issues Programming exemplifies the original mission of the land-grant university to serve the general public in its broadest sense. Extension programs are developed based on matters of wide public concern "...without prior regard for traditional Extension subject matter, audiences, and methods of program delivery", (Dalgaard, et al., p. 5). The clustered staffing pattern is a tool for increasing the effectiveness of Issues Programming due primarily to the Cluster Program Coordinator who will facilitate the issues programming efforts in the cluster area.

The final assumption made in this study was that the subjects had a greater knowledge of agent specialization and multi-county staffing than they had regarding the clustered staffing pattern. Clustering had not been utilized formally as a staffing pattern in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Both agent specialization and multi-county agent staffing had been employed as part of the overall staffing plan for the organization. For this reason, more detailed information was provided in the questionnaire on the
clustered staffing pattern, which was previously discussed in the section entitled "Limitations of the Study".
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter a review of the literature related to attitudes and behaviors, management of human resources, organizational staffing, and Extension staffing is presented. States within the North Central Region that have utilized clustered staffing will also be emphasized in this review. Information presented in this chapter is organized under the following major headings: Literature Related to Management of Human Resources; Literature Related to Attitudes and Behaviors; Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain; Literature Related to Extension Staffing; Clustered Staffing in the North Central Region; and Hierarchical Model for Analysis.

The Cooperative Extension Service has, from its inception, provided educational programs based on the needs of people (ECOP, 1987). Since Extension programs are educational in nature the organization is placed appropriately as the educational outreach for the land-grant college and university system. Extension provides informal, non-credit programs for the purpose of assisting individuals in making their own decisions. Extension programs must meet the needs of the people if they are to be significant. In
order to be effective, the programs must also satisfy the interests of those individuals who most need the assistance (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, 1987).

According to Warner and Christenson (1984), Extension must provide programs which appeal to local needs in order to maintain clientele. Due to the technological, economical, and social changes occurring in all phases of society, Extension is continually struggling to define its proper function and purpose. "Issues of defining appropriate target audiences, delivering quality programs in the most efficient manner, projecting a positive organizational image, and maintaining an adequate support base are being widely discussed", (Warner and Christenson, 1984, p. 1). Critics of Extension contend that the changes are too slow in coming, the organization is not responsive to the needs of the people; while others feel the organization is too diverse and is straying from its intended purpose.

The report of the Futures Task Force to the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (1987), stated that the Extension organization must guard against program content for which it has neither the expertise to adequately cover the subject matter, nor the resources to procure it. Many issues which Extension may address are of importance to people, regardless of demographics. For Extension to become the contemporary and progressive organization that is
envisioned, issues must guide the determination of program content.

Dalgaard, et al. (1988, p. 5), indicated that issues for Extension are "...matters of wide public concern arising out of complex human problems". Issues programming broadens the field in which Extension personnel can work. Issues programming goes beyond the existing Extension audiences and problems and creates a more comprehensive source of program priorities. Issue-centered programs are interdisciplinary in nature. This means that "individuals from different disciplines work collaboratively as a team with significant interaction during the entire process of planning, implementation, analysis, and evaluation", (Lippke, et al., 1987, p. B-5).

Issues programming can renew the Extension tradition of being proactive rather than reactive. Also, Issues programming will create a greater public awareness of Extension programs and foster expectations for positive results (Dalgaard, et al., 1988). However, before Issues programming can be utilized as an effective program delivery tool, Extension staff must be prepared to meet these new challenges. One recommendation of the Futures Task Force indicated that one or more Extension staff should remain at the county level; however, "these personnel should have skills in educational facilitation, and at least one technical skill appropriate to the locality", (Dalgaard, et
al., 1988, p. 12). The idea that county personnel should have the technical expertise to address the range of needs of today's clientele is unrealistic. County staff should represent a blend of disciplinary skills, programming skills, and interpersonal skills (ECOP Futures Task Force Report, 1987).

**Literature Related to Management of Human Resources**

The review of the literature within the business and management of human resources field produces little information regarding public service organizations. However, information provided on decision making from this field can easily be transferable to any type organization. When staffing changes are under consideration a predetermined decision making process should be utilized in order to effectively involve the appropriate individuals. According to Steers (1988), an effective way of effecting attitude change is to involve target individuals in the process by which decisions are made. A primary rationale behind the participative management movement is that the act of involving lower-level employees in decisions affecting their jobs creates more positive job attitude.

Vroom (1960), noted that when employees are allowed to participate in decisions, they become more ego-involved in the outcomes and tend to identify more with the actual issues involved and with the organization. One mechanism of
facilitating employee participation is the use of attitude surveys. These surveys represent a potentially powerful mechanism for attitude change (Steers, 1988).

Blackburn (1984), in a discussion directed specifically to the Cooperative Extension Service, indicated that the decision-making process is often a group process. As such, the manager must apply principles of democratic decision-making since those involved in the decision-making process will feel an interest in the results of the process.

Another area of human resource management which is transferable to establishing a clustered staffing pattern in Extension is the action plan for corporate downsizing presented by Smith (1987). Downsizing, a word originated by the automobile industry to describe the size of scaled-down cars, is defined in the corporate world as:

...the (systematic) reduction of a work force by an employer in a variety of ways - usually as a result of some external considerations such as losses, cash flow difficulties, and technological changes. (Appelbaum, Simpson and Shapiro, 1987, p. 52)

The initial effect of downsizing may feel like an irreplaceable staff shortage. Smith, suggested the following plan to prepare for the perceived void brought about by downsizing. Prior to the reduction, provide advance notice to all members of the organization. Information regarding the situation should be communicated as soon as it becomes available. An adequate amount of information must be issued for employees to understand why
the situation exists. A participatory problem solving process should be employed to involve all members of the organization in determining a solution. Managers should ask for input and potential solutions and use creativity to accomplish the needed activities. Smith stressed the idea that teamwork should be emphasized through a sharing of the additional work load among both employees and management. Job descriptions could also be temporarily redesigned to include new responsibilities. Managers should talk with employees as a group and individually to gather feedback on how they feel the situation is being managed. Smith also suggested rewarding employees for their cooperation and success in accomplishing additional tasks.

**Literature Related to Attitudes and Behaviors**

"A knowledge of beliefs is important in the study of attitudes...beliefs represent a major influence on attitudes. Changing beliefs can change attitudes", (Steers, 1988, p. 285). According to Scheibe (1970, p. 26), "...beliefs about future occurrences are often important determinants of those occurrences, for they influence the choices that are made, the chances that are taken, and the hypotheses that are adopted as working assumptions."

A belief can be defined as a perceived relationship between people, objectives, and events (Steers, 1988). Beliefs are what individuals consider true about themselves
and their environment. While beliefs may not be true or accurate, individuals are convinced that they are true.

Sarbin, Taft, and Bailey (1960), identified four processes through which beliefs are formed. First, beliefs are often based on past experiences. Over time, individuals observe events and draw inferences about an important issue. Second, beliefs may be constructed by individuals based on available information about a particular issue. A third process for the development of beliefs involves generalizing from similar situations, events, or objects. The fourth process in the formulation of beliefs is the influencing effects of individuals in whom great levels of confidence are placed by others. These four processes indicate that beliefs are shaped by a variety of events, including past experience, trust in others, and imagination and inductive reasoning (Steers, 1988).

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), noted that irrespective of the object under consideration, a person's attitude is determined by the salient beliefs he/she has about that object. Just as intentions must correspond to behavioral criteria, and attitudes must correspond to intentions, beliefs must correspond to attitudes if they are to permit either prediction or understanding of those attitudes. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), identified the first step toward understanding of attitude requires elicitation of the salient beliefs. Once this has been accomplished, it must
be determined how the different salient beliefs combine in determining the attitude. Next, the strength of the salient beliefs must be measured to determine the confidence an individual has in the likelihood that performing a behavior will result in a given outcome or is associated with some other attribute.

Attitudes are based on the total set of a person's salient beliefs. People usually believe that performing a given behavior will lead to both positive and negative consequence; their attitudes toward the behavior correspond to the favorability or unfavorability of the total set of consequences, each weighted by the strength of the person's beliefs that performing the behavior will lead to each of the consequences. (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980, p. 67)

This model of attitude indicates that two individuals who associate the same set of consequences with performing a given behavior may hold different attitudes toward the behavior if they evaluate the consequences differently or if the strength of their beliefs differs. By the same token, individuals who have different sets of behavioral beliefs, meaning they associate different sets of consequences with performing the behavior, may still have the same attitude.

On the basis of different experiences, individuals may form different beliefs about the consequences of performing a behavior. These beliefs in turn determine attitudes which then determine intention and the corresponding behavior. An understanding of a behavior can be gained by tracing its determinants back to the underlying beliefs. Therefore, the behavior of individuals can be influenced if a sufficient
number of salient beliefs are changed (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980).

Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain

According to Krathwohl, et al. (1964), objectives which emphasize a feeling tone, an emotion, or a degree of acceptance or rejection fall into the Affective domain within the taxonomy of educational objectives. A large number of such objectives are expressed as interests, attitudes, appreciations, values, and emotional sets or biases.

"The Affective Domain Taxonomy", developed by Krathwohl, et al. (1964), is composed of the five categories of Receiving, Responding, Valuing, Organization, and Characterization by a Value or Value Complex. At the first level of the taxonomy, Receiving, learners become sensitized to the existence of certain phenomena and stimuli. The learners become willing to receive or to attend to the phenomena. This is the first step if the learner is to be properly oriented to learn what the instructor intends that he/she will. The category of Receiving is divided into the three subcategories of Awareness, Willingness to Receive, and Controlled or Selected Attending.

The Responding level of the taxonomy is concerned with responses which go beyond merely attending to a phenomenon. In this category, the learners have a low level of
commitment to the phenomena involved. The Responding level is composed of the three subcategories Acquiescence in Responding, Willingness to Respond, and Satisfaction in Response. The Acquiescence in Responding subcategory is concerned with the "obedience" or "compliance" of individuals to the subject, activity, or phenomenon. There is a passiveness of the learners so far as the initiation of the behavior is concerned. The second subcategory, Willingness to Respond, is concerned with the capacity for voluntary activity; while the Satisfaction in Response subcategory relates to the emotional reaction, generally of pleasure or enjoyment, associated with the voluntary response.

The third category of the Affective Domain, Valuing, deals with the notion that a thing, phenomenon, or behavior has worth. The concept of worth is in part a result of an individual's own valuing or assessment, but it is much more a social product that has been slowly internalized or accepted and has come to be used by the individual as his/her own criterion of worth. The first of three subcategories of Valuing is Acceptance of a Value which relates to the idea that individuals are consistent with their beliefs to the point that others identify them as holding the given belief or value. The Preference for a Value is a subcategory that goes beyond the acceptance of a value to where the individual is sufficiently committed to
the value to pursue it, to seek it out or to want it. The subcategory of Commitment involves a high degree of certainty. Individuals who display behavior at this level are clearly perceived as holding the value.

Organization, the fourth category in the Affective Domain is intended as the proper classification for objectives which describe the beginnings of the development of a value system. Such a system is built gradually, subject to change as new values are incorporated. The Organization category contains two subcategories: Conceptualization of a Value and the Organization of a Value System. The Conceptualization of a Value permits individuals to determine how their new value relates to those that they already hold or to other new values which they obtain. Organization of a Value System provides individuals with the opportunity to bring together their values into an ordered relationship with one another.

At the fifth and final category, Characterization by a Value or Value Complex, values already have a place in an individual's value hierarchy, are organized into an internally consistent system, and have controlled the behavior of the individual for a sufficient time that he/she has adapted the prescribed manner of behaving. The Generalized is the first subcategory in this level. It provides an internal consistency to the system of attitudes and values at a particular moment. The generalized set is a
basic orientation which enables individuals to reduce and order the complex world about them and to act consistently and effectively. Characterization, the peak of the internalization process, includes those objectives which are concerned with an individual's view of the universe or philosophy of life.

**Literature Related to Extension Staffing**

Staffing is the formal process of ensuring that the organization has qualified workers available at all levels to meet its short- and long-term business objectives. Staffing professionals must determine the number of people required, as well as, when they will be needed. In addition, such professionals must ascertain the skills and abilities needed to perform critical job functions. The staffing professional also must be able to anticipate and respond to the ever-changing business environment. (Mondy, et al., 1986, p. 55)

Staffing is considered to be of vital importance to an organization, because only when individuals and jobs are properly matched can high levels of productivity be achieved. Staffing is a dynamic process, it must be continually adapted to facilitate changes within the organization (Mondy, et al., 1986).

Currently in Ohio there are four basic staff groups for providing needed educational assistance to the general public:

1. The state specialist who has statewide responsibilities for a given discipline or subject matter specialty;

2. The district specialist who is responsible for the industry or program specialty for counties within
3. The county agent, who has more general responsibilities for all facets of the Extension program within the county and is encouraged to serve in a specialty area in one or more disciplines;

4. Assistant county agents, Extension associates, program assistants, program coordinators, nutrition aides, and other paraprofessional and technical staff who assist the county agents (Ohio, 1987, p. 2.05.00).

Moore (1973), found considerable variation in staffing patterns across the U.S.; however, the three patterns which were identified as most common were:

1. County/State - Recognized as the traditional staffing pattern, county agents receive support from state specialists;

2. Multi-County/State - County agents specialize in certain subject matter fields and trade services with agents in neighboring counties with support from state specialists;

3. County/Multi-County/State - County agents work out of each county office and work only within the boundaries of their county with support from a number of specialists who work a multi-county area -- Both county and area staff are supported by state specialists.

Moore (1973), indicated a rapidly developing trend of the multi-county staffing pattern becoming a part of many state Extension services. Moore further stated that the primary reasons for the move toward multi-county staffing was to provide clientele with more specialized assistance and to make the most effective use of available resources. Moore identified two precursors of multi-county agent staffing as:
1. Increasing specialization in America's occupational structure, resulting in a growing demand for specialized information;

2. A move toward coordinating the Extension effort within the university, resulting in an expansion of programs and clientele which require specialized information and staff.

Warner (1973), examined the three primary staffing patterns identified by Moore in terms of organizational effectiveness (i.e. the degree to which an organization's goals are being realized). A questionnaire was sent to professional workers in seven states. The sample represented all job groups in each state organization. The questionnaire consisted of six major parts: 1) demographic data; 2) thirty-five Extension Management Information System purpose statements; 3) an 18 item Brayfield-Roth index of overall job satisfaction; 4) thirty-six items concerning organizational complexity; 5) twenty-five task statements concerning role perception; and 6) a section of open-ended questions allowing respondents to express their perceptions as to the strengths and weaknesses of their present staffing arrangement and to suggest any changes that would increase its effectiveness.

No statistically significant differences were found among the three staffing patterns with respect to the effectiveness of the organization itself as perceived by the respondents. Generally all three staffing patterns were seen as relatively effective. Statistically significant differences were reported among the complexity scores
reported by the three staffing patterns. Workers in states utilizing County/Multi-County/State staffing perceived themselves as more involved in the decision-making process which was indicated by a lower complexity score than the County/State respondents. The respondents working in the Multi-County/State staffing pattern showed the lowest mean complexity scores. Warren indicated this could have resulted because the county and area roles are embodied in the same individual, thus decreasing the possibility for problems in the communication and coordination while increasing the confidence placed in the worker by the clientele. Significant differences in job satisfaction were also found among the three staffing patterns. Respondents in those states utilizing the Multi-County/State demonstrated the highest level of job satisfaction, the County/Multi-County/State pattern had a slightly lower level, and the County/State pattern exhibited the lowest level of job satisfaction.

In a study by Pittman, Young, and Cunningham (1976), counties in three states were surveyed to determine clientele perception of effectiveness of programs conducted within the three major staffing patterns. Overall, clientele perceived little difference in program effectiveness by staffing patterns. It appeared to the researchers that if their needs were being met, the clientele were not greatly concerned about the staffing
pattern being utilized. No significant differences by staffing pattern were found among the mean scores of the agriculture purposes except for safety. For safety, the County/State staffing pattern was perceived as more effective than the Multi-County/State pattern. In the area of 4-H and Youth, no significant differences by staffing pattern were found. The areas of safety, health, and community facilities and services were the only areas with significant differences by staffing patterns under home economics. The County/Multi-County/State staffing pattern was perceived by clientele to be more effective than the Multi-County/State pattern in these areas. Finally, significant differences were found among the mean scores of the community resource development areas by staffing pattern only in the facilities and services, employment skills, improve the environment, and public issues areas. In the areas of facilities and services, and improve the environment the County/State staffing pattern was perceived as more effective than the Multi-County/State pattern. The County/Multi-County/State staffing pattern was perceived as more effective than the Multi-County/State pattern in the area of employment skills and public policy.

Clustering is a relatively new term in the area of Extension staffing patterns. While several states have utilized the concept of clustered staffing, little research has been conducted in the area. In a national survey by
Andrews (1987), states, on the average, reported four
different types of multi-county staffing patterns per state.
These multi-county professionals were generally supervised
by the District Directors or Regional Supervisors (68.3
percent), while Department Chairs were supervisors for the
multi-county professional 12.7 percent of the time.
County/Area Chairs or County Directors were also supervisors
12.7 percent of the time while Assistant Directors provided
supervision in 7.0 percent of the cases. Andrews indicated
that states felt that clustering has had a considerable role
in increasing agent specialization, and specialization is a
force which is pushing the movement. The primary limiting
factor in clustering is county ownership. Most states
report sensitivity to the need to maintain county support.
Even in states with widespread use of multi-county staff, it
is felt that county officials would prefer county based
staff if budgets would permit. States also reported that
communications and county involvement in the staffing
decisions is perceived to be important.

In a more recent clustered staffing study, Krueger and
Ahles (1989), reported the opinions of county commissioners,
county Extension committee members, and Extension agents
throughout the state of Minnesota. Respondents reported
that the major strength of clustering was the sharing of
expertise among the cluster counties. Overall respondents
were more positive than negative in their comments about
agent specialization. The respondents also cited programming improvements (diversity, quantity, and quality) and a better use of agents time as additional strengths of clustered staffing. The primary weakness indicated by respondents was agent travel. Respondents reported that the quality of the staff was improving and the majority of the respondents had an overall favorable attitude toward clustering. County commissioners were more favorable toward clustering than either agents or committee members. Extension committee members and agents were slightly less favorable in their rating of clustering.

Issues programming was also examined in this study with all respondents seeing the programming effort in a favorable manner. Respondents felt that the amount of time devoted to issues programming should remain at the current level. Krueger and Ahles (1989), recommended that the present course of action with clustering, agent specialization, and issues programming be continued. However, they also encouraged Extension administrators and agents to be sensitive to agent travel and agent absences from the county due to specialized training and cluster teaching.

Clustered Staffing in the North Central Region

The recommendations formulated through the public hearings held by the Extension Committee of Organization and Policy call for a reclarification of the shape of the
Cooperative Extension Service staff:

**Recommendation 18:** Extension should provide clientele access to specialized staff assistance through the effective use of multi-county or area specialists, especially in conjunction with off-campus research stations. Further, these staff, as well as state specialists, must demonstrate greater commitment to applied research. (ECOP, 1987, p. 13)

In this section of the literature review an overview of the clustered staffing patterns currently employed in the North Central states of Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota is presented.

**Minnesota.**

The Minnesota Staffing Plan was the third component of the Minnesota Extension Service's long range planning process. The first stage was a strategic plan which expressed the vision and set the direction for the Minnesota Extension Service. Stage two of the plan consisted of a restructuring plan which established the clusters of counties, re-aligned districts, announced agent specialization, and addressed issue-based programming. The core assumptions for the Minnesota Extension Service Comprehensive Staffing Plan Task Force resulted in five governing principles. These five governing principles for the Minnesota staffing plan are:

1. The plan is inclusive applying to all MES employees.

2. Diversity is sought through the plan. Staff diversity dimensions include culture, education, experience, skill level, and other affirmative
action concerns in seeking quality and fairness.

3. The vision portrays greater cooperation among counties and among campus-based units.

4. Flexibility is required to position the talents of the Minnesota Extension staff when and where they are needed.

5. Clientele access to MES staff and services is essential. People must be able to reach the Minnesota Extension Service when they need the service.

The staffing plan for the Minnesota Extension Service includes 20 clusters of counties which are arranged into seven administrative districts. The operating principles of the clustering system in Minnesota are that: each county in the state has a county chair, and each cluster unit has a program coordinator. Another goal of the Minnesota staffing plan is that no agent will have primary responsibility for more than one program area, i.e. agriculture, home economics, or 4-H/youth development. However, an agent may choose to specialize in community and natural resource development (Minnesota Extension Service, 1987).

**Nebraska.**

The Nebraska Cooperative Extension Service developed a reorganization plan which included multi-county clusters in order to meet clientele needs through more specialized agent assistance. A budget shortfall in 1986 also contributed to the development of the plan. A cluster of two to four counties in each of Nebraska's five Extension administrative
districts was selected to participate in a pilot effort. Each district director developed an organizational plan for the pilot clusters based on the following criteria:

1. The pilot clusters were to show a financial savings, while considering all possible costs, such as increased travel expenses.
2. Staff specialization was to increase.
3. All major program areas should continue to be covered at least at a minimal level.
4. A futuristic plan should be prepared giving consideration to the use of emerging technology.
5. A staffing plan should be developed to include current and future staff of Extension and research centers.
6. A plan was to be developed to evaluate the new organizational structure.
7. In developing the plan, anticipated staff retirements and current staff performance should be considered.
8. Identify the locations of possible future locations of sub-centers within the district.

Focus group interviews in each of the districts were conducted to gather feedback on the operation of the pilot clusters from current or former Extension Advisory Board members. The interviews included questions of an introductory nature; as well as, questions dealing with such areas as program delivery, operations and staffing, boards and councils, and funding.

Once the clusters were in place, a second effort was launched in the identification of priority initiatives for the University of Nebraska. Eight task forces were
established that eventually resulted in six priority initiatives with 20 sub-components identified under the six priority initiatives. This led to an increase in agent specialization because Leo Lucas, Dean and Director of the Nebraska Extension Service, suggested that 60.0 percent of agents time should be in issues programming.

The current staffing configuration in Nebraska includes 23 clusters or Extension Programming Units (EPU's), formed from 93 counties located in five administrative districts. The clusters continue to have a county chair in each county and a program coordinator for each EPU. Most clusters have an average of two agents per county, one agriculture agent and one home economics agent. The 4-H program work is conducted for the most part by assistants with Bachelor of Science degrees (Miller and Rockwell, 1987).

South Dakota.

Clustering in the South Dakota Cooperative Extension Service came about as the result of a critical review conducted by the Citizen's Review Committee. The committee, which was appointed by the South Dakota Board of Regents, directed the evaluation process between October, 1984 – July, 1985. Input from the general citizenry was obtained in the South Dakota review through requests made via newspaper articles, radio broadcasts, educational television stations and public television outlets. Over 250 letters,
some signed, others anonymous, were received which provided information to the Review Committee pertaining to the major issues facing the South Dakota Cooperative Extension Service.

A survey, administered in April, 1985, was developed utilizing the responses from the citizen input. Clustered random samples of the urban and rural population and the population located east and west of the Missouri River were surveyed. Surveys were also completed by a census of the state legislators, county commissioners, Extension county staff, Extension specialists and Extension Advisory Board members. A one percent sample of the state's Native American population was also surveyed. From the survey results the Citizen's Review Committee began to chart a course for the Extension organization.

A clustered staffing plan went into effect on July 1, 1986. A total of 21 clusters of two to four counties each, plus three, one county units were established. Cluster counties were asked to meet together to formally develop the clustering concept. Once the program priority needs were identified the Extension agents were asked to specialize in one primary and one secondary area. State specialists' roles focused on training agents and preparing teaching materials, with a reduction in county and area teaching assignments.
A unique outcome of the South Dakota clustered staffing project was the appropriation of over $800,000 from the state legislature to purchase new equipment to facilitate the implementation of the cluster plan. Microcomputers were installed for each county Extension office and every specialist and administrative staff member. Video cassette recorder units, monitors and production equipment were also placed in each county (South Dakota Cooperative Extension Service, 1985).

Hierarchical Model for Analysis

"One of the most useful tools for extracting information from a data set is hierarchical analysis", (Cohen and Cohen, 1983, p. 120). In situations where a central purpose of the study is to explain variance in the dependent variable(s) accounted for by the independent variables or antecedent characteristics, stepwise regression analysis is inappropriate. The advantage of the hierarchical analysis is that once the order of entry into the regression equation has been specified, a unique partitioning of the total variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variables can be made (Warmbrod, 1988). Cohen and Cohen (1983), identified three strategies for ordering variables in hierarchical analysis: a) causal priority; b) research relevance; and c) structural properties. Hierarchical analysis adds to the researcher's
understanding of the problem being studied because it requires thoughtful consideration by the researcher in determining the order of entry of the independent variables (Warmbrod, 1988).

For the regression models proposed for this study the dependent variables were attitude of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern; and the attitude of the OCES state personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern. The antecedent characteristics were initially entered into the hierarchical regression model in the following order: a) Success of OCES when utilizing clustering; b) Importance to OCES when utilizing clustering; c) Success of OCES when utilizing agent specialization; d) Importance to OCES when utilizing agent specialization; e) Success of OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing; f) Importance to OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing.

Cohen and Cohen (1983, p. 121), acknowledged the fact that, "...it will frequently not be possible to posit a single sequence that is uncontroversially in exact order of causal priority". However, they suggest that when the variables are ordered in a logical sequence, the hierarchical procedure becomes useful in explaining the variance in the dependent variable accounted for by a given characteristic. For this study, the order of entry was based on a logical sequence. It was logical to assume that
the perceptions of the respondents related to the success of OCES programming efforts when utilizing clustering and the importance of various program components to OCES when utilizing clustering would have a major impact on their attitudes toward clustering. The success of OCES and importance to OCES when utilizing agent specialization would logically follow because, based on the definitions, agent specialization was more closely associated to clustering than was multi-county staffing. If implemented in Ohio, clustered staffing would have agent specialization as a major component of the model. The antecedent characteristics, "success of OCES", were placed into the regression model each time prior to the "importance to OCES" characteristics. This was done because the "success" characteristics made direct impact on clientele; while the "importance" characteristics were basically logistical components of Extension programming.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Research Design

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature and was designed to gather data concerning the attitude of the population of OCES faculty and staff (excluding clerical staff) toward the clustered staffing pattern. The study was also conducted to examine the association between the perceptions of the population in terms of the three staffing pattern options (i.e. clustered staffing, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing) and their attitude toward clustering. Concerns of the population were then obtained regarding the implementation of clustered staffing in Ohio. Data were examined to determine the nature and strength of the relationships between variables.

Subject Selection

To obtain the most accurate results possible a census was utilized in gathering the information from the target population. Permission was obtained from Dr. Bobby D. Moser, Director of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service to conduct the census. A listing of the names and addresses of the Extension faculty and staff was obtained from Dr. John
Stitzlein, Leader, Personnel of OCES. All State and District Specialists, County Extension Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants employed by OCES were surveyed. The total number of subjects utilized in the study was 480. Table 1 summarizes the composition of the sample by positions within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

Table 1
Composition of Sample by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State/District Personnel</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Personnel (Extension Agents, Extension Associates, Program Assistants)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External validity, a major concern in the outcome measures of survey research, refers to the degree to which results of a study can be generalized beyond the sample. The four major threats to external validity in survey research are frame error, sampling error, selection error, and non-response error.
Frame error occurs when there is a discrepancy between the list containing the names of the population and the actual population. Frame error was controlled in this study because a complete, up-to-date listing of all District and State Specialists, County Extension Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants in Ohio was obtained.

Sampling error is a threat to external validity that can result when inappropriate sampling procedures are utilized when selecting a sample. Sampling error was controlled through the use of a census. A census ensures that sampling error is controlled because every subject in the target population is included in the sample.

Selection error takes place in survey research when some members of the population have a greater chance of being selected into the sample than other members of the population. In using a census, all members of the population were selected for the sample; however, the possibility existed for some agents who work in more than one county to receive two survey instruments. The frame was carefully reviewed for the names of all multi-county agents. If the names of these agents appeared in the frame more than once, they were removed from one of the county listings.

Non-response error involves subjects selected for the sample who do not cooperate or who cannot be located. Non-respondents can vary significantly from respondents on major variables of interest to the researcher. Non-response error
was controlled by comparing the responses of early respondents to those of late respondents (Miller and Smith, 1983). The initial deadline of November 7, 1989 was utilized to divide respondents into two (early and late) groups. Differences between early and late respondents on the dependent variables selected for the study were examined through use of t-tests. An alpha level of .05 was established a priori as the level of significance. The t-tests yielded no significant differences between the early and late respondents on the dependent variables selected for the study (alpha = .05). Research has shown that late respondents are most similar to non-respondents (Clausen and Ford, 1947). Therefore, if late respondents did not differ significantly from early respondents, it was logical to conclude that non-respondents were not significantly different from respondents on the key variables of interest in the study.

Instrumentation

Two mail questionnaires (Appendix B) were developed to collect data regarding the following:

1. The attitude of OCES faculty and staff regarding the concept of clustering;

2. The perceived success of Extension to conduct various program components when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and
clustered staffing;

3. The perceived importance of various methods of support for Extension program delivery when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing;

4. Responses to open ended questions related to possible concerns of OCES faculty and staff if the clustered staffing pattern was implemented in Ohio;

5. County personnel responses to open ended questions related to a potential plan for the clustering of counties with the county where the majority of their responsibilities take place, the major program areas of specialization needed within the cluster, and their personal choices for primary and secondary specialization areas; (The data collected from this series of questions were not included as part of the study. This information was used in the development of a clustering plan for OCES.)

6. Demographic information on each respondent concerning their current position within OCES, program area in which the greatest portion of time is devoted, highest academic degree, major area of study, total years of service in Extension, gender, and perceived knowledge of clustering.
One questionnaire was used to survey state and district faculty and staff, while the second questionnaire was used to collect the information from county faculty and staff.

The definitions and descriptions of Clustering, Agent Specialization, and Multi-County Agent Staffing (Appendix A) were located on pages two and three of both instruments. Subjects were instructed to read the definitions provided on each staffing pattern before responding to any items in the questionnaires. Instructions also indicated that if further clarification was needed on the staffing patterns, subjects should review the descriptions which provided a general overview of each pattern.

Section I in both instruments was designed to collect information pertaining to the attitude of subjects toward the clustered staffing pattern concept. Subjects were instructed to circle the number which best represented their feelings related to a series of statements pertaining to clustering. A Likert-type scale was used with the following values and anchors:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Slightly Agree
5 = Agree
6 = Strongly Agree
Section I for the state personnel questionnaire contained 14 items while Section I for the county personnel questionnaire had 13 items. The items in each Section I were divided into sub-scales to measure three of the five behaviors identified by Krathwohl, et al. (1964), as components of the Affective Domain. These behaviors, Receiving, Responding, and Valuing, are three of the five stages through which individuals progress in the development of attitudes. For each Section I, the first five items were designed to measure Receiving or a willingness of the subjects to become aware and learn about clustered staffing. Items 6-9 in each Section I measured the behavior of Responding or a willingness of the subjects to perform some function pertaining to clustered staffing. Items 10-14 in Section I for state personnel and items 10-13 in Section I for county personnel measured the behavior of Valuing or the willingness of the subjects to accept and promote clustered staffing. Items were numbered consecutively and no indication was given to subjects that sub-scales existed in the section or where these divisions were located.

The final two categories within the taxonomy, Organization and Characterization by a Value or Value Complex, were not utilized in the study. These two categories of internalization are established gradually, over time, as individuals have new experiences and incorporate new values into their value system. Since the
majority of OCES faculty and staff had never experienced clustered staffing, the Organization and Characterization categories had not been established in their value hierarchy for the concept of clustering.

Section II of the instruments consisted of 23 items which pertained to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be successfully conducted under agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. Section II was the same for both instruments. Subjects were asked to circle the number following each statement which corresponded to the answer that best described what they perceived in terms of: a) the level of success of OCES in the area in question utilizing agent specialization as an autonomous staffing pattern; b) the level of success of OCES in the area in question utilizing multi-county agent staffing including the agent specialization concept; and c) the level of potential success of OCES in the area in question utilizing clustered staffing including agent specialization.

The scale shown in Figure 1 was used to measure the success of Extension programming efforts when utilizing agent specialization and multi-county agent staffing; and the potential success of Extension programming efforts when utilizing the clustered staffing pattern. The six-point Likert-type scale was assumed to be interval in nature.
In Section III, the items pertained to various methods of support for Extension work which may or may not enhance program delivery under the three staffing patterns options. The Likert-type scale presented in Figure 1 was also used in Section III to describe what the OCES faculty and staff perceived in terms of: a) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when agent specialization is utilized as an autonomous method of staffing; b) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when multi-county agent staffing is utilized and agent specialization is included in the staffing process; and c) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when utilizing the clustered staffing method and including agent specialization. Section III was identical in the two instruments with a total of 17 items. As in Section II, subjects were asked to circle the number following each statement which corresponded to the answer that best described what they perceived in terms of the importance of each method of support for Extension programming identified.
Subjects were asked, in Section IV, to provide written responses to several open-ended items. District and state personnel were asked to respond to only two items in this section. County personnel were asked to respond to seven items. For Item 1, in both questionnaires, subjects were asked to list the one most important concern they would have if the clustered staffing pattern concept was implemented in Ohio. In Item 2, subjects were asked to identify the effects, if any, which they believed the clustered staffing pattern would have on the relationships between Extension and county funding sources.

The additional items provided to the county personnel allowed each individual the opportunity to develop a basic clustering plan for their county. These subjects were asked to identify the county where the majority of their responsibilities take place. The county faculty and staff were then asked to list all counties which would be appropriate as part of a cluster with the county previously identified, taking into consideration location, demographics, and topography. The county personnel then identified the major program areas which they felt should receive agent specialization within their identified cluster. The final two items in Section IV required each county respondent to identify the one program area he/she would like as a primary specialization area and to identify
the one or two program area(s) he/she would like as a secondary specialization area(s). (The information collected from county personnel for the development of a clustering plan and identification of specialty areas was not utilized as a part of the study. It was, however, utilized for the development of a state clustering plan for OCES.)

Section V in both instruments was used to obtain data on the selected demographic characteristics of each respondent:

Current Position Within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service was measured as: a) State/District Extension Specialist; b) County Chair; c) Multi-County Agent; d) County Extension Agent; e) Extension Associate; f) Program Assistant; and g) Other. Multi-County Agent was not listed in the county personnel questionnaire as an option for the current position characteristic. A listing of the OCES multi-county agents was obtained from Dr. John Stitzlein, Leader, Personnel. Through the use of this list and the identification number assigned to each subject, the multi-county agents who responded to the questionnaire were identified and reclassified on the current position characteristic. The level of measurement for the current position within OCES characteristic was assumed to be nominal. The seven respondents who were identified as both county chairs and multi-county agents remained classified at
the county chair level.

**Primary Program Area Assignment** was measured as either:

a) Agriculture; b) 4-H; c) Home Economics; d) Community and Natural Resource Development; e) Other. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be nominal.

**Highest Academic Degree Obtained** was measured as either: a) Bachelor's Degree; b) Master's Degree; c) Doctoral Degree; and d) Other. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be ordinal.

**Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree** was measured as either: a) Administration/Management (Including the areas of: Finance, Management and Human Resources, Management Sciences, or Marketing); b) Agriculture (Including the areas of: Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Engineering, Agronomy, Animal Science, Dairy Science, Horticulture, or Poultry Science); c) Education (Including the areas of: Adult and Continuing Education, Agricultural Education, Education Administration, Environmental Education, Extension Education, General Education, or Home Economics Education); d) Home Economics (Including the areas of: Child Development, Clothing and Textiles, Design, Family Life, Home Furnishings, Home Management, or Nutrition); e) Natural Resources (Including the areas of: Biochemistry, Ecology, Entomology, Forestry, Plant Pathology, or Wildlife Biology); f) Social Science
(Including the areas of: Community Development, Psychology, Rural Sociology, or Sociology); or g) Other. The categories for this characteristic were modified from those used by Jahi (1980), Harrison (1979), and Rennekamp (1987). The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be nominal.

The Length of Service was measured as the total number of years the individual had been employed by Extension, include their service in other states. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years as of July 1, 1989. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be ratio.

Gender was measured as either: a) Female or b) Male. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be nominal.

Perceived Level of Knowledge concerning the clustered staffing pattern concept was measured as either: a) Very High; b) High; c) Moderate; d) Low; e) Very Low; or f) None. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be ordinal.

The internal validity of survey research deals with the accuracy of the data generated by the study. Measurement error was a key threat to the internal validity of this study. To control for measurement error the items in the questionnaire were developed and presented to a panel of experts in the area of Extension administration (Appendix
C). The panel was asked to review the items for content validity. A decision was made a priori to delete or modify any item identified as inappropriate or unclear by two or more members of the panel. Alterations were made according to suggestions made by the panel. Panel members also suggested items for addition and deletion.

As a pilot test, the questionnaire, with appropriate revisions, was distributed in draft form among members of the Administrative Cabinet of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. All members of the Administrative Cabinet, a total of 14 individuals, received questionnaires. Eight questionnaires were returned and usable.

Section I in the initial drafts of the questionnaire contained a Guttman Scale which was used to determine the attitude of the subjects toward the clustered staffing pattern concept. Subjects were asked to place a check [✓] by all the statements in the Guttman Scale which correspond with the actions they would be willing to take related to the clustering of county Extension personnel in Ohio. The subjects were asked to base each response on their knowledge and perceptions regarding the concept of clustering. The first eight items in the Guttman were completed by both specialists and county personnel; however, items 9 through 13 were divided into A and B categories. Items 9A-13A were directed exclusively toward county personnel, while 9B-13B were for the consideration of state/district personnel. The
Guttman is a unidimensional scale, measuring only one attitudinal dimension, which limited the focus of this section of the study. Also, due to comments and suggestions made by the panel of experts and the responses from the pilot test group, the decision was made to change the Guttman Scale to a Likert-type scale.

Two Section I's were developed with the new scale, one for state/district personnel, the other for county personnel. These sections for the questionnaires were then reviewed by members of this researchers graduate committee for content validity. Section I for each questionnaire was then presented to 10 individuals with experience both at the county and state level in the Cooperative Extension Service. The members of the pilot test group were first asked to place themselves in the role of a county Extension agent and respond to each of the 14 items in Section I for county personnel. The pilot group members were also asked to place themselves in the role of a state or district specialist and respond to each of the 14 items in Section I for state/district personnel. Of the 10 individuals in the pilot test group, all 10 returned instruments that were usable.

Cronbach's alpha, a measure of the internal consistency of the results generated by the instruments, was calculated for Sections I, II and III from the data collected in the pilot tests. This measure of reliability was calculated
using the SPSS-PC+ computer program. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients calculated for Section I for state/district personnel were low and unacceptable. Section I for state/district personnel was then revised and presented to the same 10 individuals who participated in the initial pilot test of this section. Again, all 10 individuals returned questionnaires that were usable. The second calculation of the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for this section was acceptable (Table 2).

Cronbach's alpha coefficients were also calculated, in Section II of the instrument, for the scale which measured the levels of success of various program components under the agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing patterns. In Section III, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for the scale which measured the levels of importance of various methods of support for Extension program delivery under the agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns.

An acceptable value for Cronbach's alpha was established _a priori_ at .60. The Cronbach's alpha was set at this moderate level based on Nunnally (1967), who reported that the satisfactory level of reliability depends on how a measure is being used. In the early stages of research on predictor tests or hypothesized measures of a construct, the researcher can save both time and energy by
working with instruments that have only modest reliability, for which purposes values of .50 or .60 will suffice. A summary of the reliability analysis from the pilot tests is found in Tables 2 and 3.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data were collected according to procedures outlined in the Total Design Method For Surveys developed by Dillman (1978); however, several procedures were modified due to the uniqueness of the assessability of the population. Questionnaires were mailed on October 24, 1989, with a cover letter co-signed by Dr. Bobby D. Moser, Director, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and Dr. Keith L. Smith, Associate Director, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, (Appendix D). A self-addressed envelope was enclosed in each packet for respondents located in district and county offices to use when returning their questionnaires. Return envelopes were not stamped because all subjects had access to the Extension penalty mail privilege and could return the questionnaires at no personal cost. Respondents located on the campus of The Ohio State University received their questionnaires in campus-mail envelopes which could also serve as the return envelope. Subjects were encouraged to return the questionnaire by the initial deadline of November 7, 1989. A total of 292 questionnaires for a 60.8 percent response rate was achieved by the initial deadline.
### Table 2

**Summary of Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) in Pilot Test for Section I of the Questionnaires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Section I State Personnel</th>
<th>Section I County Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14 total items)</td>
<td>(13 total items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving</td>
<td>.81 (5 items)</td>
<td>.81 (5 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>.83 (4 items)</td>
<td>.81 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing</td>
<td>.62 (5 items)</td>
<td>.83 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

**Summary of Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) in Pilot Test for Sections II and III of the Questionnaires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Patterns</th>
<th>Section II</th>
<th>Section III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha (23 items)</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha (17 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Specialization</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-County Agent</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered Staffing</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An identification number was assigned to each subject and placed on the front cover of the questionnaire. These identification numbers were utilized to aid in the follow-up with non-respondents. On November 8, 1989, a follow-up letter was sent to all subjects in the study. This follow-up served as a thank you to those who had already responded and as a reminder to those individuals who had not yet responded. A second complete packet, including the questionnaire, a second cover letter, and self-addressed envelope for district and county personnel, was mailed on November 14, 1989. A final deadline date of November 21, 1989, was set for accepting completed questionnaires for data analysis. By the final deadline date, a total of 426 questionnaires were received for a response rate of 88.8 percent.

A decision was made a priori that each instrument must have at least 80.0 percent of Sections I, II, and III completed before it would be utilized in the data analysis. Also, questionnaires with any information missing in Section V would not be used in the analysis. Of the questionnaires received, 29 did not meet these criteria. The resulting data sample was comprised of: 92 State/District Specialists, 8 State Extension Associates, 75 County Chairs, 22 Multi-County Agents, 94 County Extension Agents, 40 County Extension Associates, 50 Program Assistants, and 16 respondents classified as Other. With the elimination of
the 29 respondents who did not meet the set standard, the final sample of usable data included 397 questionnaires for a usable response rate of 82.7 percent (See Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State/District Specialists</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Extension Associates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Chairs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-County Agents</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Agents</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Associates</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistants</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (State/District)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Usable Response Rate = 82.7 percent
Questionnaires Not Meeting Established Criteria = 29

Figure 2

Usable Data Sample by Position

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed with the SPSS-PC+ computer program. Descriptive statistics were used first to summarize and organize the data. Measures of association were utilized to
determine the linear relationship between the three attitude measures and the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options which were identified as antecedent characteristics. The conventions used for describing the measures of association are provided in Figure 3.

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

Source: Davis, 1971

Figure 3

Conventions Used to Describe Measures of Association

Hierarchical analysis procedures were used to explain the variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the selected antecedent characteristics. For the regression models proposed for this study the dependent variables were the three attitude measures of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern; and the three attitude measures of the OCES state personnel toward the
clustered staffing pattern. The antecedent characteristics were initially entered into the hierarchical regression model in the following order: a) Success of OCES when utilizing clustering; b) Importance to OCES when utilizing clustering; c) Success of OCES when utilizing agent specialization; d) Importance to OCES when utilizing agent specialization; e) Success of OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing; f) Importance to OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing.

Following initial analysis, multicollinearity was detected through the examination of the intercorrelations of the antecedent characteristics. Each antecedent characteristic in the equation was regressed on all other antecedent characteristics as prescribed by Warmbrod (1988), and coefficients of determination (R square) values examined. The variables, importance to OCES when utilizing clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing, were then combined into one variable and a second hierarchical analysis was conducted. The ordering for this analysis was as follows: a) Success of OCES when utilizing clustering; b) Success of OCES when utilizing agent specialization; c) Success of OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing; and d) Combined scores of the importance to OCES when utilizing clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Purpose of the Study

The primary focus of this study was to describe the attitudes of the population of the OCES faculty and staff concerning the clustered staffing pattern. The study was also conducted to examine the association between the perceptions of the population members in terms of the three staffing pattern options (i.e. clustered staffing, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing) and their attitude toward clustering. Concerns of the population were then obtained regarding the implementation of clustered staffing in Ohio.

Variables and Objectives of the Study

The following dependent variables and antecedent characteristics were utilized in the study:

Dependent Variable:

A. The three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the OCES county faculty and staff toward the clustered staffing pattern concept
B. The three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the OCES state/district faculty and staff toward the clustered staffing pattern concept

Antecedent Characteristics:

A. The perceived success of OCES to conduct various components of the Extension program when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns

B. The perceived importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns

C. Current Position Within OCES

D. Primary Program Area Assignment

E. Highest Academic Degree Obtained

F. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree

G. Length of Service with Extension

H. Gender

I. Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering

The following research objectives were formulated as a guide for the study:

1. To describe the faculty and staff of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service on the following selected
antecedent characteristics:
A. The perceived success of OCES to conduct various components of the Extension program when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns
B. The perceived importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns
C. Current Position Within OCES
D. Primary Program Area Assignment
E. Highest Academic Degree Obtained
F. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree
G. Length of Service with Extension
H. Gender
I. Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering

2. To describe three measures of the attitude of OCES state/district personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept across levels of the following selected antecedent characteristics:
A. Current Position Within OCES
B. Primary Program Area Assignment
C. Highest Academic Degree Obtained
D. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree
E. Length of Service with Extension
F. Gender

G. Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering

3. To describe three measures of the attitude of OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept across levels of the selected antecedent characteristics identified in Objective 2

4. To determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options

5. To determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES state/district personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options

6. To describe the major concerns of the OCES faculty and staff toward the implementation of the clustered staffing pattern in Ohio

7. To describe the concerns of the OCES faculty and staff toward the relationship between Extension and county
funding sources if the clustered staffing pattern was implemented in Ohio

Subject Selection

The target population to which results were to be generalized included all Extension faculty and staff in the state of Ohio. To obtain the most accurate results possible a census was utilized in gathering the information from the target population. A listing of the names and addresses of the Extension faculty and staff was obtained from the Leader, Personnel of OCES. All full and part-time State and District Specialists, Extension Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants employed by OCES were surveyed. The total number of subjects utilized in the study was 480.

Instrumentation

Two mail questionnaires (Appendix B) were developed to collect data about the population. Respondents were first instructed to review the definition and description of Clustering, Agent Specialization, and Multi-County Agent Staffing (Appendix A) which were located on pages two and three of each questionnaire.

Section I in both instruments was designed to collect information pertaining to the attitude of subjects toward the clustered staffing pattern concept. Section I for the
state/district personnel questionnaire was comprised of 14 Likert-type items, while Section I for the county personnel questionnaire contained 13 items. The items in each Section I were divided into sub-scales to measure three of the five behaviors identified by Krathwohl, et al. (1964), as components of the Affective Domain. For each Section I, the first five items were designed to measure Receiving or a willingness of the subjects to become aware and learn about clustered staffing. Items 6-9 in each Section I measured the behavior of Responding or a willingness of the subjects to perform some function pertaining to clustered staffing. Items 10-14 in Section I for state personnel and items 10-13 in Section I for county personnel measured the behavior of Valuing or the willingness of the subjects to accept and promote clustered staffing. Items were numbered consecutively with no information provided to the subjects regarding the existence or location of the sub-scales within the section. The following values and anchors were used for Section I:

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

Section II for both instruments consisted of 23 items which pertained to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be successfully conducted under agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered
staffing patterns. Subjects were asked to circle the number following each statement that best represented what they perceived in terms of the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing agent specialization as an autonomous staffing pattern; multi-county agent staffing (including the agent specialization concept); and the potential OCES success utilizing clustered staffing with agent specialization.

The following scale was used by the respondents to measure the success of Extension when utilizing agent specialization and multi-county agent staffing; and the potential success of Extension when utilizing the clustered staffing method:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same six-point Likert-type scale was also used in Section III to describe what respondents perceived in terms of the importance of the item in question to Extension programming when agent specialization is utilized as an autonomous method of staffing; when multi-county agent staffing is utilized and agent specialization is included in the staffing process; and when utilizing the clustered staffing method and including agent specialization. Section
III in both instruments contained 17 items which pertained to various methods of support for Extension programming. As in Section II, respondents were asked to circle the number following each statement that best represented what they perceived in terms of the importance of each method of program support when utilized under the three methods of staffing.

In Section IV subjects were asked to provide written responses to several open-ended items. District and state personnel responded to only two items in this section. County Extension agents, Extension associates, and program assistants were asked to respond to seven items. For Item 1, in both questionnaires, subjects were asked to list the one most important concern they would have if the clustered staffing pattern concept was implemented in Ohio. In Item 2, the subjects were asked to identify the effects, if any, which they believe the clustered staffing pattern would have on the relationships between Extension and county funding sources. The additional items were provided in the county personnel questionnaire to allow them to develop a basic clustering plan for their county; and to identify their personal primary and secondary specialty areas. The information obtained from these questions was not used as part of the study, but was utilized by OCES in the development of county clusters. Section V of both instruments was used to collect data on each of the selected
demographic characteristics examined in the study.

To control for measurement error the items in the questionnaire were developed and presented to a panel of experts in the area of Extension administration (Appendix C). The panel was asked to review the items for content validity. For establishing reliability, the questionnaire, with appropriate revisions, was distributed in draft form among members of the Administrative Cabinet of OCES for pilot testing. All members of the Administrative Cabinet, a total of 14 individuals, received questionnaires.

Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated from the data collected in the pilot test for Sections I, II, and III. The analysis of the pilot test results yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .81, .83, and .62 respectively for the three sub-scales of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing found in Section I of the state personnel questionnaire. For Section I of the county personnel questionnaire the sub-scales of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing produced Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .81, .81, and .83 respectively.

In Section II of the instruments, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for the three scales which measured the levels of success of various program components for agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing. The analysis yielded results of .92, .71, and .94 respectively for the three staffing pattern
options. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were also calculated for the three scales which measured the levels of importance of various program components for agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing in Section III of the instruments. The coefficients calculated for Section III were .70, .76, and .85 for agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing respectively.

Data Collection Procedures

Questionnaires were mailed to all 480 members of the target population of OCES personnel on October 24, 1989. On November 8, 1989, a follow-up letter was sent to all subjects in the study. A second complete packet was mailed on November 14, 1989, to those individuals who had not yet responded. A final deadline date of November 21, 1989, was set for accepting completed questionnaires for data analysis. By the final deadline date, a total of 292 questionnaires were received for a response rate of 88.8 percent. Of the questionnaires received, 29 were judged to be unusable because of missing information. The resulting data sample was comprised of: 92 District/State Specialists, 8 State Extension Associates, 75 County Chairs, 22 Multi-County Agents, 94 County Extension Agents, 40 County Extension Associates, 50 Program Assistants, and 16 respondents classified as Other. The final sample of usable
data included 397 questionnaires for a usable response rate of 82.7 percent.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used first to summarize and organize the data. Measures of association were utilized to determine the linear relationship between the three attitude measures and the success and importance belief scores for each of the staffing pattern options which were identified as antecedent characteristics.

Hierarchical analysis procedures were used to explain the variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the selected antecedent characteristics. For the regression models proposed for this study the dependent variables were the three attitude measures of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern; and the three attitude measures of the OCES state personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern. The antecedent characteristics were initially entered into the hierarchical regression model in the following order: a) Success of OCES when utilizing clustering; b) Importance to OCES when utilizing clustering; c) Success of OCES when utilizing agent specialization; d) Importance to OCES when utilizing agent specialization; e) Success of OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing; f) Importance to OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing.
Following initial analysis, multicollinearity was detected through the examination of the intercorrelations of the antecedent characteristics. Each antecedent characteristic in the equation was regressed on all other antecedent characteristics as prescribed by Warmbrod (1988), and coefficients of determination (R square) values examined. The variables, importance to OCES when utilizing clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing, were then combined into one variable and a second regression analysis was conducted. The ordering for this analysis was as follows: a) Success of OCES when utilizing clustering; b) Success of OCES when utilizing agent specialization; c) Success of OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing; and d) Combined scores of the importance to OCES when utilizing clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing.

Major Findings

Objective 1

Tables 4 through 12 present information which describe the OCES faculty and staff on the nine antecedent characteristics utilized in the study. Of the 397 subjects which comprised the data sample, 29.2 percent (116) were state/district faculty and staff while 70.8 percent (281) were county faculty and staff.
Table 4 displayed the frequency distribution of the current positions of the members of the data sample within OCES. The largest percentage of individuals fell under the category of county Extension agent with 23.7 percent (94). This was closely followed by the position of Extension specialist with 23.2 percent (92). A total of 22.7 percent of the respondents reported their position as either a county program assistant (50) or Extension associate (40). Almost 19 percent (75) of the respondents identified their current position as that of county chair. Five and one-half percent (22) of the respondents were identified as multi-county agents. The remaining six percent of the respondents reported their current position as either state Extension associate (8) or "other" (16). The majority of the 16 respondents who reported their current position as "other" were administrators within the Colleges of Agriculture or Human Ecology.

A total of 37.5 percent (149) of the respondents identified agriculture as their program area of primary responsibility. Agriculture was followed by 4-H as program area of primary responsibility with slightly over 27 percent (108) of the respondents. Almost 22 percent (86) reported home economics as the area of primary responsibility. The remaining 14 percent identified CNRD (24) and "other" (30) as the program areas of primary responsibility (See Table 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Associate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Ext. Associate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Agent</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-County Agent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Chair</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total County Personnel</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total State/Dist. Personnel</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>397</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Frequency Distribution for Primary Program Area Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Program Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Master's was the highest academic degree reported by 60.7 percent (241) of the respondents, followed by the Doctoral degree with 17 percent (68). Bachelor's degree was reported by 15 percent (60) as the highest academic degree obtained, and Other by seven percent (28) (See Table 6).

The frequency distribution for the major area of study in the highest academic degree was displayed in Table 7. The major most frequently identified was education which included the areas of adult and continuing education, agricultural education, education administration, environmental education, extension education, general education, and home economics education. Over 37 percent
Table 6

Frequency Distribution for Highest Academic Degree Obtained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Academic Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>397</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(148) of the OCES faculty and staff reported education as the major area of study in their highest academic degree. Agriculture was identified by approximately 27 percent (102) of the respondents. The agriculture area was followed by home economics with 15.4 percent (61). Approximately 12 percent of the respondents indicated their major as either administration/management (11), natural resources (25), or social science (11).

A total of 32.5 percent (129) reported their length of service as five years or less, over 21 percent (84) indicated their length of service as six to 10 years, approximately 20 percent (79) fell into the 11 to 15 year category, while almost 16 percent (63) were in the 16 to 20
### Table 7

**Frequency Distribution for Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Area of Study</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>397</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Frequency Distribution for Length of Service with Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years or Less</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 Years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

year range. Only 10.6 percent (42) of the respondents reported their length of service as over 20 years (See Table 8).

Table 9 displayed the frequency distribution for gender. Over 56 percent (224) of the respondents were male while approximately 44 percent (173) were female.

The majority of the OCES faculty and staff reported their perceived level of knowledge of clustering to be moderate, high, or very high. Almost 50 percent (198) indicated a moderate perceived level of knowledge of clustering, while approximately 32 percent perceived their knowledge of clustering to be high (98) or very high (28).
Table 9

**Frequency Distribution for Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>397</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

**Frequency Distribution for Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>397</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The very low and low categories were reported by 17.4 percent (69) of those responding. Only one percent (4) reported no perceived knowledge of clustering (See Table 10).

Table 11 displayed the summary data of the faculty and staff regarding their perceptions of the success of OCES to conduct various components of the Extension program when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, or clustered staffing. As a whole the faculty and staff perceived the greatest success in conducting various Extension programs would occur under the agent specialization staffing pattern. Agent specialization success had the highest mean score at 3.65 with a standard deviation of .80. Agent specialization was followed by clustering success with a mean score of 3.35 and a standard deviation of .91. Multi-County success had the lowest mean score at 2.95 and a standard deviation of .90. (These means were based on a six-point scale with a zero to five range.)

Table 12 displayed the summary data of the faculty and staff regarding their perceptions of the importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, or clustered staffing. The mean scores for the various support methods for Extension programming were similar across the three staffing pattern options. A difference of only 0.05 existed between the highest mean score of 4.04 for
Table 11  
Summary Data: Perceived Success of OCES to Conduct Various Components of the Extension Program When Utilizing Agent Specialization, Multi-County Agent, and Clustered Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>*3.65</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 0 to 5 Likert-type scale with 0 = No Success and 5 = Very Great Success

n = 397

importance to clustered staffing and the lowest mean score of 3.99 for importance to agent specialization. (These means were based on a six-point scale with a zero to five range.)
Table 12

Summary Data: Perceived Importance of Various Methods of Support for Extension Programming When Utilizing Agent Specialization, Multi-County Agent, and Clustered Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>*3.99</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 0 to 5 Likert-type scale with 0 = No Success and 5 = Very Great Success

n = 397

Objective 2

Tables 13 through 19 described the attitude measures of receiving, responding, and valuing held by state/district personnel toward clustered staffing. Mean scores for the dependent variables were calculated across the demographic characteristics of the 116 state/district personnel who comprised the data sample. Scores were based on a six-point Likert-type scale with one being the minimum score and six the maximum.

Table 13 displayed the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by the antecedent characteristic current state/district position. The eight
Table 13

Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Current State/District Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>*4.80</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Assoc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
Extension associates had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.83). Following the Extension associates were the 92 state/district specialists (mean = 4.80) and the 16 respondents who classified themselves as "other" (primarily department chairs) (mean = 4.67). The respondents who classified themselves as "other" had the highest mean scores for the responding and valuing variables (mean = 5.23, and mean = 4.92 respectively). Specialists had higher mean scores for the variables responding and valuing than did the Extension associates. The highest mean scores for the state/district specialists, Extension associates, and those respondents classifying themselves as "other" were all found on the responding variable.

Table 14 displayed the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by primary program area assignment for the state/district personnel. Those with primary program assignment in the area of home economics had the highest mean scores for all three of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.28, responding mean = 5.16, and valuing mean = 5.23). Those with their primary program assignment in the area of CNRD had the second highest mean scores across the three dependent variables followed by those individuals with primary assignment in agriculture. Respondents who identified 4-H as the primary program area assignment had the fourth highest mean scores in receiving and valuing, while those who classified their primary
Table 14

Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Primary Program Area Assignment for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th></th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th></th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>*4.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree*
assignment as "other" were fourth highest in responding. Those with 4-H and "other" identified as the area of primary assignment had no mean scores on the dependent variables which were equal to or greater than the grand means for the state/district personnel.

Table 15 provided information on the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by highest academic degree obtained for the state/district personnel. Those whose highest academic degree was a Master's had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 5.04). Those with a Doctoral degree had the second highest mean in receiving and the highest mean scores in both responding and valuing (means = 4.76, 5.03, and 5.05 respectively). Those with Bachelor's and "other" identified as the highest degree obtained had no mean scores on the dependent variables which were equal to or greater than the grand means for the state/district personnel.

Table 16 displayed the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by major area of study in the highest academic degree for state/district personnel. Those whose major field of study was education had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 5.10) and the second highest mean score for valuing (mean = 5.07); however, for the responding variable those who majored in education had the lowest mean score of any major field of study (mean = 4.89). Those who identified natural resources
Table 15
Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Highest Academic Degree Obtained for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving Mean</th>
<th>Receiving SD</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Responding SD</th>
<th>Valuing Mean</th>
<th>Valuing SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*4.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
Table 16

Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving Mean</th>
<th>Receiving SD</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Responding SD</th>
<th>Valuing Mean</th>
<th>Valuing SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin./Mgt.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*4.00 .80</td>
<td>5.17 .72</td>
<td>4.87 1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.72 .94</td>
<td>4.92 .67</td>
<td>4.79 .84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.10 .90</td>
<td>4.89 .85</td>
<td>5.07 .66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00 .47</td>
<td>5.14 .48</td>
<td>5.00 .52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Res.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.08 .60</td>
<td>5.09 .66</td>
<td>5.16 .71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.73 .76</td>
<td>5.33 .52</td>
<td>4.80 .20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.23 1.15</td>
<td>4.96 .37</td>
<td>4.57 .92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.78 .92</td>
<td>4.97 .66</td>
<td>4.88 .78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
as their major field of study had the second highest mean in receiving and the highest mean scores in valuing (means = 5.08 and 5.16 respectively). The three respondents who identified social science as their major field of study had the highest mean score for the responding variable (mean = 5.33) followed by the three respondents who indicated their major as administration/management (responding mean = 5.17). Respondents who majored in the field of home economics had the third highest mean scores for all three dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.00, responding mean = 5.14, and valuing mean = 5.00). Those who identified their major area of study as agriculture had the fifth highest mean score for receiving (mean = 4.72) and the sixth highest mean scores for responding and valuing (means = 4.92 and 4.79 respectively).

Table 17 displayed mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by length of service with Extension. The highest mean scores for the receiving variable was seen in those respondents who had a tenure of over 20 years (mean = 5.26). Those with tenure of over 20 years also had the highest mean scores for the responding and valuing variables (means = 5.33 and 5.07 respectively). Respondents with tenure of six to 10 years had the second highest mean scores on the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.89, responding = 5.07, and valuing = 4.96). Those with tenure in the 11 to 15 year category had
Table 17
Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Length of Service With Extension for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th></th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th></th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Yrs. or Less</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>*4.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 Yrs.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
the third highest mean scores on all three of the dependent
variables (receiving mean = 4.81, responding = 4.95, and
valuing = 4.91). Those with tenure of five years or less
and those with tenure in the 16 to 20 year category had the
lowest mean scores of any tenure groups. Respondents with
tenure of five years or less had the lowest mean scores of
any tenure group for the receiving and valuing variables
(means = 4.51 and 4.69 respectively). Those in the 16 to 20
year category had the lowest mean score for the responding
variable of any other tenure group (mean = 4.78).

Table 18 contained mean scores for the receiving,
responding, and valuing variables by gender. State/District
personnel who are female had higher mean scores than males
on the receiving and responding variables (means = 5.01 and
5.09 respectively for females and means = 4.73 and 4.95
respectively for males). Males had a mean score slightly
higher than females on the valuing variable (mean = 4.89
versus 4.84).

Table 19 displayed mean scores for the receiving,
responding, and valuing variables by perceived level of
knowledge of clustering for the state/district personnel.
Those who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be
moderate, high, or very high had higher mean scores for the
three dependent variables than those who perceived their
knowledge to be very low or low. Only one individual
indicated having no perceived knowledge of clustering. The
Table 18
Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Gender for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24 *5.01 .80</td>
<td>5.09 .47</td>
<td>4.84 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92 4.73 .94</td>
<td>4.95 .70</td>
<td>4.89 .73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116 4.78 .92</td>
<td>4.97 .66</td>
<td>4.88 .78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree

Five respondents who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be very high had the highest mean scores over the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.52, responding mean = 5.40, and valuing mean = 5.48). Over 74 percent of the state/district personnel rated their perceived knowledge level of clustering in the moderate and high categories. Mean scores of the receiving, responding, and, valuing variables for those who identified themselves in the moderate and high knowledge level categories were above the grand means for the three dependent variables with only one exception. Those who indicated their perceived knowledge of clustering to be high had a slightly lower mean score on the
Table 19

Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*4.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
responding variable than the grand mean for this variable (responding mean high perceived knowledge = 4.96 versus a responding grand mean = 4.97). Those who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be very low and low had mean scores that were lower than the state/district personnel grand means for all three of the dependent variables.

**Objective 3**

Tables 20 through 26 described the attitude measures of receiving, responding, and valuing held by the OCES county personnel toward clustered staffing. Mean scores for the dependent variables were calculated across the demographic characteristics of the 281 county personnel who were part of the data sample. Scores were based on a six-point Likert-type scale with one being the minimum score and six the maximum.

Table 20 displayed the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by the antecedent characteristic, current county position. The 22 multi-county agents had the highest mean score for the three dependent variables of any county position group (receiving mean = 5.09, responding mean = 4.82, and valuing mean = 4.91). Following the multi-county agents were the county Extension agents who had the second highest mean scores for each of the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.87, responding mean = 4.69, and valuing mean = 4.43).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving Mean</th>
<th>Receiving SD</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Responding SD</th>
<th>Valuing Mean</th>
<th>Valuing SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Chair</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>*4.82</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Agt.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Ext. Agt.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Assoc.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog. Asst.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree*
County chairs had the third highest mean scores for the receiving and responding variables (mean = 4.82 and mean = 4.63 respectively) but were fourth highest for the valuing variable behind the Extension associates. The Extension associates had higher mean scores for all three dependent variables than program assistants who had the lowest mean scores on each of the dependent variables. Overall, the mean scores decreased from receiving to responding to valuing for each of the county positions. The only exception was the valuing mean score for multi-county agents which was higher than their mean score for responding.

Table 21 displayed the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by primary program area assignment for the county personnel. Of the four major Extension program areas, those with a primary program assignment in home economics had the highest mean scores for all three of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.95, responding mean = 4.74, and valuing mean = 4.50). Those with a primary program assignment in the area of agriculture had the second highest mean scores across the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.87, responding mean = 4.70, and valuing mean = 4.48). Respondents who identified 4-H as the primary program area assignment had the third highest mean scores in receiving and valuing (means = 4.73 and 4.09 respectively). Those with primary responsibilities in CNRD were third highest in responding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th></th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th></th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree*
(mean = 4.60), but were fourth highest in receiving and valuing. Those who indicated their primary program area as "other" had higher mean scores than any of the four major program areas (receiving mean = 5.03, responding mean = 4.74, and valuing mean = 4.63). The majority of respondents who classified their program area assignment as "other" identified the Expanded Food and Nutrition Program and administration as their primary program area. Generally, the mean scores decreased from receiving to responding to valuing for each of the program areas. The only exception was the responding mean score for personnel in CNRD, which was higher than their mean score for receiving.

Table 22 provided information on the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by highest academic degree obtained for the county personnel. The five individuals with a Doctoral degree had the highest mean score for all three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.96, responding mean = 4.70, and valuing mean = 4.60). Those with a Master's degree had the second highest mean scores for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.85, responding mean = 4.67, and valuing mean = 4.40). Those county personnel with a Bachelor's degree had the third highest mean scores on each of the dependent variables, while those who identified their highest academic degree as "other" had the lowest mean scores on the three dependent variables. The individuals who identified their
Table 22

Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Highest Academic Degree Obtained for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving Mean</th>
<th>Receiving SD</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Responding SD</th>
<th>Valuing Mean</th>
<th>Valuing SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>*4.81</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
highest academic degree as "other" primarily were those with no academic degrees beyond the high school diploma. Those with Bachelor's and "other" identified as the highest degree obtained had no mean scores on the dependent variables which were equal to or greater than the grand means for the county personnel.

Table 23 displayed the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by major area of study in the highest academic degree for county personnel. The eight respondents whose major field of study was administration/management had the highest mean score for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.13, responding mean = 4.68, and valuing mean = 4.82). Those who identified home economics as their major field of study had the fourth highest mean in receiving (mean = 4.91) and the second highest mean scores in responding and valuing (means = 4.77 and 4.46 respectively). The eight respondents who identified social science as their major field of study had the second highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.95); however, their mean scores for responding and valuing were fourth and sixth highest respectively. Respondents who majored in the field of education represented over 44 percent of the total county personnel. This group (education majors) had the third highest mean scores for all three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.92, responding mean = 4.61, and valuing mean = 4.37).
Table 23

Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th></th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th></th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin./Mgt.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Res.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
Those who identified their major area of study as agriculture had the fifth highest mean score for receiving and the fourth highest mean score for valuing (means = 4.65 and 4.82 respectively). Agriculture majors had the lowest mean score for the responding variable (mean = 4.56). Those who identified natural resources as their major had the lowest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.47) while those who identified "other" as their major had the lowest valuing mean score (mean = 3.92). Those who classified their major as "other" were primarily individuals who had a high school diploma as their highest academic degree.

Table 24 displayed mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by length of service with Extension for the county personnel. The highest mean scores for the dependent variables, receiving and valuing, were found in respondents who had over 20 years of service in Extension (means = 4.99 and 4.60 respectively). This tenure group also had the second highest mean score in responding (mean = 4.71). Those with tenure in the 11 to 15 year category had the second highest mean scores on the receiving and valuing variables (means = 4.94 and 4.38 respectively) and the highest mean score on responding (mean = 4.76). Respondents with tenure of five years or less had the third highest mean scores of the five tenure groups for the receiving and valuing variables (means = 4.84 and 4.37
Table 24

Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Length of Service With Extension for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Yrs. or Less</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*4.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 Yrs.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree
respectively) and the fourth highest mean scores on the responding variable (mean = 4.60). Those with tenure of six to 10 years had the third highest mean scores on the responding variables (mean = 4.61) and the fourth highest mean scores on the receiving and valuing variables (means = 4.80 and 4.27 respectively). Those with tenure in the 16 to 20 year category had the lowest mean scores of any tenure groups for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.62, responding mean = 4.71, and valuing mean = 4.60). For the antecedent characteristic, length of service, mean scores decreased from receiving to responding to valuing for each of the tenure categories.

Table 25 contained mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by gender. County personnel who are female had slightly higher mean scores than males on the receiving and responding variables (means = 4.84 and 4.65 respectively for females and means = 4.83 and 4.62 respectively for males). Males had a mean score slightly higher than females on the valuing variable (mean = 4.35 for males versus mean = 4.34 for females).

Table 26 displayed mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables by perceived level of knowledge of clustering for the county personnel. Those who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be moderate, high, or very high had higher mean scores for the three dependent variables than those who perceived their knowledge
Table 25
Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Gender for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving Mean</th>
<th>Receiving SD</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Responding SD</th>
<th>Valuing Mean</th>
<th>Valuing SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>149</td>
<td><em>4.84</em></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree

to be none, very low, or low. The 23 respondents who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be very high had the highest mean scores for the responding and valuing variables (means = 4.86 and 4.70 respectively). Those with a very high perceived knowledge of clustering also had the second highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.88). Approximately 74 percent of the county personnel rated their perceived knowledge of clustering to be moderate or high. Those who classified their perceived knowledge of clustering to be high had the highest mean score for receiving (mean = 4.99) and the second highest mean scores for responding and valuing (means = 4.71 and 4.49
### Table 26

**Mean Scores for the Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables by Perceived Level of Knowledge of Clustering for County Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Receiving Mean</th>
<th>Receiving SD</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Responding SD</th>
<th>Valuing Mean</th>
<th>Valuing SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>2.73</em></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree.*
respectively). Those who classified their perceived knowledge of clustering to be moderate had the third highest mean scores for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.85, responding mean = 4.59, and valuing mean = 4.32). Only three individuals indicated having no perceived knowledge of clustering; however, these individuals had the lowest mean scores for the dependent variables of any other perceived knowledge classification. Those who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be none, very low, and low had mean scores that were equal to or less than the county personnel grand means for all three of the dependent variables.

Objective 4

The purpose of Objective 4 was to determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options. Tables 27 through 32 provided results of the regression analysis for each of the dependent variables based on data collected from county personnel.

Table 27 displayed the overall mean scores and standard deviations for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables and selected antecedent characteristics for county personnel. The selected antecedent characteristics were the
Table 27
Summary Data: Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Variables and Selected Antecedent Characteristics for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Score</td>
<td>*4.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding Score</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Score</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>**3.30</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree (From Receiving Score through Valuing Score)

**Means based on a 0 to 5 Likert-type scale with 0 = No Success or No Importance and 5 = Very Great Success or Very Great Importance (From Clustering Success through Multi-County Importance)

n = 281
success and importance scores for the three staffing patterns options under consideration by OCES.

Table 28 displayed the intercorrelations between the selected antecedent characteristics for the county personnel. The intercorrelations ranged from a low of .37 between agent specialization importance and multi-county agent success to a high of .90 between clustering importance and multi-county importance. Other very strong associations (Davis, 1971) existed between clustering success and agent specialization success (.79); clustering importance and agent specialization importance (.73); and agent specialization importance and multi-county importance (.81). Intercorrelations which were considered substantial associations between the antecedent characteristics were clustering success and clustering importance (.56); clustering success and multi-county success (.69); clustering importance and agent specialization success (.56); agent specialization success and agent specialization importance (.51); and agent specialization success and multi-county success (.59). All other correlation between the antecedent characteristics were considered moderate associations by Davis (1971).

Table 29 displayed the correlations of selected antecedent characteristics with the dependent variables for county personnel. Substantial association (Davis, 1971) existed between the receiving, responding, and valuing
Table 28

Summary Data: Intercorrelations Between the Selected Antecedent Characteristics for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success (X1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt. (X2)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success (X3)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt. (X4)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success (X5)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt. (X6)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 281
Table 29
Summary Data: Correlations of Selected Antecedent Characteristics with the Dependent Variables for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 281
variables and the antecedent characteristic clustering success (.61, .55, .64 respectively). Clustering importance and the responding variable also had a substantial association (.50) (Davis, 1971). All other measures of association between the dependent variables and the antecedent characteristics were found to be in the moderate association category (Davis, 1971).

Table 30 displayed the regression model for the receiving variable for county personnel. The linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 42.7 percent of the variance in the receiving scores. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 36.9 percent of the total variance in the receiving scores for county personnel. Since this was the first characteristic entered into the model no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. This explains the high R square change value (.369) in comparison to the five additional antecedent characteristics which were entered into the model. These five antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 5.8 percent of variance which was not accounted for by clustering success. The unique contribution of each antecedent characteristic in explaining variance in the receiving scores can be seen in Table 30 under the R square change heading. The partial regression coefficients (b) indicated the expected change in the dependent variable
Table 30

Regression of Receiving Score for County Personnel

(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .690
n = 281
associated with a one unit change in an antecedent characteristic when the other antecedent characteristics were held constant.

Table 31 displayed the regression model for the responding variable for county personnel. The linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 36 percent of the variance in the responding scores. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 29.9 percent of the total variance in the responding scores for the county personnel. Since this was the first characteristic entered into the model no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. This explains the high R square change value (.299) in comparison to the five additional antecedent characteristics which were entered into the model. Four of the five additional antecedent characteristics accounted for 6.1 percent of the variance which was not explained by clustering success. The multi-county success characteristic had an R square change of .000 indicating no proportion of variance in the responding scores was uniquely accounted for by this antecedent characteristic. The unique contribution of each antecedent characteristic in explaining variance in the responding scores can be seen in Table 31 under the R square change heading. The partial regression coefficients (b) indicated the expected change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit change in an antecedent
Table 31

Regression of Responding Score for County Personnel

(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .679
n = 281
characteristic when the other antecedent characteristics were held constant.

Table 32 displayed the regression model for the valuing variable for county personnel. The linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 46.8 percent of the variance in the valuing scores. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 41.5 percent of the total variance in the valuing scores for the county personnel. Since this was the first characteristic entered into the model no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. This explains the high $R^2$ square change value (.415) in comparison to the five additional antecedent characteristics which were entered into the model. These five antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 5.3 percent of variance which was not accounted for by clustering success. The unique contribution of each antecedent characteristic in explaining variance in the valuing scores can be seen in Table 32 under the $R^2$ square change heading. The partial regression coefficients ($b$) indicated the expected change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit change in an antecedent characteristic when the other antecedent characteristics were held constant.

Following initial analysis, multicollinearity was detected through the examination of the intercorrelations of
**Table 32**

*Regression of Valuing Score for County Personnel*

*(Hierarchical Entry)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
<th>$b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .780

n = 281
the antecedent characteristics. Each antecedent characteristic in the equation was regressed on all other antecedent characteristics as prescribed by Warmbrod (1988), and coefficients of determination (R square) values examined. The three variables, clustering importance, agent specialization importance, and multi-county importance, were combined into one variable and a second regression analysis was conducted (See Appendix E for tables of this analysis).

**Objective 5**

The purpose of Objective 5 was to determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES state/district personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options. Tables 33 through 38 provide results of the regression analysis for each of the dependent variables based on data from the state/district personnel.

Table 33 displayed the overall mean scores and standard deviations for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables and selected antecedent characteristics for state/district personnel. The selected antecedent characteristics were the success and importance scores for the three staffing patterns options under consideration by OCES.
Table 33

Summary Data: Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Scores and Selected Antecedent Characteristics for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Score</td>
<td>*4.74</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding Score</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Score</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>**3.47</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means based on a 1 to 6 Likert-type scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 6 = Strongly Agree (From Receiving Score through Valuing Score)

**Means based on a 0 to 5 Likert-type scale with 0 = No Success or No Importance and 5 = Very Great Success or Very Great Importance (From Clustering Success through Multi-County Importance)

n = 116
Table 34 displayed the intercorrelations between the selected antecedent characteristics for the state/district personnel. The intercorrelations ranged from a low of .29 between clustering success and agent specialization importance to a high of .95 between the clustering importance and multi-county importance. Other very strong associations (Davis, 1971) existed between clustering success and multi-county success (.70); clustering importance and agent specialization importance (.81); and agent specialization importance and multi-county importance (.86). Intercorrelations which were considered substantial associations between the antecedent characteristics were clustering success and agent specialization success (.63); clustering importance and agent specialization success (.59); agent specialization success and agent specialization importance (.54); agent specialization success and multi-county success (.56); and agent specialization success and multi-county importance (.59). All other intercorrelations between the antecedent characteristics were considered moderate associations by Davis (1971).

Table 35 displayed the correlations of selected antecedent characteristics with the dependent variables for state/district personnel. Moderate association (Davis, 1971) existed between each of the receiving, responding, and valuing variables and the antecedent characteristics clustering success and multi-county success. The receiving
Table 34

Summary Data: Intercorrelations Between the Selected Antecedent Characteristics for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success (X1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt. (X2)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success (X3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt. (X4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success (X5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt. (X6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 116
Table 35
Summary Data: Correlations of Selected Antecedent Characteristics with the Dependent Variables for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 116
score had a moderate association with each of the antecedent characteristics. The highest correlation coefficient for the state/district personnel was found between agent specialization importance and the receiving score (.42). The measures of association between the dependent variable, responding, and the antecedent characteristics, clustering importance, agent specialization success, agent specialization importance, and multi-county importance were found to be in the low association category (Davis, 1971). The correlation coefficients between the dependent variable, valuing, and these antecedent characteristics also fell into the low association category. The only exception to this was the association between valuing and agent specialization success which was classified as negligible (.08) (Davis, 1971).

Table 36 displayed the regression model for the receiving variable for state/district personnel. The linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 25.3 percent of the variance in the receiving scores. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 14.3 percent of the total variance in the receiving scores for state/district personnel. Since this was the first characteristic entered into the model no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. This explains the higher R square change value (.143) in comparison to the
Table 36

Regression of Receiving Score for State/District Personnel
(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .826
n = 116
five additional antecedent characteristics which were entered into the model. These five antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 11.0 percent of the variance which was not accounted for by clustering success. The last variable entered into the model, multi-county importance, made no unique contribution in explaining variance in the receiving scores. The unique contribution of each antecedent characteristic in explaining variance in the receiving score can be seen in Table 36 under the R square change heading. The partial regression coefficients \((b)\) indicated the expected change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit change in an antecedent characteristic when the other antecedent characteristics were held constant.

Table 37 displayed the regression model for the responding variable for state/district personnel. The linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 14.9 percent of the variance in the responding scores. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 9.7 percent of the total variance in the responding scores for the state/district personnel. Since this was the first characteristic entered into the model no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. This explains the higher R square change value (.097) in comparison to the five additional antecedent characteristics which were
Table 37

Regression of Responding Score for State/District Personnel
(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .648
n = 116
entered into the model. These five antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 5.2 percent of variance which was not explained by clustering success. The unique contribution of each antecedent characteristic in explaining variance in the responding scores can be seen in Table 37 under the R square change heading. The partial regression coefficients (b) indicated the expected change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit change in an antecedent characteristic when the other antecedent characteristics were held constant.

Table 38 displayed the regression model for the valuing variable for state/district personnel. The linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 28.0 percent of the variance in the valuing scores. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 11.8 percent of the total variance in the valuing scores for the state/district personnel. Since this was the first characteristic entered into the model no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. This explains the high R square change value (.118) in comparison to the five additional antecedent characteristics which were entered into the model. These five antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 16.2 percent of variance which was not accounted for by clustering success. The unique contribution of each antecedent characteristic in explaining variance in the
### Table 38

**Regression of Valuing Score for State/District Personnel**

*(Hierarchical Entry)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
<th>$b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Impt.</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Impt.</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Impt.</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard Error = .685  
$n = 116$*
valuing scores can be seen in Table 38 under the R square change heading. The partial regression coefficients (b) indicated the expected change in the dependent variable associated with a one unit change in an antecedent characteristic when the other antecedent characteristics were held constant.

Following initial analysis, multicollinearity was detected through the examination of the intercorrelations of the antecedent characteristics. Each antecedent characteristic in the equation was regressed on all other antecedent characteristics as prescribed by Warmbrod (1988), and coefficients of determination (R square) values examined. The three variables, clustering importance, agent specialization importance, and multi-county importance, were then combined into one variable and a second regression analysis was conducted (See Appendix F for tables of this analysis).

Objective 6
The purpose of Objective 6 was to describe the major concerns of the population of OCES faculty and staff toward the implementation of the clustered staffing pattern in Ohio. Concerns expressed by the faculty and staff were classified into the nine categories of: Traditional Programming; Administration; Personnel; Acceptance of Clustering; Formalizing Clusters; Promotion/Communication;
Local Support; Accessibility/Visibility; and Equity within Clusters. The major areas of concern expressed by the OCES faculty and staff were the administration strategies related to clustered staffing and the problems associated with the state/district and county personnel in attempting to understand their roles in the clustering efforts. Also, many respondents were concerned about how the clusters would be formalized and if clustering would have a negative effect on the visibility and accessibility of OCES within individual counties.

The selected verbatim comments presented under each of the categories were representative of all concerns identified by the OCES faculty and staff. While many indicated that clustering has potential as a staffing pattern for the future, they also provided evidence through their concerns that attention must given to several major areas prior to state-wide implementation of this staffing pattern option.

**Traditional Programming:**
That we are locked into "traditional thinking" regarding county lines, programs, etc. Our thinking fences us in from many exciting possibilities.

The individual counties might lose their identity.

Ohio has a very "county specific" program, and look upon agents and staff as their "own". It is very difficult, if not impossible to meet this demand and have assignments in a different environment. There is agent difference in attitude patterns between counties and finding compatible counties, given the above, is an extremely large obstacle.
County OCES staff provide a very important one-on-one function in providing educational materials and expertise to the general public. I would not like to see that relationship of friend or advisor lost.

A large concern of mine is that the people of the county would actually get less service and less attention than they do now. The personal "home" feelings of Extension would be lost. It will become volume oriented and not people oriented.

Administration:

The perception we would have one more level of bureaucracy for clientele to deal with.

Basic, on-going resource to individuals and families; other clientele are part of Extension's role. "Generalist" type concerns are still reality. By definition on this survey, it seems "control", determining what is important is in the hands of a few individuals and arbitrary at that.

That each county would receive equally good programs in all areas.

How the clusters are formed. Such issues of this will be strictly by geographic location. How do we pick counties most likely to work well together?

Administrative Process: Why is "chair" necessary? Why not an administrator in each county who is trained not in Agriculture or Home Economics, but in Administrative Science? This person could do political work, grants work, reporting, office administration, all the "stuff" that keeps agents from performing as agents.

The question of who does the agent work under. A county chairman, a district supervisor, or answers to state department wherein their expertise lies. Also, how do agents have time to be experts and also handle the daily county activities.

Someone in Administration must think clustering is the answer to all our problems. It is only a piece of the puzzle. Attracting talented people to county and state positions, and providing the "conduit" for good research-based information to get to individuals are keys.

Will there be funds for good support staff that have knowledge of their responsibilities before they would even
become support staff. In other words get qualified people and be able to pay for that!

Importance of county office - we can stretch people very thin by running them all over the place doing specialized programs while maintaining county programming efforts. Establishing priorities may help.

Some areas of need would get left out or would not have enough people assigned to them. Programming shortfalls would thus occur.

Current program delivery methods would need to be "streamlined" in order to compensate for work-hours involved.

That it will be an "added on" duty, not a replacement to current role. That it will be a "patched" on program system rather than total change.

Travel time and expense.

It will be forced upon us by administration and when a question by county staff is asked we will get the typical OCES administrative answer - we have not thought it all through yet.

It would have to be structured, assigned and directed by the state administration. Clustering units will not spontaneously happen.

Personnel Concerns:

After the initial establishment how would openings in staffing be handled e.g. a new person must fit exact criteria as one who left. Could be difficulties with county commissioners seeing they receive their moneys' worth.

My biggest concern would be that the system would fail if the original cluster agent would leave. Who would fill the void? What if the new agent didn't specialize in the same area? Would they be required to learn the new area if they were already good in another topic?

The agents would not get to know the people within each county. They would tend to work with a small group who might not need the help as much as others.

Agent attitudes are critical for clientele acceptance; if agents are positive on specialization, multi-county, or
clustering, clientele will go along. If agents are negative, clientele will be negative.

How areas of specialization or emphasis would be determined and will the agent/specialist be able to effect change at the farm, home, etc. level?

How will it be decided who gets what area of specialty.

That personnel expertise would limit adequate specialization for all subject matter areas.

Too much subject matter per specialist.

Sufficient personnel in each clustered area to form a critical mass of agents in program areas of importance to clients.

Very few agents may choose my subject matter area as their primary program emphasis.

CNRD has consistently been relegated to a secondary specialty status, and it would continue. CNRD would not have a fair share (equal number) of FTE primary specialties and yet it is equal in importance as a program area.

That agent training be emphasized - many agents have low level of subject expertise when required to specialize.

The possible loss of the ability to provide fast response to an emergency issue. I am concerned about the ability to redirect the efforts of an entire cluster, especially when an issue is not important to more than one or two counties.

That all areas of specialization could not be covered within a cluster. Local clientele may not be able to get responses to questions in a timely manner.

How can it work in the 4-H area? Each county is very individualized - each fair, camp and the training involved is specific for that county. Regardless of the method chosen, the 4-H person will have more meetings and more responsibility.

Four-H agents cannot withstand more evening meetings. Our clientele primarily meet in the evenings and to expect 4-H agents to travel to other counties for evening programs will not work. I do not want to participate in multi-county or clustering or even specialization as a 4-H agent. Maybe I would feel differently if I was in Agriculture, CNRD, or Home Economics, I am not sure.
Training of agents in specialist areas.

That it has support at all levels and that agents at local level are given special attention: in preparing for changes. This will help reduce frustration and resentment levels.

1) Who determines the need for clustering - Extension administration or the county clientele? 2) Who determines the subject of agent specialization - Extension administration, clientele or agents? 3) County funding with agent specialization across county lines.

What would the 4-H specialization areas be? How would this work effectively when dealing with youth and their shaky schedule?

What role would the Extension Associate play in a cluster formation? Would he/she support agent in program area or participate in clustering?

Need to provide additional training in areas of specialization for agents to be knowledgeable and keep current. Clustering is a much better alternative than multi-county assignments.

Too many agents are claiming specialization without the most up-to-date instruction. Specialization in academic areas is not ad hoc; it's earned, not claimed.

County agents with sufficient knowledge in specialized area.

Selection of "specialty areas" - who does this, what is it based on? How narrowly or broadly defined will the areas be?

That state specialists have major role in development of field specialists and, that district administration do not dominate the process.

One super idea from this approach is the development of materials for agents in the field by our district and state specialists (unlike the present situation). We currently are operating under a hidden team.

That state specialists understand their new responsibilities to the clustered counties. Additionally improvement of communication procedures would need to be developed.

My concern would be that state and across county line support would not be adequate. If the clustering concept is to work, state Extension specialists will have to offer in-depth academic opportunities.
Acceptance by Staff:

Job descriptions designating specific responsibilities of all staff need to be universal, understood and accepted by county staff and clientele prior to instituting a new concept in clustering.

To what degree will clustering impact on my ability to conduct my county program at a high level of quality given my time spent as chair and CNRD agent and then being asked to develop new programs outside of county when no back-up is guaranteed.

Time involved and what would be cut out now to do more.

It would be doing exactly what we are doing now as multi-county agents - only adding a "specialty" and expected to "travel" with it.

Agents being asked to fulfill multi-county positions, as well as clustering roles (trying to provide both duties is just too much). Also, we will need to educate clientele better than we did with multi-county.

Staff stress and burnout if staff perceive this as an additional work load rather than a way to work more effectively with more time to develop quality programs and educational materials.

Formalizing Clusters:

Finding groups of counties where faculty in all program areas can work effectively as a team.

It should be a choice, not forced. No one concept will be most effective in all situations. There should be acceptable alternatives.

How would you decide what counties are clustered in each group? - by program? - by geographic characteristics? - by existing faculty?

Formalization. The concept is not new. In actuality, agents have been doing it for years, based upon agent interest and mutual respect. Designation of roles will not produce good programs. Simply carrying the title of area (cluster) specialist does not produce good programming.

Formalizing a fairly successful non-formal approach such as clustering may "kill it". Effective "clusters" develop
naturally as agents earn respect for the work they do with various specialty areas. I do not believe it will be nearly as successful as the current non-formal system if we force it on people, and have them "select" who is doing what in a formal structured cluster.

Our staff has held discussions on clustering and several times tried to identify counties we might cluster with. Each agent has a different county grouping they would identify for a cluster, dependent on the programming strengths of agents in other counties.

I do not think an entire county staff needs to cluster together. We have some very strong "informal" clustering going on. Why do we have to break those ties to join forces with incompatible programs.

Most counties have some form of clustering already, but by program area, not by county office. It seems to me it would work much better if it were implemented by program area i.e. 4-H agents do a lot of clustering to conduct 4-H programs throughout the district.

Many natural clusters already exist within program areas; but counties may cluster in different directions (i.e. Agriculture going one direction and 4-H another). I hope that we do not break-up these natural clusters just to firm up boundaries. Also concerned about spending more time in county "B" vs my county "A" will not get an equal payback in programs/services.

That the clusters be by program issue areas not by geographic areas to minimize flexibility especially as personnel change. We are not a static organization.

That counties of similar demographics be clustered together.

_Promotion/Communication:_

In urban counties where informational and leadership development needs are already beyond staffing capabilities, would a clustering staff member in this situation not be overextended. Or how would "clustering" alleviate their already heavy workload. It is not apparent to me at this juncture how "clustering" benefits Cuyahoga County. No doubt commissioners will want to know this.

If this is to work, I feel that the total Extension Staff needs to fully understand the concept. If secretaries do not grasp it, I think we will have problems getting daily
routines to run smoothly, which could make everyone else less effective.

A major marketing effort would need to be provided explaining the changes so that county faculty and staff would not have to implement a change in the status quo without adequate support. In other words, do not leave them in limbo with clientele and county funders.

That a very good communications system (uniform and state of the art) be available to every Extension employee (secretaries and up). All persons should be trained to utilize and encouraged to utilize, could be telephone, Vax, Fax, or any other state of the art equipment.

Local Support:

If agents are expected to take on these extra responsibilities, then something has to "go" in the county. They cannot do it all. But, clientele still expect those services that have to "go". So we lose clientele support at a critical time. We have done the system a disservice by not re-educating clientele throughout this process.

Loss of local support. A concern that the Cooperative Extension Service is no longer a local program but a state program where local inputs would be reduced.

Erosion of support base for county programs. Simply because OCES sees multi-county program possibilities, it does not mean county clientele will.

Less time by county staff is being spent in counties. Local investors in Extension are getting very upset with less time commitment of staff being available in their counties while financial support is increasing. We may lose financial county support.

The concern of county officials and our clientele that the service from OCES was being diluted. I do not agree with this idea, but I feel it may exist.

Continued high level of local funding.

How to maintain county commitment to funding.

Loss of county funding potential.

An urgent need to avoid loss of confidence and funding support by county commissioners and county public. (Need
some physical presence and programs tailored to counties until gradual change has taken place.) Four-H youth activities in specific counties, their visibility has aided local funding over the years.

Much of Extensions clientele/funding support is loyalty to staff/OCES. What happens when county clientele do not have "a person" to relate to - have already heard this from some multi-county agents.

That county advisory committee understand that it is a process of adding expertise for the counties in a given program area and will not be detrimental to major program areas.

My one most important concern would be funding. Will county commissioners continue to fund agents or would they look to the state to provide more funding, since they work across county lines?

Loss of local support (numbers of clientele and financial). No longer "X county" but OCES so let the state support it.

Successful agents in the eyes of clientele are the ones who have great support with the people. NOT EDUCATIONAL GENIUSES.

Maintaining local support (financial and program) when agent time is spent teaching out of the county. Will counties feel they are loosing more than they are gaining? Will the trade off be equal?

How will our county commissioners and our current county clientele take the idea of sharing "their own" county Extension agents with another county on a regular basis.

Funding for Extension - How would counties determine cost?

Taxpayers would realize that Extension service has too many people and that money has been wasted attempting to keep an archaic system operating.

Visibility/Accessibility:

Extension could lose some visibility in the short term; however, when the system gets organized, the entire operation should be more effective.

Visibility of faculty with county clientele. Running day-to-day activities is a method of educating our clientele.
Becoming less visible to a majority of clientele and officials in the counties. In our counties they are accepting multi-county. A change may mean $0 budget.

Time and visibility of local staff.

I would be concerned about loosing contact with local clientele - particularly in the 4-H program. We need the contact. We need the local clientele. We need their support.

Depending on the area in Ohio, clustering would create travel problems because of geographic location, distances to travel, time requirements and lack of accessibility to clientele.

More and more distancing from clientele, particularly in youth development will eventually destroy this part of Extension programming. A mentor/role model style relationship with a county based person is why youth are attracted to the educational program.

In your zealous attempt to reach the people you are only further isolating yourself from your clientele in your county who have come to depend on agents and program assistants for up-to-date accurate information.

Not all counties can or should cluster all program areas. Too diverse. Too many holes in educational background of staff. We must be accessible to clientele.

Response to clientele may be delayed when specialist is out of the county.

Accessibility to the person or program in demand.

Responding as quickly as possible to clientele's immediate requests (i.e. telephone calls) for information - how can an agent keep up with phone calls if he/she is covering several counties?

That people's questions are answered quickly and accurately. So many agencies have lost the personal contact. They are only in once or twice a week and it is not often enough to get to know the community and its people.

Not as much contact with county people. They will not really feel it is their program. Need to develop a personal rapport to get people involved and that takes time that a cluster agent probably will not have.
The long term inability of the OCES to remain an essential and energetic part of our communities.

I think by clustering you will not have the time to solve problems as we do at this time. We would spend more time traveling than teaching.

Loss of one-on-one friendship development with clientele.

I fear that the reputation OCES has for being responsive to individual problems and concerns will be damaged and agents will lose touch with the clientele.

**Equity in Sharing Within Clusters:**

That many of the agents in adjoining counties have many of the same specialty areas. Some agents specialties are used now, creating an uneven give and take.

The impression that one county of a several county cluster has the attention of the agent more than another. The home county will most likely benefit the most. The idea of personal contact or ownership of the program may be lost by local groups.

Who sees to it that the "sharing" happens on a regular basis?

Fairness in sharing agents across county lines - Do the counties get what they pay for? Who gets the "free" ride? Will commissioners agree to the concept?

How even would the reciprocity be? Would some people be called on to do cluster programs more often than others available to them and how would it affect existing work load?

Cause of lack of teamwork in counties working towards improving individual counties clientele needs. Subject matter expertise is half the problem, agents with little rural experience or vice versa in an urban setting.

Willingness of neighboring agents to want to form clusters, take a specialty role and teach in other counties. I see some trying to still do it all and not want to travel to other counties.
Objective 7

Objective 7 dealt with the concerns of the population of OCES faculty and staff toward the relationship between Extension and county funding sources if the clustered staffing pattern was implemented in Ohio. The majority of those who responded indicated that the county commissioners would reduce Extension funding if clustered staffing was implemented. One respondent stated that: "This is the BIG issue. Several of our county commissioners have indicated they will not support Extension as great financially, if staff spend a large block of time out of the county and cannot serve the public."

Responses ranged from those who perceived clustering as detrimental to county funding to those who indicated that clustering would have a positive influence:

Very detrimental. County funding has been our salvation over the past years. I sense that splitting program responsibility, will over time, reduce our support base.

Definitely negative!!

A very negative effect.

Once county commissioners see we can provide more and better programs by creating specialists in team approach, I think we can get it accepted.

The relationships should strengthen if additional issue programs are instituted.

It should be positive if done properly. There will still be a county staff and other staff would allow programs to be expanded.

The OCES personnel indicated that a major reason for a potential spending reduction would be a perceived lack of
"ownership" by the county commissioners and the county clientele:

Major effects if they feel they are not getting same service or personnel they were getting before and if they do not have some sense of ownership.

Counties like ownership of their agents and programs. Clustered staffing could further threaten already tense situations except where downsizing has already had serious impacts.

Not much in this county, but could be detrimental in counties where commissioners feel a strong "ownership" of the program.

I think it depends on the county - those that have a great feeling of ownership will probably struggle with sharing in any way and may not support clustering. I think this would have to be worked out county for county.

Another major area of concern related to funding was the lack of visibility and personal contact within the county that may occur with clustered staffing. Respondents felt this problem would lead to reduced local support as the following comments demonstrate:

Our current commissioners would tend to view clustering negatively. Would be concerned about whether their county was getting its share of services proportional to the funding they provide.

If it is formalized, with "boxes drawn on models", county funding sources will begin asking questions and counting the hours of time devoted to their county - with potential negative effects.

Any decrease in Extension visibility is going to have negative impact at the county level. However, smart public relations and attention to local needs can offset this problem if we provide greater expertise.

Due to the agents time being shared with other counties, it would make it more difficult to convince county commissioners to increase funds when needed. Also, it would be more difficult to find time for one-on-one contact with clientele - this is important for county support.
Clientele and commissioners may not identify as closely with OCES staff and support may weaken. Since more and more funding is requested from county funds this could be very damaging.

To the extent that clustering removes staff from a county and reduces service to the myriad of client concerns and needs in a county, then client loyalty will decline - so also will county funding decline or fail to increase.

Due to lack of personalized service the support would not be as great and thus funding would decrease.

In counties where programs are strong and visible there should be no difficulties in securing needed funds.

A positive effect if programming efforts are visible and successful - in other words if we do a good job for the residents, it will be reflected in our county budget. It would be difficult for county chairs to receive monetary support for programs if agents were expected to share time between two counties. Commissioners could decrease certain counties funding. That is not what Extension needs in the future.

Negative effects would occur. We have already experienced this some with multi-county staffing. County commissioners have to see local ownership and programming to invest local funds. There is not incentive for them to fund "state" programs.

Tied closely to visibility was the idea expressed by several respondents that an agent, Extension associate, or program assistant should remain in each county. These individuals would be available to answer questions and work in a public relations capacity by maintaining high visibility in the county and serving as a contact for the county commissioners.

Most commissioners already feel they are receiving less agent support and visibility at a higher cost. One person (chairman and/or issues programmer) needs to be present the majority of the time.

May have negative - some counties want someone in office to answer questions all the time.
As long as the local county has a person (a body) in their county office, I believe the system will work. Public relations becomes very important.

County commissioners need to have an in-county person to identify with; but if the person became more effective at arranging to meet specific needs because of clustering it would not be harmful. Counties do want their "fair share" of multi-county or clustered agents.

There would be no problems with the relationship - as long as each program area still has a "body" in every county either faculty, EA, or PA for 4-H/Home Economics/Agriculture - someone local people have access to for questions, even if they refer them to another county where person with specialty is located - need the personal contact.

Planning and implementation of the clustering plans were identified by the respondents as crucial elements in the effort to maintain and secure additional county funding:

It could hurt relations with county funding sources pending increase of travel and miscellaneous expenses - especially in the beginning as we would be developing our specialties.

Depends on how well clustering was planned, implemented and conducted. Could improve funding or decrease funding.

Neutral if counties get the same or improved service. If agents get spread too thin and service declines then funding is likely to decline.

In some counties a very negative, but if handled correctly could be positive in some.

Two possible scenarios: Well administered counties will feel they are getting a great deal of expertise for their money. Poorly organized counties will not feel they are getting their share of the agents' time.

Respondents also identified equitable use of staff and training materials within the clusters as an area that could have impact on the relations with county funding sources:

Probably very little as long as program is equitable and staff does not neglect needs of local clientele.
Little, as long as clientele receive the same level of service (personal calls, conveniently located programming). I see problems where agent/support staff time/expertise is not fairly shared.

I do not think it would cause a problem as long as we could document equality in incoming and outgoing resources.

Personally I feel there will be no effects; as it is reciprocal I assume - at least as it is currently being done informally.

The OCES faculty and staff suggested that educating the commissioners and clientele to the clustered staffing pattern concept would aid in securing needed funds at the county level:

Clustering, if a good blend between all counties, will most likely strengthen the program. If there is a strong program, county funding sources will come through. Training and providing education to county commissioners to get use to the ideal will take time.

Initially some difficulty if counties have to relate the concept to the county commissioners. I feel strongly administration needs to convince commissioners of "why" we are clustering and what this means both long and short term to county budgets.

County clientele may feel that they are getting less for same dollar. Better awareness needed to prevent this.

I feel this (clustering) would lead to further confusion between Extension and county officials. This may jeopardize our county budget.

Counties will need to be well-prepared. Funding sources may feel they are being "short-changed" if adequate attention is not given to educating them.

Expect county funding to decline unless it could be clearly demonstrated that local Extension programs have been enriched or expanded under the cluster plan.

Adequately involve county commissioners and advisory committees in the decision process and justify need for clustering concept.
Very negative if the county office does not educate the county officials on what is happening and why. All agents need to become acquainted with commissioners in counties in which they teach - give commissioners a feeling of "ownership" although this puts a big burden on the agents.

Without an adequate sales pitch with documentation proving increased performance (i.e. from an Ohio pilot program), funding from local counties would be greatly reduced. Keep in mind, some counties are very supportive and stand to lose a great deal more than in counties where funding is slim or given only begrudgingly.

Responses also included the idea of obtaining information from the county commissioners regarding their perceptions toward the clustered staffing pattern.

Respondents felt that this would help to strengthen the relations between Extension and the county funding sources:

I do not know. You should ask the county commissioners.

I believe it is in everyone's best interest to get feedback from county funding sources before proceeding with clustering beyond a pilot program.

I believe that this is an important issue and that the "county funding sources" may have an opinion on clustering.

Despite the concerns expressed by the OCES faculty and staff regarding the effects of clustering on the relations with county funding sources, there were those who perceived that clustering would have an overall positive influence:

Cannot see that there would be a real problem. Sounds like there would be a "home" county; and there would be a resource exchange.

It could be positive if county funding sources see this as OCES's effort to becomes more efficient; not as a way to deprive some counties of their programs.

Over time will be positive if programs are better.

I think it would create a stronger bond. It would make us more marketable.
As long as we continue to meet the needs of a specific county, the funding will be there - if we lose it - it will be hard to get back.

If handled well - it should enhance the county's support in return for more comprehensive, better programming.

Positive. It indicates we are attempting to be more efficient and effective.

If it can be implemented successfully it should have no negative impact, and to the extent programming was improved it could improve the relationship.

In time objections would disappear if we service needs of clientele effectively.

If properly managed it will not make any difference. As long as county people get good "educational programs and services" from OCES they will support us.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of Procedures

The study was descriptive-corrrelational in nature, with the primary focus being to describe the attitudes of the population of OCES faculty and staff (excluding clerical staff) concerning the clustered staffing pattern. The study was also conducted to examine the association between the perceptions of the population members in terms of the three staffing pattern options (i.e. clustered staffing, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing) and their attitude toward clustering. Concerns of the population were then obtained regarding the implementation of clustered staffing in Ohio.

The following dependent variables were utilized in the study: a) the three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the OCES county faculty and staff toward the clustered staffing pattern concept; and b) the three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the OCES state/district faculty and staff toward the clustered staffing pattern concept.

The antecedent characteristics included in the study were: a) the perceived success of OCES to conduct various
components of the Extension program when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns; b) the perceived importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns; c) current position within OCES; d) primary program area assignment; e) highest academic degree obtained; f) major area of study in highest academic degree; g) length of service with Extension; h) gender; and i) perceived level of knowledge of clustering.

Subject Selection

The target population to which results were to be generalized included all Extension faculty and staff in the state of Ohio. To obtain the most accurate results possible a census was utilized in gathering the information from the target population. A listing of the names and addresses of the Extension faculty and staff was obtained from the Leader, Personnel of OCES. All full and part-time State and District Specialists, Extension Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants employed by OCES were surveyed. The total number of subjects utilized in the study was 480.
Instrumentation

Two mail questionnaires (Appendix B) were developed to collect data about the population. Respondents were instructed to first review the definition and description of Clustering, Agent Specialization, and Multi-County Agent Staffing (Appendix A) which were located on pages two and three of each questionnaire. In Section I of both instruments a six-point Likert-type scale, with a minimum of one and maximum of six, was designed to collect information pertaining to the attitude of the OCES faculty and staff toward the clustered staffing pattern concept. Section I for the state personnel questionnaire contained 14 items while Section I for the county personnel questionnaire had 13 items. The items in both Section I's were divided into sub-scales to measure three of the five behaviors identified by Krathwohl, et al. (1964), as components of the Affective Domain. These behaviors, Receiving, Responding, and Valuing, are three of the five stages through which individuals progress in the development of attitudes.

Section II of both instruments consisted of 23 items which pertained to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be successfully conducted under the agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. A six-point Likert-type scale, with a minimum of zero and maximum of five, was used to collect data in this section of the instruments. Subjects were
asked to circle the number following each statement that best represented what they perceived in terms of the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing agent specialization as an autonomous staffing pattern; multi-county agent staffing (including the agent specialization concept); and the potential OCES success utilizing clustered staffing with agent specialization.

The six-point Likert-type scale used in Section II was also employed in Section III to describe what respondents believed in terms of the importance of the item in question to Extension programming when agent specialization is utilized as an autonomous method of staffing; when multi-county agent staffing is utilized and agent specialization is included in the staffing process; and when utilizing the clustered staffing method and including agent specialization. The two instruments had Section III's that were identical, with 17 items pertaining to various methods of support for Extension programming.

Subjects were asked to provide written responses to several open-ended items in Section IV. For Item 1, subjects were asked to list the one most important concern they would have if the clustered staffing pattern concept was implemented in Ohio. In Item 2 the subjects were asked to identify the effects, if any, which they believed the clustered staffing pattern would have on the relationships between Extension and county funding sources if implemented
in Ohio. Additional items were provided in the county personnel questionnaire to allow them to develop a basic clustering plan for the county where the majority of their work occurred; and to identify their personal primary and secondary specialty areas. The clustering plans developed by county personnel were not included as a part of this study. However, this information was used in the development of a clustering plan for OCES. Section V of both instruments was used to obtain data on the selected demographic characteristics of each respondent.

To control for measurement error a questionnaire item content validation form was developed and presented to a panel of experts in the area of Extension administration (Appendix C). The panel was asked to review the items for content validity. The questionnaire, with appropriate revisions, was distributed in draft form among members of the Administrative Cabinet of OCES for pilot testing. All members of the Administrative Cabinet, a total of 14 individuals, received questionnaires.

Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated from the data collected in the pilot test for Sections I, II, and III. The analysis of the pilot test results yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .81, .83, and .62 respectively for the three sub-scales of receiving, responding, and valuing found in Section I of the state personnel questionnaire. For Section I of the county
personnel questionnaire, the sub-scales of receiving, responding, and valuing produced Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .81, .81, and .83 respectively.

For Section II, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for the three scales which measured the levels of success of various program components for agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing. The analysis yielded results of .92, .71, and .94 respectively for the three staffing pattern options. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were also calculated for the three scales which measured the levels of importance of various program components for agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing in Section III of the instruments. The coefficients calculated for Section III were .70, .76, and .85 for agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing respectively.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Questionnaires were mailed to all 480 members of the target population of OCES personnel on October 24, 1989. On November 8, 1989, a follow-up letter was sent to all subjects in the study. A second complete packet was mailed on November 14, 1989, to those individuals who had not yet responded. A final deadline date of November 21, 1989, was set for accepting completed questionnaires for data analysis. By the final deadline date, a total of 426
questionnaires were received for a response rate of 88.8 percent. Of the questionnaires received, 29 were judged to be unusable because of missing information. The resulting data sample was comprised of: 92 State/District Specialists, 8 State Extension Associates, 75 County Chairs, 22 Multi-County Agents, 94 County Extension Agents, 40 County Extension Associates, 50 Program Assistants, and 16 respondents classified as Other. A total of 397 composed the data sample for a final response rate of 82.7 percent.

The initial deadline of November 7, 1989 was utilized to divide respondents into two (early and late) groups. Differences between early and late respondents on the dependent variables selected for the study were examined through use of t-tests. An alpha level of .05 was established a priori as the level of significance. The t-tests yielded no significant differences between the early and late respondents on the dependent variables selected for the study.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used first to summarize and organize the data. Measures of association were utilized to determine the linear relationship between the three attitude measures and the success and importance belief scores for each of the staffing pattern options which were identified as antecedent characteristics.
Hierarchical analysis procedures were used to explain the variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the selected antecedent characteristics. For the regression models proposed for this study, the dependent variables were the three attitude measures of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern; and the three attitude measures of the OCES state personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern. The antecedent characteristics were initially entered into the hierarchical regression model in the following order: a) Success of OCES when utilizing clustering; b) Importance to OCES when utilizing clustering; c) Success of OCES when utilizing agent specialization; d) Importance to OCES when utilizing agent specialization; e) Success of OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing; f) Importance to OCES when utilizing multi-county agent staffing.

Following initial analysis, multicollinearity was detected through the examination of the intercorrelations of the antecedent characteristics. Each antecedent characteristic in the equation was regressed on all other antecedent characteristics as prescribed by Warmbrod (1988), and coefficients of determination (R square) values examined. The variables, importance to OCES when utilizing clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing, were then combined into one variable and a second regression analysis was conducted (See Appendices E and F for tables of
this analysis).

**Major Findings**

Of the 397 subjects which comprised the data sample, 29.2 percent (116) were state/district faculty and staff while 70.8 percent (281) were county faculty and staff. Nine antecedent characteristics were utilized in the study to describe the OCES faculty and staff.

The largest percentage of the OCES faculty and staff identified their current position as county Extension agent, (23.7 percent or 94 individuals). This was closely followed by the specialist position with 23.2 percent (92). Nearly 23 percent of the respondents reported their current position as either a county program assistant (50) or Extension associate (40). Almost 19 percent (75) of the respondents identified their current position as county chair. Five and one-half percent (22) of the respondents were identified as multi-county agents. The remaining six percent of the respondents reported their current position as either state Extension associate (8) or "other" (16). The majority of the 16 respondents who reported their current position as "other" were administrators within the Colleges of Agriculture or Human Ecology.

A total of 37.5 percent (149) of the respondents identified agriculture as their program area of primary responsibility. Four-H was identified as the program area
of primary responsibility by over 27 percent (108) of the respondents. Almost 22 percent (86), reported home economics as the area of primary responsibility. The remaining 14 percent identified CNRD (24) and "other" (30) as the program areas of primary responsibility.

The Master's was the highest academic degree reported by 60.7 percent (241) of the respondents, followed by the Doctoral with 17 percent (68). Bachelor's degree was reported by 15 percent (60) as the highest academic degree obtained, and "other" by seven percent (28).

The major area of study most frequently identified by the OCES faculty and staff was education. Over 37 percent (148) of the OCES faculty and staff reported education as the major area of study in their highest academic degree. Agriculture was identified by approximately 27 percent (102) of the respondents. Agriculture was followed by home economics with 15.4 percent (61). Approximately 12 percent of the respondents indicated their major as either administration/management (11), natural resources (25), or social science (11).

A total of 32.5 percent (129) of OCES personnel reported their length of service as five years or less, over 21 percent (84) indicated their length of service as six to 10 years, approximately 20 percent (79) fell into the 11 to 15 year category, while almost 16 percent (63) were in the 16 to 20 year range. Only 10.6 percent (42) of the
respondents reported their length of service as over 20 years.

The frequency distribution for gender of the OCES faculty and staff was also included as an antecedent characteristic in the study. Over 56 percent (224) of the respondents were male while approximately 44 percent (173) were females.

The majority of the OCES faculty and staff reported their perceived level of knowledge of clustering to be moderate, high, or very high. Almost 50 percent (198) indicated a moderate perceived level of knowledge of clustering, while approximately 32 percent perceived their knowledge of clustering to be high (98) or very high (28). The very low and low categories were reported by 17.4 percent (69) of those responding. Only one percent (4) reported no perceived knowledge of clustering.

Faculty and staff were surveyed to determine their perceptions of the success of OCES to conduct various components of the Extension program when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, or clustered staffing. Perceived success when utilizing agent specialization staffing had the highest mean score (mean = 3.65). Agent specialization success was followed by clustered staffing success with a mean score of 3.35. Multi-County staffing had the lowest success mean score at 2.95. (These means were based on a six-point scale with a zero to five range.)
Information was also obtained from the OCES personnel regarding their perceptions of the importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, or clustered staffing. The mean scores for the various support methods for Extension programming were similar across the three staffing pattern options. A difference of only 0.05 existed between the highest mean score of 4.04 for importance to clustered staffing and the lowest mean score of 3.99 for importance to agent specialization. (These means were based on a six-point scale with a zero to five range.)

The second objective of the study was to describe the attitude measures of receiving, responding, and valuing held by state/district personnel toward clustered staffing. Mean scores for the dependent variables were calculated across the demographic characteristics of the 116 state/district personnel who comprised the data sample. Scores were based on a six-point Likert-type scale with one being the minimum score and six the maximum.

Mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were examined across the antecedent characteristic current state/district position. State Extension associates had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.83). The Extension associates were followed closely by the 92 state/district specialists (mean = 4.80) and the 16 respondents who classified themselves as "other" (primarily
department chairs/administrators) (mean = 4.67). The respondents who classified themselves as "other" had the highest mean scores for the responding and valuing variables (mean = 5.23 and mean = 4.92 respectively). State/District specialists had higher mean scores for the variables responding and valuing than did the Extension associates.

The mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were examined across the antecedent characteristic primary program area assignment. Those with primary program assignment in the area of home economics had the highest mean scores for all three of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.28, responding mean = 5.16, and valuing mean = 5.23). Those with their primary program assignment in the area of CNRD had the second highest mean scores across the three dependent variables followed by those individuals with primary assignment in agriculture. Respondents who identified 4-H as the primary program area assignment had the fourth highest mean scores in receiving and valuing, while those who classified their primary assignment as "other" were fourth highest in responding.

Mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were observed across the antecedent characteristic highest academic degree obtained. Those whose highest academic degree was a Master's had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 5.04). Those with a Doctoral degree had the second highest mean in receiving and
the highest mean scores in both responding and valuing (means = 4.76, 5.03, and 5.05 respectively). Those with Bachelor's and "other" identified as the highest degree obtained had no mean scores on the dependent variables which were equal to or greater than the overall grand means for state/district personnel.

The mean score values for receiving, responding, and valuing variables were also examined by major area of study in the highest academic degree. Those whose major field of study was education had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 5.10) and the second highest mean score for valuing (mean = 5.07); however, for the responding variable those who majored in education had the lowest mean score of any major field of study (mean = 4.89). Those who identified natural resources as their major field of study had the second highest mean in receiving and the highest mean scores in valuing (means = 5.08 and 5.16 respectively). The three respondents who identified social science as their major field of study had the highest mean score for the responding variable (mean = 5.33) followed by the three respondents who indicated their major as administration/management (responding mean = 5.17).

Respondents who majored in the field of home economics had the third highest mean scores for all three dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.00, responding mean = 5.14, and valuing mean = 5.00). Those who identified their major
area of study as agriculture had the fifth highest mean score for receiving (mean = 4.72) and the sixth highest mean scores for responding and valuing (means = 4.92 and 4.79 respectively).

The receiving, responding, and valuing mean scores were observed across the antecedent characteristic length of service with Extension. The highest mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were seen in those respondents who had a tenure of over 20 years (means = 5.26, 5.33, and 5.07 respectively). Respondents with tenure of six to 10 years had the second highest mean scores on the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.89, responding = 5.07, and valuing = 4.96). Those with tenure in the 11 to 15 year category had the third highest mean scores on all three of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.81, responding = 4.95, and valuing = 4.91). Those with tenure of five years or less and those with tenure in the 16 to 20 year category had the lowest mean scores of any tenure groups. Respondents with tenure of five years or less had the lowest mean scores of any tenure group for the receiving and valuing variables (means = 4.51 and 4.69 respectively). Those in the 16 to 20 year category had the lowest mean score for the responding variable of any other tenure group (mean = 4.78).

Receiving, responding, and valuing mean scores were examined across the antecedent characteristic gender.
State/District personnel who are female had higher mean scores than males on the receiving and responding variables (means = 5.01 and 5.09 respectively for females and means = 4.73 and 4.95 respectively for males). Males had a mean score slightly higher than females on the variable valuing (mean = 4.89 versus 4.84).

The perceived level of knowledge of clustering was used to examine the mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables. Those who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be moderate, high, or very high had higher mean scores for the three dependent variables than those who perceived their knowledge to be very low or low. Only one individual indicated having no perceived knowledge of clustering. The five respondents who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be very high had the highest mean scores over the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.52, responding mean = 5.40, and valuing mean = 5.48). Over 74 percent of the state/district personnel rated their perceived knowledge level of clustering in the moderate and high categories. Mean scores of the receiving, responding, and valuing variables for those who identified themselves in the moderate and high knowledge level categories were above the grand means for the three dependent variables with only one exception. Those who indicated their perceived knowledge of clustering to be high had a slightly lower mean score on the responding variable than the grand mean for
this variable (responding mean high perceived knowledge = 4.96 versus a responding grand mean = 4.97). Those who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be very low and low had mean scores that were lower than the state/district personnel grand means for all three of the dependent variables.

Objective 3 was included in the study to describe the attitude measures of receiving, responding, and valuing held by the OCES county personnel toward clustered staffing. Mean scores for the dependent variables were calculated across the demographic characteristics of the 281 county personnel who were part of the data sample. Scores were based on the same six-point Likert-type scale utilized with the state/district personnel.

Mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were first examined across levels of the antecedent characteristic, current county position. The 22 multi-county agents had the highest mean score for the three dependent variables of any county position group (receiving mean = 5.09, responding mean = 4.82, and valuing mean = 4.91). Following the multi-county agents were the county Extension agents who had the second highest mean scores for each of the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.87, responding mean = 4.69, and valuing mean = 4.43). The county chairs had the third highest mean scores for the receiving and responding variables (mean = 4.82 and mean =
4.63 respectively) but were fourth highest for the valuing variable behind the Extension associates. The Extension associates had higher mean scores for all three dependent variables than program assistants who had the lowest mean scores on each of the dependent variables.

Of the four major Extension program areas, those whose primary program was home economics had the highest mean scores for all three of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.95, responding mean = 4.74, and valuing mean = 4.50). Those with primary program assignment in the area of agriculture had the second highest mean scores across the three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.87, responding mean = 4.70, and valuing mean = 4.48). Respondents who identified 4-H as the primary program area assignment had the third highest mean scores in receiving and valuing (means = 4.73 and 4.09 respectively). Those with primary responsibilities in CNRD were third highest in responding (mean = 4.60), but were fourth highest in receiving and valuing. Those who indicated their primary program area as "other" had higher mean scores than any of the four major program areas (receiving mean = 5.03, responding mean = 4.74, and valuing mean = 4.63).

The mean scores for the dependent variables were also examined by highest academic degree obtained. The five individuals with Doctoral degrees had the highest mean score for all three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.96,
responding mean = 4.70, and valuing mean = 4.60). The county personnel with a Master's degree, a total of 200 individuals, had the second highest mean scores for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.85, responding mean = 4.67, and valuing mean = 4.40). The county personnel with Bachelor degrees had the third highest mean scores on each of the dependent variables, while those who identified their highest academic degree as "other" had the lowest mean scores on the three dependent variables. The individuals who identified their highest academic degree as "other" were primarily those with no academic degrees beyond the high school diploma.

Mean scores for the dependent variables were described across levels of the major areas of study in the highest academic degree obtained by the county personnel. Eight respondents whose major field of study was administration/management had the highest mean score for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 5.13, responding mean = 4.68, and valuing mean = 4.82). Those who identified home economics as their major field of study had the fourth highest mean in receiving (mean = 4.91) and the second highest mean scores in responding and valuing (means = 4.77 and 4.46 respectively). The eight respondents who identified social science as their major field of study had the second highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.95); however, their mean scores for responding and
valu ing were fourth and sixth highest respectively. Respondents who majored in the field of education represented over 44 percent of the total county personnel. This group had the third highest mean scores for all three dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.92, responding mean = 4.61, and valuing mean = 4.37). Those who identified their major area of study as agriculture had the fifth highest mean score for receiving and the fourth highest mean score for valuing (means = 4.65 and 4.82 respectively). Agriculture majors had the lowest mean score for the responding variable (mean = 4.56). Those who identified natural resources as their major had the lowest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.47), while those who identified "other" as their major had the lowest valuing mean score (mean = 3.92). Those who classified their major as "other" were primarily those individuals who had high school diploma as their highest academic degree.

Respondents who had tenure of over 20 years had higher mean scores for the dependent variables, receiving and valuing, than any other tenure category (means = 4.99 and 4.60 respectively). This tenure group also had the second highest mean score in responding (mean = 4.71). Those with tenure in the 11 to 15 year category had the second highest mean scores on the receiving and valuing variables (means = 4.94 and 4.38 respectively) and the highest mean score on responding (mean = 4.76). Respondents with tenure of five
years or less had the third highest mean scores of the five tenure group for the receiving and valuing variables (means = 4.84 and 4.37 respectively) and the fourth highest mean scores on the responding variable (mean = 4.60). Those with tenure of six to 10 years had the third highest mean scores on the responding variables (mean = 4.61) and the fourth highest mean scores on the receiving and valuing variables (means = 4.80 and 4.27 respectively). Those with tenure in the 16 to 20 year category had the lowest mean scores of any tenure groups for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.62, responding mean = 4.71, and valuing mean = 4.60).

The female county personnel had slightly higher mean scores than males on the receiving and responding variables (means = 4.84 and 4.65 respectively for females and means = 4.83 and 4.62 respectively for males). Males had a mean score slightly higher than females on the valuing variable (mean = 4.35 for males versus mean = 4.34 for females).

The county personnel who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be moderate, high, or very high had higher mean scores for the three dependent variables than those who perceived their knowledge to be none, very low, or low. The 23 respondents who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be very high had the highest mean scores for the responding and valuing variables (means = 4.86 and 4.70 respectively). Those with a very high perceived knowledge
of clustering also had the second highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.88). Approximately 74 percent of the county personnel rated their perceived knowledge of clustering to be moderate or high. Those who classified their perceived knowledge of clustering to be high had the highest mean score for receiving (mean = 4.99) and the second highest mean scores for responding and valuing (means = 4.71 and 4.49 respectively). Those who classified their perceived knowledge of clustering to be moderate had the third highest mean scores for each of the dependent variables (receiving mean = 4.85, responding mean = 4.59, and valuing mean = 4.32). Only three individuals indicated having no perceived knowledge of clustering; however, these individuals had the lowest mean scores for the dependent variables of any perceived knowledge classification. Those who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be none, very low, and low had mean scores that were equal to or less than the county personnel grand means for all three of the dependent variables.

The purpose of Objective 4 was to determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES county personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance characteristics for each of the staffing pattern options. As previously indicated, hierarchical analysis procedures were used to explain the variance in the
dependent variables accounted for by the selected antecedent characteristics.

Intercorrelations of the antecedent characteristics ranged from a low of .37 between agent specialization importance and multi-county agent success to a high of .90 between clustering importance and multi-county importance. Other very strong associations (Davis, 1971) existed between clustering success and agent specialization success (.79); clustering importance and agent specialization importance (.73); and agent specialization importance and multi-county importance (.81). Intercorrelations which were considered substantial associations (Davis, 1971) between the antecedent characteristics were clustering success and clustering importance (.56); clustering success and multi-county success (.69); clustering importance and agent specialization success (.56); agent specialization success and agent specialization importance (.51); and agent specialization success and multi-county success (.59).

Substantial association existed between the dependent variables, receiving, responding, and valuing, and the antecedent characteristic clustering success (.61, .55, .64 respectively). Clustering importance and the responding variable also had a substantial association (.50). All other measures of association between the dependent variables and the antecedent characteristics were found to be in the moderate association category according to Davis
Through the use of regression analysis it was determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 42.7 percent of the variance in the receiving score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 36.9 percent of the total variance in the receiving scores for county personnel. Since this was the first characteristic entered into the model no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. The five remaining antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 5.8 percent of variance which was not accounted for by clustering success.

Regression analysis for responding found that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 36.0 percent of the variance in this dependent variable. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 29.9 percent of the total variance in the responding scores for the county personnel. Four of the five additional antecedent characteristics accounted for 6.1 percent of the variance which was not explained by clustering success. The multi-county success characteristic had an R square change of .000 indicating no proportion of variance in the responding variable was uniquely accounted for by this antecedent characteristic.
Through the regression analysis for valuing, it was determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 46.8 percent of the variance. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 41.5 percent of the total variance in the valuing scores for the county personnel. The five remaining antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 5.3 percent of variance which was not accounted for by clustering success.

Following the initial analysis of the three dependent variables utilizing the six selected antecedent characteristics, the three "importance" characteristics were combined due to multicollinearity. A second complete analysis was conducted on the dependent variables utilizing the three "success" variables and the combined "importance" variable (Appendix E).

The purpose of the fifth objective was to determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the OCES state/district personnel toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance characteristics for each of the staffing pattern options. Again, hierarchical analysis procedures were used to explain the variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the selected antecedent characteristics.
The intercorrelations ranged from a low of .29 between clustering success and agent specialization importance to a high of .95 between the clustering importance and multi-county importance. Other very strong associations (Davis, 1971) existed between clustering success and multi-county success (.70); clustering importance and agent specialization importance (.81); and agent specialization importance and multi-county importance (.86). Intercorrelations which were considered substantial associations between the antecedent characteristics were clustering success and agent specialization success (.63); clustering importance and agent specialization success (.59); agent specialization success and agent specialization importance (.54); agent specialization success and multi-county success (.56); and agent specialization success and multi-county importance (.59). All other intercorrelations between the antecedent characteristics were considered moderate associations according to Davis (1971).

Moderate association existed between each of the receiving, responding, and valuing variables and the antecedent characteristics clustering success and multi-county success. The receiving score had a moderate association with each of the antecedent characteristics. The highest correlation coefficient for the state/district personnel was found between agent specialization importance and the receiving score (.42). The measures of association
between the dependent variable, responding, and the antecedent characteristics, clustering importance, agent specialization success, agent specialization importance, and multi-county importance were found to be in the low association category. The correlation coefficients between the dependent variable, valuing, and the antecedent characteristics also fell into the low association category. The only exception to this was the association between valuing and agent specialization success which was classified as negligible (.08) (Davis, 1971).

Through the regression analysis it was determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 25.3 percent of the variance in the receiving score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 14.3 percent of the total variance in the receiving scores for state/district personnel. Four of the five remaining antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 11.0 percent of the variance which was not accounted for by clustering success. The last variable entered into the model, multi-county importance, made no unique contribution in explaining variance in the receiving score.

From the regression model for responding, it was determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 14.9 percent of the variance in this dependent variable. The first antecedent
characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 9.7 percent of the total variance in the responding scores for the state/district personnel. The five remaining antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 5.2 percent of variance which was not explained by clustering success.

Through the regression analysis for valuing, it was determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 28.0 percent of the variance in the valuing score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was clustering success which accounted for 11.8 percent of the total variance in the valuing scores for the state/district personnel. The five remaining antecedent characteristics accounted for an additional 16.2 percent of variance which was not accounted for by clustering success.

Multicollinearity was detected in the "importance" characteristics during the initial analysis of the data from the state/district personnel. These antecedent characteristics had very strong associations according to Davis (1971), with intercorrelations of .95 between clustering importance and multi-county importance; .81 between clustering importance and agent specialization importance; and .86 between agent specialization importance and multi-county importance. These three "importance" variables were combined as done previously in the county
personnel analysis. A second complete analysis was conducted on the dependent variables utilizing the three "success" variables and the combined "importance" variable (Appendix F).

The purpose of Objective 6 was to describe the major concerns of the population of OCES faculty and staff toward the implementation of the clustered staffing pattern in Ohio. Concerns expressed by the faculty and staff were classified into the nine categories of: Traditional Programming; Administration; Personnel; Acceptance of Clustering; Formalizing Clusters; Promotion/Communication; Local Support; Accessibility/Visibility; and Equity within Clusters.

The major areas of concerns identified by the respondents were the administration strategies related to clustered staffing and the problems associated with the state/district and county personnel in attempting to understand their roles in the clustering efforts. Also, many respondents were concerned about how the clusters would be formalized and if clustering would have a negative effect on the visibility and accessibility of OCES within individual counties. While respondents indicated that clustering has potential as a staffing pattern for the future, they also provided evidence that attention must be given to several major areas of concern prior to state-wide implementation of this staffing pattern option.
Objective 7 dealt with the concerns of the population of OCES faculty and staff toward the relationship between Extension and county funding sources if the clustered staffing pattern was implemented in Ohio. The majority of those who responded suggested that county commissioners would reduce Extension funding if clustered staffing was implemented. However, responses ranged from those who perceived clustering as detrimental to county funding to those who indicated that clustering would have a positive influence.

OCES personnel indicated that a major reason for a potential budget reduction would be a perceived lack of "ownership" by the county commissioners and the county clientele. Other major areas of concern related to funding were also identified in Objective 6. These concerns included the lack of visibility and personal contact within the county, planning and implementation of the clustering plan, informing commissioners about clustering, and equitable sharing within the cluster. Tied closely to visibility was the idea expressed by respondents that an agent, Extension associate, or program assistant should remain in each county. These individuals would be available to answer questions and work in a public relations capacity by maintaining high visibility in the county and serving as a contact for the county commissioners. Responses also included the idea of obtaining information from the county
commissioners regarding their perceptions of clustered staffing. The respondents indicated that requesting this information would help to strengthen the relations between Extension and the county funding sources.

**Implications of the Findings**

As described in Chapter II, in the Receiving category of the Affective Domain learners become sensitized to the existence of certain phenomena and stimuli. The learners become willing to receive or to attend to the phenomena (Krathwohl, 1964). With a receiving mean score of 4.78 for state/district personnel and 4.83 for county personnel on a six-point scale, the OCES faculty and staff should be willing to learn more about the concept of clustering.

The Responding level of the taxonomy is concerned with responses which go beyond merely attending to a phenomenon. In this category, the learners have a low level of commitment to the phenomena involved. Again, the mean scores for the responding variable in the study was such that the majority of OCES faculty and staff should respond initially to the clustering concept in an open, receptive manner (state/district personnel mean = 4.97 and county personnel mean = 4.63). OCES personnel would be willing to participate in the preliminary tasks related to the implementation of clustering.
The third category of the Affective Domain, Valuing, deals with the notion that a thing, phenomenon, or behavior has worth. The concept of worth is, in part, a result of an individual's own valuing or assessment which has come to be used by the individual as his/her own criterion of worth. The valuing mean scores for the state/district and county personnel suggested that the OCES faculty and staff found some merit in the clustered staffing pattern concept. The county personnel had their lowest mean score on the valuing characteristic which signified that additional time and information was needed in order to increase their assessment of the worth of the clustering concept.

Examination of educational levels for both county and state/district faculty and staff found that individuals with Master's and Doctoral degrees had higher receiving, responding, and valuing scores than those with a Bachelor's degree or high school diploma. Findings also indicated that the individuals in Extension associate and program assistant positions had lower mean scores on the dependent variables than any other position groups. These findings were not surprising since Extension Associates and Program Assistants also comprised the majority of those individuals who held only a Bachelor's degree or high school diploma.

Perceived level of knowledge of clustered staffing was examined for both the state/district and county faculty and staff. Findings produced evidence to show that those
individuals who perceived their knowledge of clustering to be very high, high, or moderate were consistently higher on the dependent variable scores than those who rated their knowledge as low, very low, or none. This held true for the state/district faculty and staff, as well as, county faculty and staff.

The notion that one process in the development of beliefs involves generalizing from similar situations, events, or objects (Sarbin, Taft, and Bailey, 1960), was supported by findings in this study. For many of the faculty and staff their generalizations about clustered staffing came from the agent specialization and multi-county staffing patterns which had previously been utilized by OCES. The strong intercorrelations between agent specialization success and clustering success suggested that the faculty and staff perceive these staffing patterns in a similar fashion. Multicollinearity existed in the antecedent characteristics related to the perceived importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. These characteristics also had similar means and standard deviations. This indicated that the population considered these factors to be at similar levels of importance across the three staffing pattern options.
Another process in the formulation of beliefs identified by Sarbin, Taft, and Bailey (1960), was the influencing effects of individuals in whom great levels of confidence are placed by others. While findings indicated that, generally, the OCES state/district and county personnel have a receptive attitude toward clustering, there were numerous concerns of the faculty and staff at all levels of the organization which they felt should be addressed by the OCES administration. Of particular concern were those issues related to the administration of the clustered staffing pattern at the state and local levels.

The antecedent characteristic, clustering success, made significant contributions to explaining variance in each of the three dependent variables for both state/district and county personnel. As the perceived level of success for conducting various components of the Extension program under the clustering staffing pattern was increased, the attitude measures of receiving, responding, and valuing were also increased.

**Recommendation for Application of Findings**

Change is needed within the Cooperative Extension Service on a continual basis in order that the organization can respond to the needs of the clientele, utilize new technologies, and effectively utilize funds, while attempting to improve employee satisfaction and performance.
While change within organizations is universal and inevitable, it rarely occurs in a smooth, continuous fashion. Resisting change is natural, occurs frequently, and can be caused by many different factors. Based on these premises and the findings of this study the following recommendations were offered concerning implementation of clustered staffing within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service:

1. The attitude scores of the OCES faculty and staff suggest that they would be receptive and should receive more information regarding the clustered staffing pattern concept.

2. In order to provide OCES personnel with information on clustering that is relevant to their needs, pilot clusters should be established in each Extension district. All OCES faculty and staff need regular updates as to the progress of the cluster counties, as well as, the problems which they encounter.

3. The major categories of concerns identified in the study must be addressed by the OCES administration at all levels within the organization if clustered staffing is to be successfully conducted in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
4. Based on concerns of faculty and staff, clientele and county funding sources should be informed of the clustering plan prior to implementation. Policies should be developed to address such issues as equity of sharing within the cluster, identification of and training within specialty areas, and how clusters will be formalized.

5. Based on responses from the OCES faculty and staff, consideration should be given to the idea of placing an agent, Extension associate, or program assistant in each county to serve in a public relations capacity. Such a position would help to maintain high visibility in the county and also provide a contact for the county commissioners.

6. Those with lower perceptions of clustering must receive training and information concerning the concept. Particular attention should be given to Extension associates and program assistants as these individuals had consistently lower mean scores on the three dependent variables.

7. Because of the strong intercorrelations between agent specialization success and clustering success, the state/district and county personnel who have had
favorable experiences with agent specialization should be utilized to promote clustered staffing throughout the OCES system. Findings would indicate that those individuals who favor agent specialization would also have a favorable attitude toward clustered staffing. Promoting clustered staffing through these individuals would most likely have greater impact on the OCES county and state/district personnel rather than having clustering promoted only by OCES Administration.

Need for Further Study

Continued research is needed as implementation of a clustered staffing pattern takes place in Ohio. Before clusters are developed state-wide, pilot clusters should be established in each Extension district in Ohio. Comparisons could then be made between the county personnel who have experienced clustering first hand and those who are staffed in the multi-county, agent specialization, and conventional manners. Clientele, advisory committee members, and county commissioners should also be surveyed in the pilot clusters to obtain information regarding their attitude toward the services and educational programs that are being provided.

When OCES personnel have gained experience in the clustered staffing pattern, research should be conducted to examine the Organization and Characterization by a Value or Value Complex categories within the Affective Domain
Taxonomy. As new experiences and values are acquired while working within, or in support of, a formalized clustered staffing pattern, OCES personnel should be surveyed to determine if the Organization and Characterization categories have been established in their value hierarchy for the clustering concept.

Item analysis should be done on the questionnaires utilized in this study (Appendix B). Research is needed to determine the exact order for the levels of success for the individual components of the Extension program and for the levels of importance for the individual methods of support for Extension programming.

As Extension explores staffing methods which can provide clientele with greater expertise and quality programming, further research is needed to develop instruments which can accurately measure the attitude of Extension personnel and clientele toward various staffing pattern options. Methods of qualitative analysis and self-report instruments are needed to obtain information from county and state/district personnel, county and state funding sources, as well as, the Extension clientele.
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DEFINITION OF CLUSTERING

The definition of clustering currently being utilized by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is as follows:

The clustered staffing pattern would involve two or more counties with staff members from each county working together in conducting the Extension programming efforts. Each Agent would have responsibility for a program area(s) in a home county and, in addition, identify an area of specialization in a primary and possibly a secondary specialty area. An Agent would serve as a resource and teacher in his/her specialty area(s) for all counties within the cluster. A County Chair would remain located in each county with a Program Coordinator identified for the cluster to facilitate programming efforts, particularly Issues Programming.

DESCRIPTION OF CLUSTERING

Clustering is a vehicle to maintain or increase the present staffing levels of county personnel in Ohio. It can, however, serve as a means for increasing the level of expertise to clientele utilizing a limited number of Extension faculty. Clustering also provides opportunities for increasing interdisciplinary programming which is essential to Issues Programming in Ohio. Agents may select their primary and secondary specialty areas from within the broad categories of Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, and CNRD. In addition, agents may select their primary or secondary specialty area(s) from the category of Program Development, including such areas as leadership, program planning, teaching methodology, and evaluation.

Once specialty areas are selected and agreed upon by Extension administration, agents would develop and maintain a high level of knowledge in their subject matter area(s) to serve as the cluster specialists in the selected specialty area(s). State and district specialists' roles would change somewhat in order to provide more training programs to county personnel in their selected specialty areas and in developing teaching materials for agents to utilize in their county and cluster work.

The clustered staffing pattern concept allows counties to work together to conduct quality programs that address the emerging issues of Extension clientele. Clustering permits agents to work across county lines in their area(s) of specialization and also includes an individual or individuals who serve as cluster program coordinators to facilitate the issues programming efforts. Funding and administrative concerns would need additional discussion if the clustering concept were implemented in Ohio.
DEFINITION OF AGENT SPECIALIZATION

Agent specialization is a staffing arrangement wherein county Extension personnel direct up to 25% of their time to specific subject matter areas. Agents share expertise via presentations, serving on issue task forces and developing written materials for use beyond county boundary lines.

DESCRIPTION OF AGENT SPECIALIZATION

Assistant Directors identify areas of high priority need based on the Long Range Plan and issue programs. Agents then identify one or more of these high priority need areas as their primary and secondary specialty areas. The selection of these specialty areas is based upon competence developed through academic course work, in-service trainings, applied research efforts possibly including research study in an academic department, attending departmental seminars, subscribing to publications in the specialty, holding membership in appropriate professional organizations, working closely with specialists, and other appropriate activities.

Agent specialization is a major component of the clustered staffing concept and could also be included in a multi-county staffing plan. However, agent specialization should also be considered a staffing pattern which can stand alone. In agent specialization staffing there are no formal arrangements between an agent's assigned or home county and neighboring counties. Agents simply maintain overall program responsibility in their home county while developing a specialty area(s) to the point that they teach in the area(s) of expertise both inside and outside the county.

DEFINITION OF MULTI-COUNTY STAFFING

The multi-county method of staffing involves the sharing of an Agent's time between two counties. The Agent takes primary responsibility for the same major program area (either Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, or CNRD) in each county. The Multi-county Agent is generally assisted by an Extension Associate and/or Program Assistant who coordinates activities in the county in which they are permanently located.

DESCRIPTION OF MULTI-COUNTY STAFFING

As previously mentioned, agent specialization can be included as a component of multi-county staffing. In addition to the overall program responsibility in their assigned counties, multi-county agents would also develop an area or areas of specialization. Agents would develop their competency to the point where they could teach in their area(s) of expertise both within their assigned counties and in other counties when invitations were extended.
APPENDIX B

COUNTY PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

AND

STATE/DISTRICT PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE
ATTITUDES OF EXTENSION FACULTY AND STAFF REGARDING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING PATTERN IN OHIO

A State-Wide Study of Extension Faculty and Staff

Autumn, 1989
Please respond to the items in each of the five sections of the questionnaire. It is extremely important that you respond to each question in this booklet. Your most accurate and honest responses will be greatly appreciated because the purpose is to determine the attitudes and perceptions of the Ohio Cooperative Extension faculty and staff toward the concept of clustered staffing. Your questionnaire will be reviewed and analyzed by Graduate Students and individual responses will be kept confidential. The questionnaire should take approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete. Once completed, please mail the questionnaire to Room 4 Agriculture Administration Building. Before answering any of the items in this booklet, please read the definitions of clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing on pages 2 and 3. Should you need further clarification on these staffing patterns, a brief description is also provided following each definition.
SECTION I

INSTRUCTIONS: The items in this section are for you to indicate your attitude regarding the Clustered Staffing Pattern Concept. Please circle the number which best represents your feelings related to the following statements pertaining to clustering. The numbers represent the following:

1 - STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
2 - DISAGREE (D)
3 - SLIGHTLY DISAGREE (SLD)
4 - SLIGHTLY AGREE (SLA)
5 - AGREE (A)
6 - STRONGLY AGREE (SA)

EXAMPLE:

```
SD   D   SLD   SLA   A   SA
Clustering is a new concept.  1   2   3   4   5   6
```

This response indicates that the respondent Strongly Agrees with the statement.
1. I would discuss the concept of clustering with a co-worker.
2. I would discuss the clustering concept with Extension professionals who have worked in clustered counties.
3. I would discuss the concept of clustering with my supervisor.
4. I would voluntarily attend a District level meeting regarding the clustering concept.
5. I would voluntarily attend a State level meeting regarding the clustering concept.
6. I would assist with the development of a clustered staffing plan for my county.
7. I would assist an agent with cluster responsibilities.
8. I would request assistance from an agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" when conducting programs for clientele only if it is required by Administration.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I would request assistance from an agent serving as a &quot;Cluster specialist&quot; when conducting programs for clientele, because of their expertise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I would serve in a &quot;Cluster specialist&quot; role.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I would encourage other agents to serve in a &quot;Cluster specialist&quot; role.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>As a county professional working within a cluster, I would attend in-service trainings to maintain a high level of expertise in my selected specialty area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I would spend 25% of my time working in a &quot;Cluster specialist&quot; role.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II

INSTRUCTIONS: The items found in this section pertain to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be successfully conducted under the agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. Please circle the number following each statement corresponding to the answer which best describes what you believe in terms of: A) the level of success of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) in the area in question utilizing agent specialization as an autonomous staffing pattern; B) the level of success of OCES in the area in question utilizing multi-county agent staffing including the agent specialization concept; and C) the level of potential success of OCES in the area in question utilizing clustered staffing with agent specialization. Remember to respond to each item in terms of your perceptions toward Extension’s success utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing.

In Section II the following scale will be used to measure the SUCCESS OF OCES WHEN UTILIZING AGENT SPECIALIZATION; SUCCESS OF OCES WHEN UTILIZING MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING; and POTENTIAL SUCCESS OF OCES WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: Level of success in supervising work of volunteers

LEVELS OF SUCCESS

AGENT SPECIALIZATION  
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING  
CLUSTERED STAFFING

In this example, the respondent indicated: A) the success of OCES is "very great" in supervising the work of volunteers under the agent specialization staffing method; B) the success of OCES is "great" in supervising the work of volunteers under multi-county agent staffing; and C) the potential success of OCES would also be "great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**

1. Level of success in providing information clientele can use

   - **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5

2. Level of success in providing clientele with research based information

   - **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5

3. Level of success in providing quality programs to a diverse clientele

   - **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5

4. Level of success in providing a high level of subject matter expertise at the county level

   - **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**

5. Level of success in responding to emerging issues of clientele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Level of success in involving advisory committees in the program planning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Level of success in conducting needs assessment to determine program direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Level of success in conducting in-depth program evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of affluent adults

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

10. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of youth from affluent families

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

11. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of low income adults

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

12. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of youth from low income families

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**

13. Level of success in communicating effectively with clientele of various educational levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Level of success in conducting programs cooperatively with other agencies and organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Level of success in maintaining program flexibility to promptly address emerging issues of a wide sample of the general public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Level of success in developing issue response teams to address emerging needs of clientele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (N)</td>
<td>Very Little (VL)</td>
<td>Little (L)</td>
<td>Some (S)</td>
<td>Great (G)</td>
<td>Very Great (VG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**

17. Level of success in developing comprehensive programs which focus on issues that affect financial success in agriculture

- **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5

18. Level of success in developing comprehensive programs which focus on issues related to rural revitalization

- **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5

19. Level of success in developing comprehensive educational programs which focus on issues related to family well-being

- **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
20. Level of success in developing comprehensive educational programs which aid in preparing youth for responsibility

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

21. Level of success in developing comprehensive program which focus on issues related to water quality

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

22. Level of success in providing opportunities for leadership development of adults

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

23. Level of success in providing opportunities for leadership development of youth

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
SECTION III

INSTRUCTIONS: The items found in this section pertain to various methods of support for Extension work which may or may not enhance program delivery under the agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. Please circle the number following each statement corresponding to the answer which best describes what you believe in terms of: A) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when agent specialization is utilized as an autonomous method of staffing; B) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when multi-county agent staffing is utilized and agent specialization is included in the staffing process; and C) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when utilizing the clustered staffing method and including agent specialization. Remember to give your perceptions of the importance of each item to Extension when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing.

In Section III the following scale will be used to measure the IMPORTANCE TO OCES WHEN UTILIZING AGENT SPECIALIZATION; IMPORTANCE TO OCES WHEN UTILIZING MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING; and IMPORTANCE TO OCES WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Very Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(VL)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(VG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: Level of importance of support staff

LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE ----

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

In this example, the respondent indicated that: A) the importance of Support Staff to OCES when utilizing the agent specialization staffing method is "very great"; B) the importance of Support Staff to OCES under the multi-county agent staffing is "very great"; and C) the importance of Support Staff to OCES would remain "very great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.
LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE

1. Level of importance of an Extension office in every county

   AGENT SPECIALIZATION
   MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
   CLUSTERED STAFFING

2. Level of importance of a county chair in every county

   AGENT SPECIALIZATION
   MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
   CLUSTERED STAFFING

3. Level of importance of a program coordinator for issues programming

   AGENT SPECIALIZATION
   MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
   CLUSTERED STAFFING

4. Level of importance of a toll-free WATS line for incoming calls from clientele

   AGENT SPECIALIZATION
   MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
   CLUSTERED STAFFING

5. Level of importance of call-forwarding telephone service for transferring incoming client calls from one county to another

   AGENT SPECIALIZATION
   MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
   CLUSTERED STAFFING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Very Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(VL)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(VG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE**

6. Level of importance of agents with subject matter/program specialization areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Level of importance of Extension associates with subject matter/program specialization areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Level of importance of program assistants as activity coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Level of importance of more in-depth in-service training programs to support "agent specialization"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Level of importance of Extension advisory boards or committees in every county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very Little (VL)</td>
<td>Little (L)</td>
<td>Some (S)</td>
<td>Great (G)</td>
<td>Very Great (VG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE**

11. Level of importance of increasing travel funds

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

12. Level of importance of improved communication between the State/District Administration and the County Staff

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

13. Level of importance of improved communication between the State/District Specialists and the County Staff

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

14. Level of importance of printed Extension publications

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Very Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(VL)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(VG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE**

15. Level of importance of computer information sharing services for clientele

- AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5

16. Level of importance of video-taped educational programs

- AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5

17. Level of importance of satellite programs

- AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
SECTION IV

INSTRUCTIONS: Please provide a written response to each of the following items.

1. List the one most important concern you would have if the clustering concept was implemented in Ohio.

2. What effects, if any, do you believe the clustered staffing pattern would have on the relationships between Extension and county funding sources?

3. Identify the county where the majority of your responsibilities take place.
4. List all the counties which would be appropriate as cluster counties with the county you identified above taking into consideration location, demographics, and topography.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Identify the major program areas which should receive agent specialization within the cluster. Be sure and identify all programs you feel are important in Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, and CNRD.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. Identify the program area you would like to have as a primary specialization area.

________________________________________________________________________

7. Identify the program area(s) you would like to have as a secondary specialization area. (Limit responses to two areas.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
SECTION V

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle the letter which corresponds to the most appropriate response for each of the following items.

1. What is your current position within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service?
   A. COUNTY CHAIR
   B. COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT
   C. EXTENSION ASSOCIATE
   D. PROGRAM ASSISTANT
   E. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)__________________________

2. To what Extension program area do you devote the greatest portion of your time?
   A. AGRICULTURE
   B. 4-H
   C. HOME ECONOMICS
   D. COMMUNITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
   E. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)__________________________

3. What is the highest academic degree you have obtained? (Circle One)
   A. BACHELOR'S DEGREE
   B. MASTER'S DEGREE
   C. DOCTORAL DEGREE
   D. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)__________________________
4. What was the major area of study in your highest academic degree?

A. ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: FINANCE, MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCES, MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, OR MARKETING)
B. AGRICULTURE (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING, AGRONOMY, ANIMAL SCIENCE, DAIRY SCIENCE, HORTICULTURE, OR POULTRY SCIENCE)
C. EDUCATION (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, EXTENSION EDUCATION, GENERAL EDUCATION, OR HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION)
D. HOME ECONOMICS (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: CHILD DEVELOPMENT, CLOTHING AND TEXTILES, DESIGN, FAMILY LIFE, HOME FURNISHINGS, HOME MANAGEMENT, OR NUTRITION)
E. NATURAL RESOURCES (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: BIOCHEMISTRY, ECOLOGY, ENTOMOLOGY, FORESTRY, PLANT PATHOLOGY, OR WILDLIFE BIOLOGY)
F. SOCIAL SCIENCE (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, PSYCHOLOGY, RURAL SOCIOLOGY, OR SOCIOLOGY)
G. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)______________________________

5. How many total years have you worked with Extension? (Include service in other states.) Indicate number of years as of July 1, 1989.

_____YEARS

6. What is your gender?

A. FEMALE
B. MALE
7. What do you believe is your level of knowledge concerning the clustered staffing pattern concept?

A. VERY HIGH  
B. HIGH  
C. MODERATE  
D. LOW  
E. VERY LOW  
F. NONE  

PLEASE BE CERTAIN THAT YOU HAVE CLEARLY INDICATED YOUR RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION.
PLEASE FEEL FREE TO LIST ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
YOU MAY HAVE IN THE SPACE BELOW

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS IMPORTANT
EXTENSION STUDY. HOPEFULLY, THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY WILL
HELP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE STAFFING PLAN
WHICH WILL STRENGTHEN THE PROGRAMS OF THE OHIO
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE.

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY NOVEMBER
7, 1989 TO:

Donnie R. King
Room 4, Agriculture Administration Building
2120 Pyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-6182
ATTITUDES OF EXTENSION FACULTY AND STAFF REGARDING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING PATTERN IN OHIO

A State-Wide Study of Extension Faculty and Staff

Autumn, 1989
INTRODUCTION

Please respond to the items in each of the five sections of the questionnaire. It is extremely important that you respond to each question in this booklet. Your most accurate and honest responses will be greatly appreciated because the purpose is to determine the attitudes and perceptions of the Ohio Cooperative Extension faculty and staff toward the concept of clustered staffing. Your questionnaire will be reviewed and analyzed by Graduate Students and individual responses will be kept confidential. The questionnaire should take approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete. Once completed, please mail the questionnaire to Room 4 Agriculture Administration Building. Before answering any of the items in this booklet, please read the definitions of clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing on pages 2 and 3. Should you need further clarification on these staffing patterns, a brief description is also provided following each definition.
INSTRUCTIONS: The items in this section are for you to indicate your attitude regarding the Clustered Staffing Pattern Concept. Please circle the number which best represents your feelings related to the following statements pertaining to clustering. The numbers represent the following:

1 - STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)
2 - DISAGREE (D)
3 - SLIGHTLY DISAGREE (SLD)
4 - SLIGHTLY AGREE (SLA)
5 - AGREE (A)
6 - STRONGLY AGREE (SA)

EXAMPLE:

Clustering is a new concept. 1 2 3 4 5 6

This response indicates that the respondent Strongly Agrees with the statement.
1. I would discuss the concept of clustering with a co-worker.  & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
2. I would discuss the clustering concept with Extension professionals who have worked in clustered counties. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
3. I would discuss the concept of clustering with my supervisor. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
4. I would voluntarily attend a District level meeting regarding the clustering concept. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
5. I would voluntarily attend a State level meeting regarding the clustering concept. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
6. I would assist with the development of a plan for my unit to provide support to agents with cluster responsibilities. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
7. I would provide assistance to agents serving as "Cluster specialists" only if required by Administration. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
8. I would provide assistance to agents serving as "Cluster specialist" because of the need for Extension to furnish clientele with a greater level of expertise at the county level. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6
9. I would request assistance from an agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" when conducting programs for clientele, because of their expertise.

10. I would gain satisfaction in the work of providing support to the "Cluster specialists" in my program area.

11. I would encourage agents to serve as "Cluster specialists" in my program area.

12. I would conduct in-service training programs for agents serving as "Cluster specialists" within my area of expertise.

13. I would develop teaching materials for the "Cluster specialists" working in my area of expertise to use when conducting programs for clientele.

14. I would spend no less than 10% of my Extension time in support of the "Cluster specialists".
SECTION II

INSTRUCTIONS: The items found in this section pertain to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be successfully conducted under the agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. Please circle the number following each statement corresponding to the answer which best describes what you believe in terms of: A) the level of success of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) in the area in question utilizing agent specialization as an autonomous staffing pattern; B) the level of success of OCES in the area in question utilizing multi-county agent staffing including the agent specialization concept; and C) the level of potential success of OCES in the area in question utilizing clustered staffing with agent specialization. Remember to respond to each item in terms of your perceptions toward Extension's success utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing.

In Section II the following scale will be used to measure the SUCCESS OF OCES WHEN UTILIZING AGENT SPECIALIZATION; SUCCESS OF OCES WHEN UTILIZING MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING; and POTENTIAL SUCCESS OF OCES WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: Level of success in supervising work of volunteers

LEVELS OF SUCCESS

AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5

In this example, the respondent indicated: A) the success of OCES is "very great" in supervising the work of volunteers under the agent specialization staffing method; B) the success of OCES is "great" in supervising the work of volunteers under multi-county agent staffing; and C) the potential success of OCES would also be "great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**

1. Level of success in providing information clientele can use
   - AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5

2. Level of success in providing clientele with research based information
   - AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5

3. Level of success in providing quality programs to a diverse clientele
   - AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5

4. Level of success in providing a high level of subject matter expertise at the county level
   - AGENT SPECIALIZATION: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
   - CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Very Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(VL)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(VG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**

5. Level of success in responding to emerging issues of clientele

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

6. Level of success in involving advisory committees in the program planning process

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

7. Level of success in conducting needs assessment to determine program direction

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

8. Level of success in conducting in-depth program evaluations

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF SUCCESS</th>
<th>No Very Little Little Some Great Very Great</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N) (VL) (L) (S) (G) (VG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of affluent adults

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

10. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of youth from affluent families

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

11. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of low income adults

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

12. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of youth from low income families

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**  

13. Level of success in communicating effectively with clientele of various educational levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Level of success in conducting programs cooperatively with other agencies and organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Level of success in maintaining program flexibility to promptly address emerging issues of a wide sample of the general public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Level of success in developing issue response teams to address emerging needs of clientele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (N)</td>
<td>Very Little (VL)</td>
<td>Little (L)</td>
<td>Some (S)</td>
<td>Great (G)</td>
<td>Very Great (VG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS**

17. **Level of success in developing comprehensive programs which focus on issues that affect financial success in agriculture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Level of success in developing comprehensive programs which focus on issues related to rural revitalization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. **Level of success in developing comprehensive educational programs which focus on issues related to family well-being**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Level of success in developing comprehensive educational programs which aid in preparing youth for responsibility

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5

21. Level of success in developing comprehensive program which focus on issues related to water quality

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5

22. Level of success in providing opportunities for leadership development of adults

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5

23. Level of success in providing opportunities for leadership development of youth

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING
0 1 2 3 4 5
INSTRUCTIONS: The items found in this section pertain to various methods of support for Extension work which may or may not enhance program delivery under the agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. Please circle the number following each statement corresponding to the answer which best describes what you believe in terms of: A) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when agent specialization is utilized as an autonomous method of staffing; B) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when multi-county agent staffing is utilized and agent specialization is included in the staffing process; and C) the importance of the item in question to the programming efforts of OCES when utilizing the clustered staffing method and including agent specialization. Remember to give your perceptions of the importance of each item to Extension when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing.

In Section III the following scale will be used to measure the IMPORTANCE TO OCES WHEN UTILIZING AGENT SPECIALIZATION; IMPORTANCE TO OCES WHEN UTILIZING MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING; and IMPORTANCE TO OCES WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: Level of importance of support staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>N VL L S G VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the respondent indicated that: A) the importance of Support Staff to OCES when utilizing the agent specialization staffing method is "very great"; B) the importance of Support Staff to OCES under the multi-county agent staffing is "very great"; and C) the importance of Support Staff to OCES would remain "very great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance of an Extension office in every county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance of a county chair in every county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance of a program coordinator for issues programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance of a toll-free WATS line for incoming calls from clientele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance of call-forwarding telephone service for transferring incoming client calls from one county to another</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE**  

6. Level of importance of agents with subject matter/program specialization areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Level of importance of Extension associates with subject matter/program specialization areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Level of importance of program assistants as activity coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Level of importance of more in-depth in-service training programs to support "agent specialization"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Level of importance of Extension advisory boards or committees in every county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Level of importance of increasing travel funds

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

12. Level of importance of improved communication between the State/District Administration and the County Staff

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

13. Level of importance of improved communication between the State/District Specialists and the County Staff

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5

14. Level of importance of printed Extension publications

AGENT SPECIALIZATION 0 1 2 3 4 5
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
CLUSTERED STAFFING 0 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE**

15. Level of importance of computer information sharing services for clientele

- **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5

16. Level of importance of video-taped educational programs

- **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5

17. Level of importance of satellite programs

- **AGENT SPECIALIZATION**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
- **CLUSTERED STAFFING**: 0 1 2 3 4 5
SECTION IV

INSTRUCTIONS: Please provide a written response to each of the following items.

1. List the one most important concern you would have if the clustering concept was implemented in Ohio.

2. What effects, if any, do you believe the clustered staffing pattern would have on the relationships between Extension and county funding sources?
SECTION V

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle the letter which corresponds to the most appropriate response for each of the following items.

1. What is your current position within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service?
   A. STATE/DISTRICT EXTENSION SPECIALIST
   B. EXTENSION ASSOCIATE
   C. PROGRAM ASSISTANT
   D. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)__________________________

2. To what Extension program area do you devote the greatest portion of your time?
   A. AGRICULTURE
   B. 4-H
   C. HOME ECONOMICS
   D. COMMUNITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
   E. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)__________________________

3. What is the highest academic degree you have obtained? (Circle One)
   A. BACHELOR'S DEGREE
   B. MASTER'S DEGREE
   C. DOCTORAL DEGREE
   D. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)__________________________
4. What was the major area of study in your highest academic degree?

A. ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: FINANCE, MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCES, MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, OR MARKETING)
B. AGRICULTURE (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING, AGRONOMY, ANIMAL SCIENCE, DAIRY SCIENCE, HORTICULTURE, OR POULTRY SCIENCE)
C. EDUCATION (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, EXTENSION EDUCATION, GENERAL EDUCATION, OR HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION)
D. HOME ECONOMICS (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: CHILD DEVELOPMENT, CLOTHING AND TEXTILES, DESIGN, FAMILY LIFE, HOME FURNISHINGS, HOME MANAGEMENT, OR NUTRITION)
E. NATURAL RESOURCES (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: BIOCHEMISTRY, ECOLOGY, ENTOMOLOGY, FORESTRY, PLANT PATHOLOGY, OR WILDLIFE BIOLOGY)
F. SOCIAL SCIENCE (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, PSYCHOLOGY, RURAL SOCIOLOGY, OR SOCIOLOGY)
G. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) ________________________

5. How many total years have you worked with Extension? (Include service in other states.) Indicate number of years as of July 1, 1989.

_____YEARS

6. What is your gender?

A. FEMALE
B. MALE
7. What do you believe is your level of knowledge concerning the clustered staffing pattern concept?

A. VERY HIGH
B. HIGH
C. MODERATE
D. LOW
E. VERY LOW
F. NONE

PLEASE BE CERTAIN THAT YOU HAVE CLEARLY INDICATED YOUR RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTION.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS IMPORTANT EXTENSION STUDY. HOPEFULLY, THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY WILL HELP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE STAFFING PLAN WHICH WILL STRENGTHEN THE PROGRAMS OF THE OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE.

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY NOVEMBER 7, 1989 TO:

Donnie R. King
Room 4, Agriculture Administration Building
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-6182
APPENDIX C

PANEL OF EXPERTS WHO ASSESSED THE
CONTENT VALIDITY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
### Panel of Experts Who Assessed the Content Validity of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick G. Boyle</td>
<td>Chancellor &amp; Director</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James J. Brasher</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Brazzel</td>
<td>Organizational Development</td>
<td>Extension Service</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Gunderson</td>
<td>Coordinator, Staff &amp; Organizational Development</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sanderson</td>
<td>Program Leader, Staff &amp; Organizational Development</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>University of Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyn Smith</td>
<td>Southern Regional Director</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources Programs</td>
<td>University of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Warren</td>
<td>Human Resource Management Specialist</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Selected Panel of Experts

Patrick G. Boyle, Wisconsin  
James J. Brasher, Florida  
Mike Brazzel, Washington, D.C.  
Gail Gunderson, North Dakota  

Dear Colleague:

We are currently in the process of ascertaining the content validity of a survey instrument which we plan to use for collecting data for a state-wide Extension study in Ohio. The study will be a doctoral dissertation with the information obtained being used to determine the future staffing patterns utilized in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. A census will be used to study the attitudes of Specialists, Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants toward the conventional, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns with emphasis placed upon clustering. The title of the dissertation is "Attitudes of Extension Faculty and Staff Regarding the Clustered Staffing Pattern in Ohio". We would greatly appreciate you serving on the panel of experts to help determine the content validity of the survey instrument.

Attached is a form which has been developed for your use in commenting on the items which have been developed for the questionnaire. As you review the proposed items, please feel free to comment on the following topics:

Content Validity - Are the items representative of the concept being measured? Are the items appropriate?

Clarity - Is each item clear? Is the language appropriate for the intended audience?

Format - Is there a logical flow in the questionnaire? What are your suggestions for improvement? (The actual instrument will be constructed according to Dillman, 1978.)

Other - Feel free to make any additions, corrections or suggestions as warranted.

If possible, please return the enclosed form with your comments to Dr. Keith L. Smith by September 6. Thanks in advance for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Smith  
Leader, Personnel Development

Donnie R. King  
Graduate Associate

KLS/DRK:1kb  
Enclosure
ATTITUDES OF EXTENSION FACULTY AND STAFF REGARDING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING PATTERN IN OHIO

BY: Donnie R. King

ADVISER: Keith L. Smith

The Ohio State University

Autumn, 1989
**QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM CONTENT VALIDATION FORM**

**SECTION I**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Listed below is a Guttman Scale which will be used to determine the attitude of respondents toward clustering after they have reviewed the "Definition and Description of Clustering". Please rate each item on two criteria: 1) the appropriateness of the item in determining the attitude of respondents toward the clustering concept; and 2) the clarity of the meaning of the item. Please circle your response.

1) Is the item appropriate?
   - YES - Appropriate
   - NO - Not Appropriate

2) Is the item clear?
   - Yes - Meaning Clear
   - No - Meaning Unclear

Please reword any items that may be appropriate but unclear in the lines located below the items.

Since the order of the items within a Guttman Scale is extremely important (the intensity of the items should increase as respondents proceed through the scale), we ask that you reorder the items in the blanks located to the left of each item should you feel it necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriate?</th>
<th>Clear?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I would discuss the concept of clustering with a co-worker.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I would discuss the clustering concept with Extension Professionals who have worked in clustered counties.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I would discuss the concept of clustering with my supervisor.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I would voluntarily attend a District level meeting regarding the clustering concept. YES NO YES NO

5. I would voluntarily attend a State level meeting regarding the clustering concept. YES NO YES NO

6. I would assist an Agent with cluster responsibilities. YES NO YES NO

7. I would request assistance from an Agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" when conducting programs for clientele. YES NO YES NO

8. I would serve in a "Cluster specialist" role. YES NO YES NO

9A. As a county professional working within a cluster, I would maintain a high level of expertise in my selected specialty area. YES NO YES NO

9B. As a State/District specialist, I would provide training and teaching materials for Agents serving as "Cluster specialists" within my area of expertise. YES NO YES NO
10A. As a county professional, I would spend 10% of my time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

**APPROPRIATE?**  YES  NO  YES  NO

**CLEAR?**

10B. As a State/District specialist, I would spend 10% of my Extension time in support of the "Cluster specialist".  

**APPROPRIATE?**  YES  NO  YES  NO

**CLEAR?**

11A. As a county professional, I would spend 25% of my time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

**APPROPRIATE?**  YES  NO  YES  NO

**CLEAR?**

11B. As a State/District specialist, I would spend 25% of my Extension time in support of the "Cluster specialist".  

**APPROPRIATE?**  YES  NO  YES  NO

**CLEAR?**

12A. As a county professional, I would spend 50% of my time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

**APPROPRIATE?**  YES  NO  YES  NO

**CLEAR?**

12B. As a State/District specialist, I would spend 50% of my Extension time in support of the "Cluster specialist".  

**APPROPRIATE?**  YES  NO  YES  NO

**CLEAR?**

13A. As a county professional, I would spend more than 50% of my time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

**APPROPRIATE?**  YES  NO  YES  NO

**CLEAR?**
13B. As a State/District specialist, I would spend more than 50% of my Extension time in support of the "Cluster specialist".

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

YES NO YES NO

SECTION II

INSTRUCTIONS: The items found in this section pertain to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be successfully conducted under the conventional or multi-county methods of program delivery. Respondents will be asked to identify what they believe in terms of: A) the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing the conventional staffing method; B) the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing multi-county agent staffing; and C) the level of potential OCES success in the area in question utilizing clustered staffing.

As in Section I, you are asked to respond yes or no to the Appropriateness and Clarity of each item. Space is again provided for you to reword any items which are appropriate but unclear.

In Section II the following scale will be used to measure the SUCCESS OF EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING THE CONVENTIONAL STAFFING METHOD; SUCCESS OF EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING; and POTENTIAL SUCCESS OF EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: Supervise work of volunteers

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONAL STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the respondent indicated: A) the success of OCES is "very great" in supervising the work of volunteers under the conventional staffing method; B) the success of OCES is "great" in supervising the work of volunteers under multi-county agent staffing; and C) the potential success of OCES would also be "great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conduct needs assessment to determine program direction</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide useful information</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide accurate information</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide up-to-date information</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide clientele with research based recommendations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide quality programs to a wide variety of clientele</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In general, provide a high level of subject matter expertise at the county level</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to emerging needs of clientele</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct in-depth program evaluations</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of affluent adults</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of youth from affluent families</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of lower income adults

26. Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of youth from lower income families

27. Communicate effectively with clientele of various educational levels

28. Involve advisory committees in the program planning process

29. Conduct programs cooperatively with other agencies and organizations

30. Maintain program flexibility to promptly address emerging needs of clientele

31. Develop issue response teams to address emerging needs of clientele

32. Develop comprehensive programs which focus on issues that affect financial success in agriculture

33. Develop comprehensive programs which focus on issues related to rural revitalization
34. Develop comprehensive educational programs which focus on issues related to family well-being

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

YES NO YES NO

35. Develop comprehensive educational programs which aid in preparing youth for responsibilities

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

YES NO YES NO

36. Develop comprehensive program which focus on issues related to water quality

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

YES NO YES NO

37. Provide opportunities for leadership development of adults

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

YES NO YES NO

38. Provide opportunities for leadership development of youth

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

YES NO YES NO

Are there other items which you feel should be added to this section of the questionnaire?

SECTION III

INSTRUCTIONS: The items found in this section pertain to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be important in conducting programs under the conventional, multi-county, or clustering staffing methods. Respondents will be asked to circle the number following each statement corresponding to the answer which best describes what they believe in terms of: A) the importance of the item in question to Extension programming when the conventional staffing method is utilized; B) the importance of the item in question to Extension programming when multi-county agent staffing is utilized; and C) the importance of the item in question to Extension when the clustered staffing method described on page 1 of this questionnaire is utilized.
You are asked to respond yes or no to the Appropriateness and Clarity of each item as in Sections I and II. Space is again provided for you to reword any items which are appropriate but unclear.

In Section III the following scale will be used to measure the IMPORTANCE TO EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING THE CONVENTIONAL STAFFING METHOD; IMPORTANCE TO EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING; and IMPORTANCE TO EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE:** Support Staff

- CONVENTIONAL STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4
- MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4
- CLUSTERED STAFFING: 0 1 2 3 4

In this example, the respondent indicated that: A) the importance of Support Staff under the conventional staffing method is "very great"; B) the importance of Support Staff under the multi-county agent staffing is "very great"; and C) the importance of Support Staff would remain "very great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APPROPRIATE?</th>
<th>CLEAR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. County Office in every county</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. County Chair in every county</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Program Coordinator for Issues Programming</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Toll-Free Watts Line</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Agents with subject matter/program specialization areas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Associates with subject matter/program specialization areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>YES NO YES NO</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other items which you feel should be added to this section of the questionnaire? ______________________________________

SECTION IV

INSTRUCTIONS: In Section IV respondents will be asked to provide a written response to each of the following items. (District and State Specialists will answer only Questions 1 and 2.)

Once again we ask you to respond yes or no to the Appropriateness and Clarity of each item as in Sections I, II and III. Space is again provided for you to reword any items which are appropriate but unclear.

1. List the one most important concern you have regarding the implementation of the clustering concept in Ohio. YES NO YES NO

2. What effects, if any, do you believe the clustered staffing pattern will have on the relationships between Extension and our county funding sources? YES NO YES NO

3. Identify the county where the majority of your responsibilities take place. YES NO YES NO

4. List the counties which would be appropriate as cluster counties with the county you identified above taking into consideration location, demographics, and topography. YES NO YES NO
5. Identify the major program areas which should receive Agent specialization within the cluster. Be sure and identify all programs you feel are important in Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, and CNRD. YES NO YES NO

6. Identify the program area you would like to have as a primary specialization area. YES NO YES NO

7. Identify the program area(s) you would like to have as a secondary specialization area. (Limit responses to two areas.) YES NO YES NO

Are there other important questions which you feel should be added to this section?

SECTION V

INSTRUCTIONS: Respondents will be asked to circle the letter which corresponds to the most appropriate response for each of the following demographic items.

Please read each item and answer the questions in the boxes provided.

1. What is your current position within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service?
   A. EXTENSION SPECIALIST
   B. COUNTY CHAIRMAN
   C. COUNTY EXTENSION AGENT
   D. EXTENSION ASSOCIATE
   E. PROGRAM ASSISTANT
1. (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the choices listed appropriate?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the question clear?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any suggestions for improvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the highest academic degree you have obtained? (Circle One)

| A. BACHELOR'S DEGREE |
| B. MASTER'S DEGREE |
| C. EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST |
| D. DOCTORAL DEGREE |
| E. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the choices listed appropriate?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the question clear?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any suggestions for improvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What was the major area of study in your highest academic degree?

| A. ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: FINANCE, MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCES, MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, OR MARKETING) |
| B. AGRICULTURE (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING, AGRONOMY, ANIMAL SCIENCE, DAIRY SCIENCE, HORTICULTURE, OR POULTRY SCIENCE) |
| C. EDUCATION (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION, EXTENSION EDUCATION, GENERAL EDUCATION, OR HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION) |
| D. HOME ECONOMICS (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: CHILD DEVELOPMENT, CLOTHING AND TEXTILES, DESIGN, FAMILY LIFE, HOME FURNISHINGS, HOME MANAGEMENT, OR NUTRITION) |
| E. NATURAL RESOURCES (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: BIOCHEMISTRY, ECOLOGY, ENTOMOLOGY, FORESTRY, PLANT PATHOLOGY, WILDLIFE BIOLOGY) |
| F. SOCIAL SCIENCE (INCLUDING THE AREAS OF: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, PSYCHOLOGY, RURAL SOCIOLOGY, OR SOCIOLOGY) |
| G. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) |
3. (CONTINUED)

Are the choices listed appropriate? YES NO
Is the question clear? YES NO
Any suggestions for improvement? _____________________________

4. To what Extension program area do you devote the greatest portion of your time?

A. AGRICULTURE
B. 4-H
C. HOME ECONOMICS
D. COMMUNITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
E. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____________________________

Are the choices listed appropriate? YES NO
Is the question clear? YES NO
Any suggestions for improvement? _____________________________

5. How many total years have you worked with Extension? (Include service in other states) Indicate number of years as of July 1, 1989.

____ YEARS

Are the choices listed appropriate? YES NO
Is the question clear? YES NO
Any suggestions for improvement? _____________________________

6. What is your gender?

A. FEMALE
B. MALE

Are the choices listed appropriate? YES NO
Is the question clear? YES NO
Any suggestions for improvement? _____________________________
7. What do you believe is your level of knowledge concerning the clustered staffing pattern concept?

A. VERY HIGH  
B. HIGH  
C. MODERATE  
D. LOW  
E. VERY LOW  
F. NONE

Are the choices listed appropriate? YES NO
Is the question clear? YES NO
Any suggestions for improvement? ___________________________

NOTE TO PANEL OF EXPERTS: The following two items are to ascertain whether the respondents followed the directions and read the definitions attached to the survey.

8. What will definitely not be a change as a result of the clustered staffing pattern?

A. INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF  
B. DECREASE IN THE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF  
C. NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF REMAINS THE SAME

Are the choices listed appropriate? YES NO
Is the question clear? YES NO
Any suggestions for improvement? _____________________________

9. Program Coordinators will be used in the clustered staffing pattern.

A. YES  
B. NO

Are the choices listed appropriate? YES NO
Is the question clear? YES NO
Any suggestions for improvement? _____________________________
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS IMPORTANT EXTENSION STUDY. HOPEFULLY, THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY WILL HELP TO DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE STAFFING PLAN WHICH WILL STRENGTHEN THE PROGRAMS OF THE OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE.

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO KEITH L. SMITH BEFORE LEAVING THE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 6, 1989.

Keith L. Smith
Room 4, Agriculture Administration Building
2120 Pyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-6182
APPENDIX D

COVER LETTERS AND FOLLOW-UP CORRESPONDENCE
Dear Colleague:

As a member of the OCES Administrative Cabinet, we are asking you to participate as a member of a pilot test group. This pilot test will aid in determining the reliability of the instrument which will be utilized to determine the attitude of Extension faculty and staff in Ohio toward the clustered staffing pattern concept. In the near future, the enclosed questionnaire will be distributed to all Specialists, Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants employed by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

In order to have the best instrument possible for this important study, it must be both valid and reliable. A panel of experts has reviewed the questionnaire for content validity. Our next step is to have you complete the questionnaire in order that a measure of the internal consistency of the results generated can be obtained.

As you complete the questionnaire, also feel free to make any comments regarding the clarity, format, or appropriateness of the individual items. The cover letter which will be mailed to Extension faculty and staff, and the definitions of clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county are included in the first three pages of the questionnaire for you to review and critique.

If you have any questions while completing the questionnaire, please call Donnie King at (614) 292-6182. Please return your completed questionnaire to Room 4, Agriculture Administration Building by September 22, 1989. Thank you for your help and cooperation in the matter.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Smith
Leader, Personnel Development

Donnie R. King
Graduate Associate

The Ohio State University, The United States Department of Agriculture, and County Commissioners Cooperating
Dear Colleague:

The staffing pattern for Extension in Ohio will change due to the need to provide clientele with greater expertise at the local level. Issue programming has also created the need for greater flexibility in our programming and staffing in order to address the emerging needs of the citizens of Ohio. The conventional staffing pattern of three agents in every county is no longer possible due to budget constraints which have plagued Extension throughout the 1980's. Therefore, the staffing pattern for OCES will move toward agent specialization, multi-county staffing, clustered staffing, or a combination of these staffing patterns.

You are being asked to participate in a study to determine the attitude of the OCES faculty and staff toward several staffing pattern options. All Specialists, Extension Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants in the organization will be surveyed to determine their attitudes toward agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns with an emphasis placed upon clustering.

The results of this study will be used in determining the future staffing pattern for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. For the results to be truly representative of the entire organization, your response to the enclosed questionnaire is critical. You can be sure of complete confidentiality. The code number on the questionnaire is used simply to help identify which questionnaires have been returned. Graduate students in the Department of Agricultural Education will analyze the results of the study and they will be the only individuals who have access to the individual questionnaires.

The questionnaire should take approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete. We ask that you respond to the questionnaire based on your perceptions and knowledge of agent specialization, multi-county staffing, and clustered staffing.

If you have any questions while completing the questionnaire, please contact Donnie King at (614) 292-6182. Please return your completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope by November 7, 1989. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser
Director

cc: Administrative Cabinet
Enclosure
Dear Colleague:

The staffing pattern for Extension in Ohio will change due to the need to provide clientele with greater expertise at the local level. Issue programming has also created the need for greater flexibility in our programming and staffing in order to address the emerging needs of the citizens of Ohio. The conventional staffing pattern of three agents in every county is no longer possible due to budget constraints which have plagued Extension throughout the 1980's. Therefore, the staffing pattern for OCES will move toward agent specialization, multi-county staffing, clustered staffing, or a combination of these staffing patterns.

You are being asked to participate in a study to determine the attitude of the OCES faculty and staff toward several staffing pattern options. All Specialists, Extension Agents, Extension Associates, and Program Assistants in the organization will be surveyed to determine their attitudes toward agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns with an emphasis placed upon clustering.

The results of this study will be used in determining the future staffing pattern for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. For the results to be truly representative of the entire organization, your response to the enclosed questionnaire is critical. You can be sure of complete confidentiality. The code number on the questionnaire is used simply to help identify which questionnaires have been returned. Graduate students in the Department of Agricultural Education will analyze the results of the study and they will be the only individuals who have access to the individual questionnaires.

The questionnaire should take approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete. We ask that you respond to the questionnaire based on your perceptions and knowledge of agent specialization, multi-county staffing, and clustered staffing.

If you have any questions while completing the questionnaire, please contact Donnie King at (614) 292-6182. Please return your completed questionnaire by November 7, 1989 to Room 4 Agriculture Administration Building. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser
Director

cc: Administrative Cabinet
Enclosure
Dear Colleague:

On October 24, 1989 a questionnaire to obtain your opinion about several staffing pattern options for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service was mailed to you. If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire to us, please accept our sincere thanks for your time and efforts.

If you have not completed the questionnaire, please do so today. The results of this study will be used in determining the future staffing pattern for our organization. If these results are to be truly representative of the faculty and staff of OCES, your response is critical.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire or it was misplaced, please contact Donnie King at (614) 292-6182, and he will mail another to you without delay.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser
Director

Keith L. Smith
Associate Director

c: Administrative Cabinet
November 14, 1989

Dear Colleague:

On October 24, 1989 a questionnaire to obtain your opinion about several staffing pattern options for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service was mailed to you. As of today we have not received your completed questionnaire. If you have recently completed and returned the questionnaire to us, please accept our sincere thanks for your time and efforts.

We are writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of the study. If these results are to be truly representative of the faculty and staff of OCES, it is essential that each person return their questionnaire.

The results of this study will be used in determining the future staffing pattern for our organization. The study was undertaken because of our belief that each individual in the organization should have the opportunity to provide input when major staffing changes are being considered. This may possibly be your last opportunity to provide such input before these staffing changes take place.

In the event that you did not receive the questionnaire or it was misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. A pre-addressed envelope is also enclosed for your use in returning the questionnaire. You may use the penalty mail privilege when mailing the questionnaire. The questionnaire should take approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete. We strongly encourage you to respond by the final deadline of November 21.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser  
Director

Keith L. Smith  
Assistant Director

C: Administrative Cabinet

The Ohio State University, The United States Department of Agriculture and County Commissioners Cooperating
Dear Colleague:

On October 24, 1989 a questionnaire to obtain your opinion about several staffing pattern options for the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service was mailed to you. As of today we have not received your completed questionnaire. If you have recently completed and returned the questionnaire to us, please accept our sincere thanks for your time and efforts.

We are writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of the study. If these results are to be truly representative of the faculty and staff of OCES, it is essential that each person return their questionnaire.

The results of this study will be used in determining the future staffing pattern for our organization. The study was undertaken because of our belief that each individual in the organization should have the opportunity to provide input when major staffing changes are being considered. This may possibly be your last opportunity to provide such input before these staffing changes take place.

In the event that you did not receive the questionnaire or it was misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. The questionnaire should take approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete. We strongly encourage you to respond by the final deadline of November 21.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser
Director

Keith L. Smith
Associate Director

BDM/KLS:drk

c: Administrative Cabinet

The Ohio State University, The United States Department of Agriculture and County Commissioners Cooperating
APPENDIX E

SECOND REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOLLOWING DETECTION OF MULTICOLLINEARITY

COUNTY PERSONNEL
Table 39

R Square Statistics for the Regression of Antecedent Characteristics Clustering Importance (CI), Agent Specialization Importance (ASI), and Multi-County Importance (MCI) for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>ASI</th>
<th>MCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R sq</td>
<td>R sq</td>
<td>R sq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI and MCI</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI and MCI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI and ASI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 281
Table 40

Summary Data: Intercorrelations of the Selected Antecedent Characteristics with Importance Variables Combined for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Intercorrelations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success (X1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success (X2)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success (X3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Impt. (X4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 281
Table 41

Summary Data: Correlations of Selected Antecedent Characteristics with the Dependent Variables for County Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Impt.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 281
### Table 42

Regression of Receiving Score for County Personnel  
(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Importance</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .699  
\[ n = 281 \]
Table 43

Regression of Responding Score for County Personnel
(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Impt.</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .684
n = 281
Table 44

Regression of Valuing Score for County Personnel
(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>$b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Impt.</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .784
n = 281
APPENDIX F

SECOND REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOLLOWING
DETECTION OF MULTICOLLINEARITY

STATE/DISTRICT PERSONNEL
Table 45

R Square Statistics for the Regression of Antecedent Characteristics Clustering Importance (CI), Agent Specialization Importance (ASI), and Multi-County Importance (MCI) for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>CI R sq</th>
<th>ASI R sq</th>
<th>MCI R sq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASI and MCI</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI and MCI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI and ASI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 116
Table 46

Summary Data: Intercorrelations of the Selected Antecedent Characteristics with Importance Variables Combined for State/District Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success (X1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success (X2)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success (X3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Impt. (X4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 116
Table 47  
**Summary Data: Correlations of Selected Antecedent Characteristics with the Dependent Variables for State/District Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Receiving</th>
<th>Responding</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Impt.</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 116
Table 48

Regression of Receiving Score for State/District Personnel
(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Importance</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .832
n = 116
Table 49

Regression of Responding Score for State/District Personnel
(Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Importance</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .649
n = 116
### Table 50

**Regression of Valuing Score for State/District Personnel**  
*(Hierarchical Entry)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>R sq change</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clustering Success</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agt. Spec. Success</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Co. Success</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Importance</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Error = .696  
\(n = 116\)
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