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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

The land-grant institutions in America have constituted a unique educational system, since their founding in the latter half of the nineteenth century. 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 the 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 colleges for all people 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. The Cooperative Extension Service has had considerable success during its seventy-five years of existence. 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 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). This charge 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 (1987), 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, the approach could have far reaching implications for organizational staffing and cooperation with academic departments throughout the land-grant institutions.

G. R. McDowell (1988) 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" (p. 19). 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, institutions are beginning to examine new ways which the Cooperative Extension Service can help to carry out the land-grant mission.

Extension could be linked with university teaching hospitals, computer centers, research stations, and all subject matter departments of the university. With the established networks that Extension has across every state, developing linkages with all areas of the university could only serve to expand the scope of all public service programs and the types of technology being transferred to the people. This type approach is essential if the Cooperative Extension Service is to maintain a significant role within the land-grant system.

The Cooperative Extension Service and the research component of the land-grant institutions need a closer linkage in order that researchers might have a better understanding of the needs of society. 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 the 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 of the general public.
Speaking specifically to Cooperative Extension, E. W. Eddy (1989) 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" (p. 5). 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. The results of research need to be 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 to the general public.

Statement of the Problem

The Cooperative Extension Service nationally, as well as, the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service 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", 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.

- The Extension Service should develop inter-disciplinary issue response teams both at state and multi-county and/or district levels.

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

- 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.

In order to provide the best information available to clientele, the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is currently considering the idea of clustering county Extension offices to allow agents to specialize in areas of interest that are needed within the cluster counties and to coordinate the issues programming efforts. This plan could provide clientele with higher quality information, as well as, 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 personal development of county personnel. 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 is obligated 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, Extension faculty and staff should be surveyed to determine their level of commitment to the concept and to allow their input into the staffing plan.

With little information available on the subject of clustered staffing, the need for a study of this nature is great.
The county advisory committee members of the Extension organization can make the necessary comparisons of the staffing pattern options available and identify major concerns which should be addressed. Also, by providing county Extension advisory committee members the opportunity to provide input into a staffing plan through an attitude survey, their understanding of clustered staffing, as well as, the other staffing pattern options is increased. This increased level of understanding will, hopefully, reduce their resistance to any changes in the 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 designing the necessary changes.

The primary focus of this study was to examine the attitudes of county Extension advisory committee members concerning the clustered staffing pattern. The study was also conducted to obtain information from the subjects regarding the implementation of clustered staffing in Ohio and to compare the three staffing patterns -- clustered staffing, agent specialization, and multi-county staffing.
Variables and Objectives of the Study

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

Dependent Variable:

The three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the county Extension advisory committee members toward the clustered staffing pattern concept.

Antecedent Characteristics:

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

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

C. Highest Academic Degree Obtained

D. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree

E. Primary Program Support Area

F. Length of Service

G. Extension Volunteer Roles Held

H. Gender
I. Level of Knowledge

The following research objectives were formulated for this study:

1. To describe the population of the county Extension Advisory committees 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 programs when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns.

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

   C. Highest Academic Degree Obtained

   D. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree

   E. Primary Program Support Area

   F. Length of Service

   G. Extension Volunteer Roles Held

   H. Gender

   I. Level of Knowledge
2. To describe three measures of the attitude of the county Extension advisory committee members toward the clustered staffing pattern concept across levels of the following selected antecedent characteristics:

A. Highest Academic Degree Obtained
B. Major Area of Study in Highest Academic Degree
C. Primary Program Support Area
D. Length of Service
E. Extension Volunteer Roles Held
F. Gender
G. Level of Knowledge

3. To determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the county Extension advisory committee members toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance scores for each of the staffing pattern options.

4. To describe the major concerns of county Extension advisory committee members if the clustered staffing pattern was implemented in Ohio.

5. To describe the concerns of county Extension advisory committee members 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** - The major area of study in the highest academic degree of the respondents.

**Agent Specialization** - This staffing approach provides an opportunity for county Extension personnel to direct up to 25% of their time to specific subject matter areas and to share expertise within the cluster/multi-county/contiguous counties via presentation, serving on issue task forces, and developing written materials for use beyond the county boundary lines.

**Attitude** - The mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related. The construct is organized into a continuum with five levels, receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization.
**Clustering (Clustered Staffing Pattern)** - Two or more counties with staff members from each county working together in conducting the Extension programming efforts. Each agent will have charge of 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 serves as a resource and teacher in his/her specialty area(s) for all counties within the cluster. A county chair is located in each county, with a program coordinator identified for the cluster to facilitate programming efforts, particularly Issues Programming.

**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 the county chair or another agent 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 Extension Advisory Committee** - A committee, representing the population of the county, designed to assist county Extension agents and administration in planning, conducting, and evaluating Extension educational programs and in publicizing their effectiveness.

**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 the purpose of this study the term county personnel was used when referring to county Extension agents, Extension associates, and program assistants.

**Highest Academic Degree** - The highest academic degree received by the respondents and operationally defined as:
A. Did not attend high school  B. High school diploma or equivalent  C. Bachelor's Degree  D. Master's Degree  E. Educational Specialist  F. Ph.D.

**Length of Service** - The self-reported number of years the respondent had been serving as a volunteer of the Cooperative Extension Service as of January 1, 1990.

**Level of Knowledge** - The self-reported degree of understanding respondents had concerning the clustered staffing pattern concept.
Multi-County Staffing - The method of staffing which involves sharing 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 coordinate activities in the county in which they are permanently located.

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 are 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 - The initial attitudinal level where the learner is sensitized to the existence of certain phenomena or stimuli; that is to be willing to receive or to attend to them.

Responding - The second attitudinal level where the learner is committed to a subject so that he/she will seek it out and gain satisfaction from working with it or engaging in it.

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.

Valuing - The third level of attitude development where the learner represents a social product that has been slowly internalized or accepted ... and the learner displays this behavior with sufficient consistency in appropriate situations that he/she comes to be perceived as holding a value.
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 the agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns. 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.

Another limitation of the study was the varying levels of knowledge respondents had about the three staffing patterns. The knowledge level of respondents might 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 can create a bias toward the pattern.

To reduce the effects of these limitations the definitions of clustering, agent specialization, and multi-county agent staffing were included in the questionnaire.
Providing the definition 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. Additional descriptive information was provided in the questionnaire on the clustered staffing pattern ("Definition and Description of Clustering"). 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 have been utilized in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service while clustered staffing has never been 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 subjects on clustered staffing with their knowledge of agent specialization and multi-county staffing.
Basic Assumptions

For the purpose of this study an assumption was made that the clustering concept in Ohio will involve two or more counties with staff members from each county working together to conduct the Extension programming efforts. Agents will 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 the areas of leadership, program planning, teaching methodology, and evaluation.

Once specialty areas are selected and agreed to by Extension Administration, agents will 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 will 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 which will be 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., 1988, 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 subjects had a greater level of knowledge of agent specialization and multi-county staffing than they had regarding the clustered staffing pattern. This was the reason that additional 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

The Cooperative Extension Service has, from its inception, provided educational programs based on the needs of people (Geasler, et.al., 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" (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) indicated that issues for Extension are "matters of wide public concern arising out of complex human problems" (p. 5). 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", (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).

Involvement of Local Citizens

A special feature of the Extension Service as it has developed over the years has been its grassroots organization and dependency upon volunteers who help plan, conduct, and evaluate its educational offerings (Prawl, 1984). The involvement of the "common man" in the educational process is a hallmark of the Extension Service.

In Ohio, citizen involvement is encouraged by the recommended formation of county Extension Advisory Committees. These committees are designed to assist county Extension agents and administration in planning, conducting, and evaluating Extension educational programs and in publicizing their effectiveness.

The Extension Advisory Committee is responsible for providing a two-way flow of information with the existing, specialized program planning committees. Representation of all Extension program areas and clientele located within the county is desirable on the Advisory Committee.
The Extension Support Committee is formed with the purpose of acquainting appropriate elected county, state, and federal officials, as well as opinion leaders, about the nature and importance of Extension educational programs. This educational effort occurs within a systematic process of contacts between Support Committee members and the elected officials.

The most fluent citizens available should be selected to serve as the official spokespersons for the Cooperative Extension Service. These committee members will make direct contacts with officials and opinion leaders regarding Extension programs and budgetary needs.

County commissioners are authorized to levy a tax and appropriate monies from that tax or the county's general fund to the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Fund according to the Ohio Revised Code, section 3335.37. The monies contributed to the Cooperative Extension Service Fund may be expended for the benefit of the citizens of the county (Ohio, 1987).
Management of Human Resources

The review of the literature within the business and management of human resources field yielded no reference to the Cooperative Extension Service and very little information regarding public, service providing organizations. The specific concepts of manpower planning and corporate downsizing were investigated.

Manpower planning, as defined by Dill, Gaver, and Weber (1986), is:

"a specification of the kinds and numbers of persons an organization will need to accomplish its objectives; a forecast from current inventories of how well it is now able to meet the projected needs; a comparison of needs with forecast supply; and the formation of plans for recruiting, assigning and developing personnel."

Downsizing was a word originated by the automobile industry to describe the size of scaled-down cars. In business, downsizing, is:

"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).

The initial effect of downsizing may feel like an irrereplaceable staff shortage. Smith suggests the following action plan to prepare for the perceived void.
Prior to the reduction, provide advance notice. Communicate information regarding the situation as soon as it becomes available. An adequate amount of information must be issued for employees to understand why the situation exists. Use a participatory problem solving process. Ask for input and potential solutions. Use creativity to accomplish the needed activities.

Emphasize teamwork by sharing the additional workload among employees and management. Temporarily redesign job descriptions to include new responsibilities. Continue to communicate throughout the conduct of the newly acquired duties. Talk with employees as a group and individually to gather feedback on how things are going. Reward your employees for their cooperation and success in accomplishing additional tasks (Smith, 1987).

The creation of strategic alliances and competitive collaboration among two or more multinational corporations seems to be increasing in frequency. This author believes a similar alliance can be created between educational delivery components of a Cooperative Extension Service. A review of key obstacles to the planning segment of organizational learning, the accumulation of invisible assets, is provided by Pucik, 1988.
These barriers to organizational learning are embedded in the organization's climate and may be a result of rational, short-term management practices that have lead to a loss of control over the ultimate outcome of the organization.

Communicate the strategic intent throughout the firm. Explaining the nature of the missing competencies which lead to the alliance is also helpful.

Remaining cognizant of the ever-changing arena of competition is difficult, but essential. Short-term decisions may appear correct when viewed in a static manner.

Those activities which cannot be assigned a financial or quantitative value are often underrated in their importance to the long-term success of the organization. The outcome can be no budget for organizational learning which results in an ill-equipped staff.

The tendency in creating a new alliance is to rush ahead without adequate time to evaluate the learning capacity of the staff. The process needed to analyze the learning skills of the staff and the existing learning climate is often overlooked.

A shift is occurring in how organizations view personnel.
Personnel, corporately viewed as expenses or overhead, can be eliminated or cut, while personnel viewed as assets are developed. This thinking has prompted a renaming of personnel functions to employee resources or ER. Ellig, 1986, suggested that the ER process in an organization evolves through four stages. A budget-driven plan is the first stage, while a plan addressing issues, external to the organization follows. The third stage focuses on internal issues coordinated from within the ER unit. The final stage provides a comprehensive ER plan including organizational issues, strategy, goals, and objectives.

**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. And they 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 has statewide responsibilities for a given discipline or subject matter specialty;

2. The district specialist is responsible for the industry or program specialty for counties within the assigned district(s);

3. The county agent, who has more general responsibilities for all facets of the Extension program within the county and is encouraged to serve as a specialist in one or more disciplines;

4. Assistant county agents, Extension associates, program assistants, program coordinators, nutrition aides, and other paraprofessional and technical staff assist the county agents (Ohio, 1987, p. 2.05.00).
Moore, (1972) found considerable variation in staffing patterns across the US; 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 the 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 organizations 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 eighteen 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, et. al., (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. The clientele were not greatly concerned about the staffing pattern being utilized, if their needs were being met. 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 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 on the facilities and services, employment skills, improve 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), report 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 as favorable. Respondents felt that the amount of time devoted to issues programming should remain at the current level. Krueger and Ahles 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 Patterns in the Cooperative Extension Service

"Recommendation 17: The presence of one or more Extension staff members should be continued at the county level. These personnel should have skills in educational facilitation, and at least one technical skill appropriate to the locality. 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).

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

The definition of clustering used in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service follows.
Clustering (Clustered Staffing Pattern) - Two or more counties with staff members from each county working together in conducting the Extension programming efforts. Each agent will have charge of 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 serves as a resource and teacher in his/her specialty area(s) for all counties within the cluster. A county chair is located in each county, with a program coordinator identified for the cluster to facilitate programming efforts, particularly Issues Programming.

A summary of the clustered staffing variations employed in the North Central states of Minnesota, South Dakota, and Nebraska is included. The length of time in which the clustered staffing pattern has been in place varies from 20 years to less than one year.

Minnesota

The Minnesota Staffing Plan is the third component of the Extension Service's long range planning process.
It was preceded by a strategic plan expressing the vision of the Minnesota Extension Service and a restructuring plan creating the clusters, realigning districts, announcing agent specialization, and addressing issue-based programming.

The staffing plan includes 20 clusters of counties, ranging in number from 2 to 4; which are arranged into seven administrative districts. The basic assumptions of the staffing plan are:

1. The plan is inclusive affecting all MES employees.

2. Diversity is sought through the plan. Staff diversity dimensions include culture, education, experience, and skill level.

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

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

5. Clientele access to MES staff and services is essential.

Operating principles of the cluster system in Minnesota are that: each county in the state will have a county chair, each clustered unit will have a program coordinator, and 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, 1987).

Nebraska

Meeting clientele needs through more specialized agent assistance, along with a budget shortfall in 1986 plunged the Nebraska Cooperative Extension Service into a reorganization plan including multi-county clusters. A cluster of 2-4 counties in each of Nebraska's five extension administrative districts was selected to participate in the pilot effort.

The district director developed an organizational plan for the pilot cluster which was based on the following criteria.

1. Show a financial savings, while considering all possible costs, including increased travel expenses.

2. Increase staff specialization.

3. Coverage of all program areas at a minimal level, at least.

4. Include emerging technology in a futuristic plan.

5. Design a plan to evaluate the new structure.

6. Prepare a staffing plan to include current and future staff of extension and research centers.
7. Consider the current staff performance and anticipated staff retirements in a staff utilization plan.

8. Project the locations of additional clusters within the district.

Focus group interviews in each of the districts were conducted to gather feedback on the cluster's operation from current or former Extension Advisory Board members. The interviews includes questions of an introductory nature; and on program delivery, operations and staffing, boards and councils, and funding.

The current staffing configuration in Nebraska includes 23 clusters or extension programming units (EPUs), 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. Six, full-time 4-H agents are employed in the Nebraska CES, with most of the 4-H work conducted by 4-H assistants with Bachelor of Science degrees (Miller and Rockwell, 1987).
South Dakota

An evaluation of the South Dakota Cooperative Extension Service conducted by the Citizen's Review Committee, which was appointed by the South Dakota Board of Regents, was completed during October 1984 - July 1985. High levels of citizen involvement were obtained in the South Dakota review through requests made via newspaper articles, radio broadcasts, educational television and public television outlets.

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 were also surveyed.

A clustered staffing plan went into effect on July 1, 1986. A total of 21 clusters of 2-4 counties each, plus three, one county units are in place.
South Dakota has paid especially close attention to the staff assignments and potential training and development needs of both county agents and specialist staff. County agents will specialize in one primary and one secondary area, while specialist staff roles will focus on training county 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 every agent and specialist, while VCR playback units, monitors and production equipment was enhanced (South Dakota, 1985).

Attitude and its Relations to Behavior

The construct, attitude, is defined by Allport as a "mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related" (Fishbein, 1967, p. 8). The construct is organized into a continuum with five levels, receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization by a value complex (Krathwohl, 1964, p. 35).
Receiving is the attitudinal level where the learner is "sensitized to the existence of certain phenomena or stimuli; that is to be willing to receive or to attend to them" (Krathwohl, 1964, p. 98). An example of the receiving level may be that the participant is aware that a variety of staffing patterns exist for the Cooperative Extension Service.

The responding level finds the learner "committed to a subject so that he will seek it out and gain satisfaction from working with it or engaging in it" (Krathwohl, 1964, p. 119). At this attitude level, the participant may seek out additional information regarding staffing patterns. That may include attending an information session or seeking out a printed description of the staffing patterns to review.

Valuing, the third level of attitude development, "represents a social product that has been slowly internalized or accepted ... and the learner displays this behavior with sufficient consistency in appropriate situations that he comes to be perceived as holding a value (Krathwohl, 1964, p. 139). At this point in attitude formation, the participant seeks to be identified with the value."
The committee member may request the formation of a study group to recommend action regarding a staffing pattern, may persuade other committee members to consider a different staffing pattern, or may make the motion to adopt a given staffing pattern.

Fishbein (1967) has suggested that "behavior toward a given object is a function of many variables, of which attitude toward the object is only one" (p. 491). Other factors in the intention equation include: distribution of reinforcement, the affective value of reinforcement, the participant's behavioral expectation, motivation to comply, and the strength of these factors. This complex view of attitude permits it to be considered as a part of the determination of a participant's behavior.

Ajzen and Fishbein agree that although "from a theoretical point of view, intentions determine behaviors, ... a number of factors will influence the strength of the observed relationship between intention and behavior" (1980, p.42). The authors suggest that the elements of action, target, context and time can predict behavior from intention if these elements remain consistent in both situations.
A second notion to consider in the discussion is that "intention will predict behavior only if the intention does not change before the behavior is observed (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980, p. 52). The stability of the intention must be considered when collecting the intentions of the participant. Those intentions of a fragile or changing nature must be measured immediately prior to the observation of behavior.

The Ajzen and Fishbein theory suggests that aggregate intentions are "apt to be much more stable over time than individual intentions" (1980, p. 48). The use of aggregate information rules out the influence of idiosyncratic events affecting one individual's intentions.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Research Design

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature and was designed to gather data concerning the attitude of county Extension advisory committee members toward clustering, based on their responses to Likert-type scale questionnaire items. The target population to which results were to be generalized were all county Extension advisory committee members in the state of Ohio.

Subject Selection

To obtain the most accurate results possible a clustered, random sample 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 survey. A listing of the names and addresses of the county Extension advisory committee members was obtained from respective county Extension chairs of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
The sample size was determined by estimating the average number of members on a county Extension advisory committee. Based upon the rosters submitted by county extension chairs in over one-half of the counties in Ohio, the average size of a county Extension advisory committee was determined to be 18 members. Using that assumption, the total membership of 88 county Extension advisory committees during January 1990 was estimated to be 1584. Krejcie and Morgan suggested that the sample size needed to be representative of a given population of 1584 would be 310 (1970).

The number of intact county Extension advisory committees needed to reach an adequate sample of 310 members was determined by dividing the sample by 18, the average size of committees with a resulting sample of 17.22 intact county Extension advisory committees needed. The sample was clustered according to administrative districts of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

To acquire a clustered, random sample based upon the Extension administrative districts in Ohio, only 3 intact committees per district would have been needed. This number was increased to five committees in the three larger Extension districts, Northeast, Northwest, and Southwest.
The sample size in the two smaller Extension districts was increased to four committees. A total of 23 counties (26 percent) were included in the clustered, random sample of the county Extension advisory committees were surveyed. The randomly drawn survey counties included: East district - Belmont, Coshocton, Harrison, and Knox; Northeast district - Ashland, Columbiana, Geauga, Stark, and Wayne; Northwest district - Defiance, Hancock, Henry, Marion, and Paulding; South district - Adams, Athens, Clinton, and Gallia; and Southwest district - Champaign, Clark, Clermont, Darke, and Shelby. The total number of subjects utilized in the study was 530. 

Instrumentation

A mail questionnaire (Appendix B,) was adapted from a King survey (1990) to collect data regarding the following:

1. the attitude of county Extension advisory committee members regarding the concept of clustering.

2. a comparison of the success Extension has experienced with various program components when utilizing agent specialization and multi-county staffing; and the perceived potential success if clustered staffing was utilized.
3. a comparison of the importance of various program components to Extension in Ohio when utilizing agent specialization and multi-county staffing; and the perceived potential success if clustered staffing was utilized.

4. responses to open ended questions related to major concerns respondents might have if the clustered staffing pattern was implemented in Ohio.

5. demographic information on each respondent concerning the highest academic degree earned, major area of study, program area in which greatest portion of time is devoted, gender, perceived knowledge of clustering, total length of service as an Extension service volunteer, and the volunteer roles held with the CES.

In Section I, respondents were instructed to first review the "Definition and Description of Clustering" along with the definitions of Agent Specialization and Multi-County Agent Staffing Patterns (Appendix A) which were located on pages one and two of the questionnaire. The respondents were then asked to circle the number which most closely corresponds with the attitude they have related to the clustering of county Extension personnel in Ohio.
Respondents were asked to base their answers on their knowledge and perceptions regarding the concept of clustering. Items 1-5 were designed to measure the respondent's ability to receive information regarding the clustered staffing pattern. The next four items, 6-9, were developed to measure the respondent's attitude toward clustered staffing at the responding level. The final four items, 10-13, were created to indicate the respondent's attitude toward clustered staffing at the valuing level.

Section II of the instrument 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. Respondents were asked to circle the number following each statement which corresponded to the response that best described what they believe in terms of: A) the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing agent specialization as an autonomous staffing pattern; B) the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing multi-county agent staffing including the agent specialization concept; and C) the level of potential OCES success in the area in question utilizing clustered staffing with agent specialization.
The following scale was used 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. The six-point Likert-type scale shown in Figure 1 was assumed to be interval in nature.

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

---

Figure 1
Six-Point Likert-Type Scale

For Section III, the same Likert-type scale provided in Figure 1 was used to describe what respondents believed in terms of: A) the importance of the item in question to Extension programming when agent specialization is utilized as an autonomous method of staffing; B) the importance of the item in question to Extension programming 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 Extension when utilizing the clustered staffing method and including agent specialization.
Section III of the instrument contained 16 items which pertained to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be important in conducting programs under the agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns. As in Section II, respondents were asked to circle the number following each statement which corresponded to the response that best described what they believe in terms of the importance of each component when utilized under the three methods of staffing. Respondents were asked to provide written responses to three open-ended items in Section IV. In Item 1 respondents were asked to list the one most important concern they would have if the clustered staffing pattern concept was implemented in Ohio. For Item 2 respondents 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. Item 3 asked respondents to identify the benefits, if any, which may be outcomes of the clustered staffing pattern.

Section V of the instrument was used to obtain data on the selected demographic characteristics of each respondent.
Highest Academic Degree Obtained was measured as either: A) Did not complete high school; B) High school diploma or equivalent; C) Bachelor's Degree; D) Master's Degree; E) Educational Specialist; F) Doctoral Degree; and G) Other. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be interval.

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); G) Other; or H) did not attend college. 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.

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.

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

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 Length of Service was measured as the total number of years the individual had contributed volunteer service to Extension, including their service in other states.
Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years as of January 1, 1990. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be ratio.

The Volunteer Roles held was measured as the total number of volunteer roles held with the CES. The level of measurement for this characteristic was assumed to be nominal.

The final format of the questionnaire was constructed according to Dillman (1978).

Validity Concerns

External validity, a major concern in the results 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 county Extension advisory committee members in the sample was obtained.
Sampling error results from the utilization of inappropriate sampling procedures when selecting a sample. The sampling error associated with a clustered, random sample was controlled by increasing the size of the sample for each of the five Extension districts from three to five committees for the three larger districts and from three to four committees for the two remaining smaller districts.

Selection error occurs when some members of the population have a greater chance of being selected into the sample than other members of the population. Twenty-three intact county Extension advisory committees were used in the sample.

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 January 20, 1990 was utilized to divide respondents into two groups.
Differences between early and late respondents on the dependent variables selected for the study were examined through use of t-tests. Research has shown that late respondents are most similar to non-respondents (Clausen and Ford, 1947). Therefore, if late respondents do not differ significantly from early respondents it is logical to conclude that non-respondents are not significantly different from respondents.

No statistical significance was indicated between early and late respondents except on the receiving mean score in Section I. This does not permit the results of this survey to be generalized to the entire population of county Extension advisory committee members serving during January 1990.

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.

The questionnaire, with appropriate revisions, was distributed in draft form among the volunteer members of the State Extension Advisory Committee of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. All volunteer members of the State Extension Advisory Committee, a total of 24 individuals received questionnaires. Seven (7) questionnaires were returned and usable.

Even though the number of returned questionnaires is small. The Cronbach's alpha was decidedly higher than the acceptable minimum to permit confidence in the findings.

Cronbach's alpha, a measure of the internal consistency of the results generated by the instrument, was calculated from the data collected in the pilot test. This measure of reliability was calculated using the SPSS-X computer program available through The Ohio State University Instruction and Research Computer Center.
Cronbach's alpha was 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 in Section II of the instrument. The measure was 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 instrument.

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: "What satisfactory level of reliability is, depends on how a measure is being used. In the early stages of research on predictor tests or hypothesized measures of a construct, one saves time and energy by working with instruments that have only modest reliability, for which purposes values of .50 or .60 will suffice."(p. 89) A summary of the reliability analysis from the pilot test is found in Table 1.
Table 1
Summary of Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) in Pilot Test for Sections II and III of the Questionnaire

<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</td>
<td>Cronbach's alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23 items)</td>
<td>(16 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Specialization</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-County Agent</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered Staffing</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected according to the mail questionnaire procedures of Dillman (1978). Questionnaires were mailed on January 11, 1990 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 E). A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed in each packet for respondents. Subjects were encouraged to return the questionnaire by the initial deadline of January 20, 1990.

An identification number was assigned to each subject and placed on the cover page of the questionnaire. These identification numbers were utilized to aid in the follow-up with non-respondents.
A second complete packet, including the questionnaire, a second cover letter, and self-addressed stamped envelope was mailed on March 26, 1990. A final deadline date of April 8, 1990, was set for accepting completed questionnaires for data analysis. By the final deadline date, a total of 335 questionnaires were received for a response rate of 63 percent.

A decision was made a priori that an instrument must have at least 80 percent of Sections 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, 16 did not meet these criteria. The resulting data sample was comprised of responses from 319 county Extension advisory committee members, for an acceptance response rate of 60 percent.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed with the SPSS-X computer program available at The Ohio State University Instruction and Research Computer Center. Descriptive statistics were used first to summarize and organize the data.
Measures of association were utilized to determine the linear relationship between each of the three staffing methods across the levels of the antecedent characteristics. The conventions used for describing the measures of association are provided in Figure 2.

<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 2
Conventions Used to Describe Measures of Association

Multiple Regression (MR) was used to determine the proportion of the variance in the perceived levels of success of various Extension program components across the agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns associated with the variance in each of the antecedent demographic characteristics.
MR was also used to determine the proportion of the variance in the perceived levels of importance of various Extension program components across the agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns associated with the variance in each of the antecedent demographic characteristics. The alpha level of .05 was established a priori to use when making inferences to the population.
Chapter IV
Data Analysis and Interpretation

Major Findings

Nine antecedent characteristics were utilized in the study to describe the county Extension advisory committee members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. A total of 335 subjects were included in the data sample.

Table 2
Summary Data: Frequency of Respondents by Highest Academic Degree (n=306)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or GED</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Specialist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high school diploma was the highest academic degree held by 40.5 percent (124) of the county Extension advisory committee members, followed by bachelor's degree with 34 percent (104). Master's degree was reported as the highest degree obtained by 10.8 percent (33), followed by doctoral degree with 8.8 percent (27).

Table 3
Summary Data: Frequency of Respondents by Major (n=292)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin/mgmt</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No College</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major area of study most frequently identified by the county Extension advisory committee members was agriculture and other.
Over 47 percent of the sample reported agriculture (69) or other (69) as the major area of study in their highest academic degree obtained. Education was the major area of study for 20.9 percent (61) of the subjects, while social science was the major area of study for 13 percent (38).

Table 4
Summary Data: Frequency of Respondents by Program Support Area (n=309)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Support Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 39.5 percent (122) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported their program support area as agriculture. 4-H was reported as the support area of 35 percent (108) of the subjects, while home economics was the support area of 15.5 percent (48).
Table 5
Summary Data: Frequency of Respondents by Gender (n=311)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distribution for gender of the county Extension advisory committee members was also included as an antecedent characteristic of the study. Over 57 percent (178) of the subjects were male, while 42.8 percent (133) were female.

Table 6
Summary Data: Frequency of Respondents by Level of Knowledge (n=306)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the county Extension advisory committee members reported their perceived knowledge of the clustered staffing pattern to be moderate, high, or very high. Over 51.3 percent (157) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported their perceived knowledge of the clustered staffing pattern to be moderate, while 18.6 percent (57) perceived their knowledge to be high. A low perception of knowledge regarding the clustered staffing pattern was reported by 15.4 percent (47) of the county Extension advisory committee members.

Table 7
Summary Data: Frequency of Respondents by Length of Service (n=320)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five or less</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 32.8 percent (105) of county Extension advisory committee members reported their length of service as less than five years, over 18.7 percent (60) reported their service to be six to ten years; and approximately 14.3 percent (46) had served 16 to 20 years. About 12.5 percent (40) of the county Extension advisory committee members had served 11 to 15 years. Of note, 8.7 percent (28) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported serving 31 or more years in a volunteer role with the Ohio Cooperative Extension service.

Table 8
Summary Data: Frequency of Respondents by Number of Volunteer Roles Held (n=310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Roles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly 60 percent (191) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported county advisory committee membership as the only volunteer role held with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. County Extension advisory committee members reporting service in one additional volunteer role, beyond county Extension advisory committee, was 30.8 percent (99).

Table 9  
**Summary Data: Perceived Success across Staffing Patterns (n=281)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Pattern</th>
<th>Grand Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Specialization</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-county Agent</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered Staffing</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on a six-point, Likert-type scale of 0 to 5.

County Extension advisory committee members 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 agents, or clustered staffing patterns. Perceived success when utilizing agent specialization staffing had the highest mean score (mean = 3.58).
Agent specialization success was followed by clustered staffing success with a mean score of 3.49. Multi-county staffing had the lowest success mean score at 3.45. These means were based on a six-point, Likert-type scale with a zero to five range.

Table 10
Summary Data: Perceived Importance of Methods of Support for Extension Programming across Staffing Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Pattern</th>
<th>Grand Mean*</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Specialization</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-county Agent</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered Staffing</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on a six-point, Likert-type scale of 0 to 5.

Data was also gathered from the county Extension advisory committee members on their perceptions of the importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agents, or clustered staffing patterns. The highest mean score (mean = 4.10) was received for the clustered staffing patterns.
The agent specialization mean was 4.06 while the multi-county agent mean was 4.03. These means were based on a six-point, Likert-type 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 county Extension advisory committee members toward clustered staffing. Mean scores for the dependent variables were calculated across the demographic characteristics of the 315 county Extension advisory committee members in the data sample. Scores were based on a six-point, Likert-type scale with one being the minimum score and six as the maximum.

Mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were examined across the antecedent characteristic highest academic degree obtained. The county Extension advisory committee members who reported a highest academic degree obtained of 'other' held the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.72), while those without a high school diploma had a mean score of 4.66. Those committee members with a master's degree had a mean score on the receiving variable of 4.61, while those members with an educational specialist degree had a mean score of 4.60.
County Extension advisory committee members without a high school diploma obtained the highest mean scores of 5.00 and 4.25 for responding and valuing respectively. Those committee members with an education specialist certificates had a mean responding score of 4.6, and those committee members holding a bachelor's degree had a mean responding score at 4.32. The county Extension advisory committee members in the Ph.D. category of highest academic degree obtained had no mean scores which were equal to or greater than the overall grand means.

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 natural resources had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.85); responding and valuing mean scores for those in natural resources are 4.14 and 3.21 respectively. Those earning their highest degree in agriculture had the highest mean score for the responding and valuing variable (mean = 4.34 and 4.10, respectively), while the receiving mean for those in agriculture was 4.63.
Table 11
Summary Data: Cross tabulations of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Mean Scores with Highest Academic Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Receiving Mean n=295</th>
<th>Responding Mean n=297</th>
<th>Valuing Mean n=296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or GED</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Specialist</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean X</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on six-point, Likert-type scale of 1 to 6.

Those county Extension advisory committee members with no college experience consistently held the third highest mean score for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables (mean score = 4.64, 4.23, and 3.78 respectively).
Table 12
Summary Data: Cross tabulations of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Mean Scores with Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Receiving Mean n=281</th>
<th>Responding Mean n=284</th>
<th>Valuing Mean n=282</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin/mgt</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home economics</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat resources</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc sciences</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No College</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean X</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on six-point, Likert-type scale of 1 to 6.

The mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were examined across the antecedent characteristic primary program support area. Those with the primary program support area of 4-H; other; and community and natural resource development and other, had the highest mean scores for receiving, responding, and valuing respectively (mean scores = 4.76, 4.52, and 4.10).
The second highest receiving mean scores for the receiving variable were those earned by committee members in the primary program support areas of CNRD or other (mean score = 4.60). The second highest responding mean scores for this characteristic were those earned by committee members in the primary program support areas of CNRD or 4-H (mean score = 4.30). The third highest valuing mean score was that earned by committee members in the primary program support areas of 4-H (mean score = 3.98). The committee members in the primary program support area of home economics had the fourth highest mean scores (responding = 4.17 and valuing = 3.70), while the receiving mean score was 4.36 and below the receiving grand mean. The agriculture primary program support area committee members had the fifth highest responding mean (mean = 4.15) and the two means falling below the grand mean for the variable with the receiving mean at 4.43 and a valuing mean of 3.54.
Table 13
Summary Data: Cross tabulations of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Mean Scores with Program Support Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Receiving Mean n=298</th>
<th>Responding Mean n=300</th>
<th>Valuing Mean n=299</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRD</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean X</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on six-point, Likert-type scale of 1 to 6.

Receiving, responding, and valuing mean scores were examined across the antecedent characteristic gender. Female county Extension advisory committee members had the highest mean scores for receiving, responding, and valuing (mean = 4.64, 4.26, and 3.16 respectively). Male county Extension advisory committee members had responding and valuing mean scores of 4.21 and 3.68, while the receiving mean score for male committee members was below the grand mean.
Table 14
Summary Data: Cross tabulations of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Mean Scores with Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Receiving Mean n=300</th>
<th>Responding Mean n=302</th>
<th>Valuing Mean n=301</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean ( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on six-point, Likert-type scale of 1 to 6.

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 high, very high, or moderate had higher mean scores, respectively, than those who perceived their knowledge level to be low, very low, or none. Those committee members with high knowledge levels had receiving, responding, and valuing mean scores of 4.80, 4.40 and 3.92 respectively. All committee members with low, very low, or no knowledge of clustering had mean scores below the receiving and responding grand means. The valuing mean for those committee members with no knowledge of clustering was also below the grand mean.
### Table 15
Summary Data: Cross tabulations of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Mean Scores with Perceived Level of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Receiving Mean</th>
<th>Responding Mean</th>
<th>Valuing Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=295</td>
<td>n=298</td>
<td>n=296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean (\bar{x})</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on six-point, Likert-type scale of 1 to 6.

The receiving, responding, valuing mean scores were observed across the antecedent characteristic length of volunteer service with CES. The highest receiving and responding mean scores were held by the county Extension advisory committee members with 21-25 years of service (mean scores = 5.09 and 4.66 respectively). The highest valuing mean score is 4.35 for those county Extension advisory committee members with 31 or more years of volunteer service.
The second highest receiving and valuing mean scores are 4.93 and 4.29 for those county Extension advisory committee members with 26 to 30 years of volunteer service, while the second highest responding mean score was held by those county Extension advisory committee members with 31 or more years of volunteer service (mean score = 4.61). The third highest mean scores were receiving at 4.86 by volunteers with six to ten year of service; responding at 4.50 held by volunteers with 26-30 years of service; and valuing at 4.07 for those volunteers with five or less years of service.

Mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were examined across the antecedent characteristic the number of volunteer roles held within CES. Volunteers who hold two roles in addition to serving as a county Extension advisory committee member had the highest mean score for receiving (mean = 5.05) followed by volunteers with three additional roles with a mean receiving score of 4.88. Volunteers serving as a county Extension advisory committee member had a mean score of 4.92, and volunteers with one additional role at 4.81.
### Table 16
Summary Data: Cross tabulations of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Mean Scores with Length of Volunteer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Receiving Mean n=316</th>
<th>Responding Mean n=320</th>
<th>Valuing Mean n=315</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean $\bar{x}$</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on six-point, Likert-type scale of 1 to 6.

Volunteers serving as county Extension advisory committee members only had the highest mean scores of 4.47 and 3.95 for responding and valuing respectively. Responding mean scores were held by volunteers with two additional roles at 4.36 and volunteers with three additional roles at 4.22.
The volunteers with one role in addition to serving county Extension advisory committee members did not have a mean score above the responding grand mean, while the volunteers with three additional roles have a mean below the valuing grand mean.

Table 17
Summary Data: Cross tabulations of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing Mean Scores with Number of Volunteer Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Roles</th>
<th>Receiving Mean n=295</th>
<th>Responding Mean n=297</th>
<th>Valuing Mean n=296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean $\bar{x}$</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on six-point, Likert-type scale of 1 to 6.

The purpose of Objective 3 was to determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the county Extension advisory committee members toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance characteristics for each of the staffing pattern options.
As previously indicated, multiple regression analysis procedures were used to explain the variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the antecedent characteristics.

Table 18
Summary Data: Regression of Receiving Mean Score on Selected Variables (n=308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec X1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-cty X2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered X3</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec X4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-cty X5</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered X6</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Y</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intercorrelations of the antecedent characteristics ranged from a low of .48 between clustering success mean score and clustering importance mean score to a high of .88 for multi-county agent success mean score and clustering success mean score.

Table 19  
Summary Data: Regression of Responding Mean Score on Selected Variables (n=310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Means</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec X1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-cty X2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered X3</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance Means</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec X4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-cty X5</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered X6</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding Y</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional strong associations (Davis, 1971) include .86 for agent specialization success mean score and multi-county agent success mean score; .85 with agent specialization success mean score and clustering success mean score; .79 for multi-county agent importance mean score and clustering importance mean score; and .72 with agent specialization importance mean score and multi-county agent importance mean score.

Table 20
Summary Data: Regression of Valuing Mean Score on Selected Variables (n=309)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercorrelations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$ $X_2$ $X_3$ $X_4$ $X_5$ $X_6$ $Y$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Intercorrelations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Means</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec $X_1$</td>
<td>1.00 .86 .85 .45 .56 .52 .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-cty $X_2$</td>
<td>.86 1.00 .88 .39 .46 .45 .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered $X_3$</td>
<td>.85 .88 1.00 .48 .53 .49 .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance Means</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec $X_4$</td>
<td>.45 .39 .48 1.00 .72 .64 .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-county $X_5$</td>
<td>.56 .46 .53 .72 1.00 .79 .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered $X_6$</td>
<td>.52 .45 .49 .64 .79 1.00 .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing mean $Y$</td>
<td>.54 .45 .42 .19 .20 .23 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those substantial correlations (Davis, 1971) are .64 agent specialization importance mean score and clustering importance mean score; .57 for agent specialization success mean score and multi-county agent importance mean score; .53 with clustering success mean score and multi-county agent importance mean score; and .52 for agent specialization success mean score and clustering importance mean score. 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 (1971).

Regression analysis determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 24 percent of the variance in the receiving score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was agent specialization success which explained 17 percent of the variance. Since this was the first antecedent characteristic in the model, no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. The next antecedent characteristic entered into the model was multi-county agent importance mean score which explained an additional 5 percent of the variance.
The remaining four antecedent characteristics accounted for the remaining two percent of the variance not attributed to either agent specialization success or multi-county agent importance.

Table 21
Regression of Receiving Mean Score on Selected Variables (n=308) (Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² chg</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec Success mean</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-county Importance mean</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

standard error = .78
Adjusted $R^2 = .42$
For model: $F = 32.91; p<.001$

Regression analysis determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 25 percent of the variance in the responding score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was agent specialization success which explained 21 percent of the variance.
Since this was the first antecedent characteristic in the model, no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. The next antecedent characteristic entered into the model was multi-county agent importance mean score which explained an additional 3 percent of the variance. The remaining four antecedent characteristics accounted for the remaining one percent of the variance not attributed to either agent specialization success or multi-county agent importance.

Table 22
Regression of Responding Mean Score on Selected Variables (n=310) (Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{chg}$</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec Success Mean</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-county Importance mean</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>&lt;.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

standard error = .79
Adjusted $R^2 = .23$
For model: $F = 35.61; p<.001$
Regression analysis determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 31 percent of the variance in the valuing score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was agent specialization success which explained 29 percent of the variance. Since this was the first antecedent characteristic in the model, no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. The remaining five antecedent characteristics accounted for the remaining two percent of the variance not attributed to either agent specialization success or multi-county agent importance.

Table 23
Regression of Valuing Mean Score on Selected Variables (n=308) (Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{chg}$</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Spec Success mean</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

standard error = 1.02
Adjusted $R^2 = .28$
For model: $F = 90.92; p < .001$
The purpose of Objective 4 was to describe the major concerns of the population of county Extension advisory committee members toward the implementation of the clustered staffing pattern in Ohio.

Table 24
Summary Data: Categories of Concerns Regarding the Clustered Staffing Pattern (n=282)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to agent</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent burnout</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced personal contact with agent</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of service within cluster</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding concerns</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely response to requests</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit formation issues</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower quality of service</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential treatment to home county</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce quality of 4-H program</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous comments</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower performing agents in office</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate clerical/PA staff of requests</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not favor clustered staffing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced local citizen input</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase quality of program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office with county chair per county</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILL require extensive PR and education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerns expressed by the 282 committee members indicating written comments fell into eight major categories of (Appendix F): Access to time and services of personnel; Agent burnout; Lower personal contact with personnel; Equity within Clusters; Funding; Timely response to requests for assistance; Lower quality of services, and Lower quality of 4-H program.

The purpose of Objective 5 was to describe the perceived effect of clustered staffing on the relationship between OCES and county funding sources (Appendix G).

Table 25
Summary Data: Potential Effects of Clustered Staffing on Local Funding Sources (n=271)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative effect</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither positive or negative</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the 271 county extension advisory committee members writing comments felt that a negative effect on funding would result with the clustered staffing pattern (n=137). No difference in the funding would be seen with clustered staffing by 63 of the committee members. Questions were raised by 55 committee members without indicating a positive or negative effect from clustered staffing on funding from local sources.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of Procedures

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature and was designed to gather data concerning the attitude of county Extension advisory committee members toward the clustered staffing pattern. The study was also designed to identify the association of the participants perceptions toward the three staffing patterns, agent specialization, multi-county staffing and clustered staffing, and their attitude toward clustered staffing. Concerns of the participants regarding the implementation of clustered staffing were also described.

The dependent variables used in the study were the three attitude measures of Receiving, Responding, and Valuing held by the county Extension advisory committee members 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 programs when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns; b) the perceived importance of various techniques of support for the Extension programs when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agent, and clustered staffing patterns; c) highest academic degree obtained; d) major area of study in highest academic degree; e) primary program support area; f) length of service; g) Extension volunteer roles held; h) gender; and i) level of knowledge of the clustered staffing pattern.

**Subject Selection**

The population to which results were to be generalized was the county Extension advisory committees located within each county of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. To obtain the most accurate results possible a clustered, a clustered, random sample was utilized in gathering the information from the target population. A listing of the names and addresses of the county Extension advisory committee members was obtained from respective county Extension chairs of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
A clustered, random sample of 26 percent of the county Extension advisory committees, including representative from each of the five OCES administrative districts, were surveyed. The total number of subjects utilized in the study was 530.

Instrumentation

A mail questionnaire (Appendix B) was developed to collect data from the sample. In Section I, respondents were instructed to first review the "Definition and Description of Clustering" along with the definitions of Agent Specialization and Multi-County Agent Staffing Patterns (Appendix A) which were located on pages two and three of the questionnaire. The respondents were then asked to circle the number, of a six-point, Likert-type scale, which most closely corresponds with the attitude they have related to the clustering of county Extension personnel in Ohio. Respondents were asked to base their answers on their knowledge and perceptions regarding the concept of clustering. The items in 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.
Section II of the instrument 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. Respondents were asked to circle the number following each statement which corresponded to the response that best described what they believe in terms of: the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing agent specialization as an autonomous staffing pattern; the level of OCES success in the area in question utilizing multi-county agent staffing including the agent specialization concept; and the level of potential OCES success in the area in question utilizing clustered staffing with agent specialization.

The six-point, Likert-type scale that was used in Section II was also used 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; the importance of the item in question to Extension programming when multi-county agent staffing is utilized and agent specialization is included in the staffing process;
and the importance of the item in question to Extension when utilizing the clustered staffing method and including agent specialization. Section III of the instrument contained 16 items which pertained to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be important in conducting programs.

Respondents were asked to provide written responses to three open-ended items in Section IV. In Item 1 respondents were asked to list the one most important concern they would have if the clustered staffing pattern concept was implemented in Ohio. For Item 2 respondents 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. Item 3 asked respondents to identify the benefits, if any, which may be outcomes of the clustered staffing pattern.

Section V of the instrument was used to obtain data on the selected demographic characteristics of each respondent.

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. The questionnaire, with appropriate revisions, was distributed in draft form among the volunteer members of the State Extension Advisory Committee of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. All volunteer members of the State Extension Advisory Committee, a total of 24 individuals received questionnaires.

Cronbach's alpha was calculated using the data collected in the pilot test for Sections I, II, and III of the instrument. Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .88, .75, and .91 were obtained from the results of the pilot test for the three sub-scales in Section I of receiving, responding, and valuing respectively.

In Section II, the 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 results were .94, .81, and .94 respectively for the three staffing patterns.
In Section III, the calculation of Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for the three scales which measured the levels of importance of the various program components for agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing patterns. The coefficients for Section III were .74, .79, and .68 for the respective, agent specialization, multi-county agent staffing, and clustered staffing patterns.

Data Collection Procedures

The 530 sample subjects were encouraged to return their questionnaire by the initial deadline of January 20, 1990. A second complete packet, including the questionnaire, a second cover letter, and self-addressed stamped envelope was mailed on March 26, 1990. A final deadline date of April 8, 1990, was set for accepting completed questionnaires for data analysis. By the final deadline date, a total of 335 questionnaires were received for a response rate of 63 percent.

A decision was made a priori that an instrument must have at least 80 percent of Sections 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, 16 did not meet these criteria. The resulting data sample was comprised of responses from 319 county Extension advisory committee members, for a final response rate of 60 percent.

The initial deadline of January 20, 1990 was used to divide respondents into two (early and late) groups. Difference 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 except on the receiving variable 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 each of the three staffing methods across the levels of the antecedent characteristics.
Multiple Regression (MR) was used to determine the proportion of the variance in the perceived levels of success of various Extension program components across the agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns associated with the variance in each of the antecedent characteristics. MR was also used to determine the proportion of the variance in the perceived levels of importance of various Extension program components across the agent specialization, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns associated with the variance in each of the antecedent characteristics.

Major Findings

Nine antecedent characteristics were utilized in the study to describe the county Extension advisory committee members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. A total of 335 subjects were included in the data sample.

Highest academic degree. The high school diploma was the highest academic degree held by 40.5 percent (124) of the county Extension advisory committee members, followed by bachelor's degree with 34.0 percent (104). Master's degree was reported as the highest degree obtained by 10.8 percent (33), followed by doctoral degree with 8.8 percent (27).
**Major area of study.** The major area of study most frequently identified by the county Extension advisory committee members was agriculture and other. Over 47.0 percent of the sample reported agriculture (69) or other (69) as the major area of study in their highest academic degree obtained. Education was the major area of study for 20.9 percent (61) of the subjects, while social science was the major area of study for 13.0 percent (38).

**Program support area.** A total of 39.5 percent (122) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported their program support area as agriculture. 4-H was reported as the support area of 35.0 percent (108) of the subjects, while home economics was the support area of 15.5 percent (48).

**Gender.** The frequency distribution for gender of the county Extension advisory committee members was also included as an antecedent characteristic of the study. Over 57.0 percent (178) of the subjects were male, while 42.8 percent (133) were female.

**Perceived knowledge of clustering.** The majority of the county Extension advisory committee members reported their perceived knowledge of the clustered staffing pattern to be moderate, high, or very high.
Over 51.3 percent (157) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported their perceived knowledge of the clustered staffing pattern to be moderate, while 18.6 percent (57) perceived their knowledge to be high. A low perception of knowledge regarding the clustered staffing pattern was reported by 15.4 percent (47) of the county Extension advisory committee members.

**Length of volunteer service.** A total of 32.8 percent (105) of county Extension advisory committee members reported their length of service as less than five years, over 18.7 percent (60) reported their service to be six to ten years; and approximately 14.3 percent (46) had served 16 to 20 years. About 12.5 percent (40) of the county Extension advisory committee members had served 11 to 15 years. Of note, 8.7 percent (28) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported serving 31 or more years in a volunteer role with the Ohio Cooperative Extension service.

**Number of volunteer roles held.** Nearly 60.0 percent (191) of the county Extension advisory committee members reported county advisory committee membership as the only volunteer role held with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.
County Extension advisory committee members reporting service in one additional volunteer role, beyond county Extension advisory committee, was 30.8 percent (99).

**Perceived success utilizing three different staffing patterns.** County Extension advisory committee members 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 agents, or clustered staffing patterns. Perceived success when utilizing agent specialization staffing had the highest mean score (mean = 3.57). Agent specialization success was followed by clustered staffing success with a mean score of 3.49. Multi-county staffing had the lowest success mean score at 3.47. These means were based on a six-point, Likert-type scale with a zero to five range.

**Importance of methods of support for Extension when using three different staffing patterns.** Data was also gathered from the county Extension advisory committee members on their perceptions of the importance of various methods of support for Extension programming when utilizing agent specialization, multi-county agents, or clustered staffing patterns.
The highest mean score (mean = 4.10) was received for the clustered staffing patterns. The agent specialization mean was 4.06 while the multi-county agent mean was 4.03. These means were based on a six-point, Likert-type 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 county Extension advisory committee members toward clustered staffing. Mean scores for the dependent variables were calculated across the demographic characteristics of the 315 county Extension advisory committee members in the data sample. Scores were based on a six-point, Likert-type scale with one being the minimum score and six as the maximum.

Highest academic degree. Mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were examined across the antecedent characteristic highest academic degree obtained. The county Extension advisory committee members who reported a highest academic degree obtained of 'other' held the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.72), while those without a high school diploma had a mean score of 4.66.
Those committee members with a master's degree had a mean score on the receiving variable of 4.61, while those members with an educational specialist degree had a mean score of 4.60. County Extension advisory committee members without a high school diploma obtained the highest mean scores of 5.00 and 4.25 for responding and valuing respectively.

Those committee members with an education specialist certificates had a mean responding score of 4.60, and those committee members holding a bachelor's degree had a mean responding score at 4.32. The county Extension advisory committee members in the Ph.D. category of highest academic degree obtained had no mean scores which were equal to or greater than the overall grand means.

Major area of study. 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 natural resources had the highest mean score for the receiving variable (mean = 4.85); responding and valuing mean scores for those in natural resources are 4.14 and 3.21 respectively.
Those earning their highest degree in agriculture had the highest mean score for the responding and valuing variable (mean = 4.34 and 4.10, respectively), while the receiving mean for those in agriculture was 4.63. Those county Extension advisory committee members with no college experience consistently held the third highest mean score for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables (mean score = 4.64, 4.23, and 3.78 respectively).

**Program support area.** The mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables are examined across the antecedent characteristic primary program support area. Those with the primary program support area of 4-H; other; and community and natural resource development and other, had the highest mean scores for receiving, responding, and valuing respectively (mean scores = 4.76, 4.52, and 4.10). The second highest receiving mean scores for the receiving variable were those earned by committee members in the primary program support areas of community and natural resource development (CNRD) or other (mean score = 4.60). The second highest responding mean scores for this characteristic were those earned by committee members in the primary program support areas of CNRD or 4-H (mean score = 4.30).
The third highest valuing mean score was that earned by committee members in the primary program support areas of 4-H (mean score = 3.98). The committee members in the primary program support area of home economics had the fourth highest mean scores (responding = 4.17 and valuing = 3.70), while the receiving mean score was 4.36 and below the receiving grand mean.

The agriculture primary program support area committee members had the fifth highest responding mean (mean = 4.15) and only two means fell below the grand mean for the variable with the receiving mean at 4.43 and a valuing mean of 3.54.

Gender. Receiving, responding, and valuing mean scores were examined across the antecedent characteristic gender. Female county Extension advisory committee members had the highest mean scores for receiving, responding, and valuing (mean = 4.64, 4.26, and 3.16 respectively). Male county Extension advisory committee members had responding and valuing mean scores of 4.21 and 3.68, while the receiving mean score for male committee members was below the grand mean.
**Perceived level of knowledge.** 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 high, very high, or moderate had higher mean scores, respectively, than those who perceived their knowledge level to be low, very low, or none. Those committee members with high knowledge levels had receiving, responding, and valuing mean scores of 4.80, 4.40 and 3.92 respectively.

All committee members with low, very low, or no knowledge of clustering had mean scores below the receiving and responding grand means. The valuing mean for those committee members with no knowledge of clustering was also below the grand mean.

**Length of volunteer service.** The receiving, responding, valuing mean scores were observed across the antecedent characteristic length of volunteer service with CES. The highest receiving and responding mean scores were held by the county Extension advisory committee members with 21-25 years of service (mean scores = 5.09 and 4.66 respectively).
The highest valuing mean score was 4.35 for those county Extension advisory committee members with 31 or more years of volunteer service. The second highest receiving and valuing mean scores were 4.93 and 4.29 for those county Extension advisory committee members with 26 to 30 years of volunteer service, while the second highest responding mean score was held by those county Extension advisory committee members with 31 or more years of volunteer service (mean score = 4.61).

The third highest mean scores were receiving at 4.86 by volunteers with six to ten year of service; responding at 4.50 held by volunteers with 26-30 years of service; and valuing at 4.07 for those volunteers with five or less years of service.

Number of volunteer roles held. Mean scores for the receiving, responding, and valuing variables were examined across the antecedent characteristic the number of volunteer roles held within CES. Volunteers who held two roles in addition to serving as a county Extension advisory committee member had the highest mean score for receiving (mean = 5.05) followed by volunteers with three additional roles with a mean receiving score of 4.88;
volunteers serving as a county Extension advisory committee member only with a mean score of 4.92, and volunteers with one additional role at 4.81. Volunteers serving as county Extension advisory committee members only had the highest mean scores of 4.47 and 3.95 for responding and valuing respectively.

Responding mean scores were held by volunteers with two additional roles at 4.36 and volunteers with three additional roles at 4.22. The volunteers with one role in addition to serving county Extension advisory committee members did not have a mean score above the responding grand mean, while the volunteers with three additional roles had a mean below the valuing grand mean.

The purpose of Objective 3 was to determine the proportion of variance in each of the three measures of attitude of the county Extension advisory committee members toward the clustered staffing pattern concept accounted for by the success and importance characteristics for each of the staffing pattern options. As previously indicated, multiple regression analysis procedures were used to explain the variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the antecedent characteristics.
Intercorrelations of the antecedent characteristics ranged from a low of .19 between valuing mean score and agent specialization importance mean score to a high of .88 for multi-county agent success mean score and clustering success mean score. Additional strong associations (Davis, 1971) include .86 for agent specialization success mean score and multi-county agent success mean score; .85 with agent specialization success mean score and clustering success mean score; .79 for multi-county agent importance mean score and clustering importance mean score; and .72 with agent specialization importance mean score and multi-county agent importance mean score.

Those substantial correlations (Davis, 1971) are .64 agent specialization importance mean score and clustering importance mean score; .57 for agent specialization success mean score and multi-county agent importance mean score; .54 for valuing mean with agent specialization success mean score; .53 with clustering success mean score and multi-county agent importance mean score; and .52 for agent specialization success mean score and clustering importance mean score.
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 (1971).

Regression analysis determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 24 percent of the variance in the receiving score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was agent specialization success which explained 17 percent of the variance. Since this was the first antecedent characteristic in the model, no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. The next antecedent characteristic entered into the model was multi-county agent importance mean score which explained an additional 5 percent of the variance.

The remaining four antecedent characteristics accounted for the remaining two percent of the variance not attributed to either agent specialization success or multi-county agent importance.

Regression analysis determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 25 percent of the variance in the responding score.
The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was agent specialization success which explained 21 percent of the variance. Since this was the first antecedent characteristic in the model, no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. The next antecedent characteristic entered into the model was multi-county agent importance mean score which explained an additional 3 percent of the variance. The remaining four antecedent characteristics accounted for the remaining one percent of the variance not attributed to either agent specialization success or multi-county agent importance.

Regression analysis determined that the linear combination of the six antecedent characteristics accounted for 31 percent of the variance in the valuing score. The first antecedent characteristic entered into the model was agent specialization success which explained 29 percent of the variance. Since this was the first antecedent characteristic in the model, no other antecedent characteristics were under consideration. The remaining five antecedent characteristics accounted for the remaining two percent of the variance not attributed to either agent specialization success or multi-county agent importance.
The purpose of Objective 4 was to describe the major concerns of the populations of county Extension advisory committee members toward the implementation of the clustered staffing pattern in Ohio. Concerns expressed by the 282 committee members providing written comments fell into eight major categories of: Access to time and services of personnel; Agent burnout; Lower personal contact with personnel; Equity within Clusters; Funding; Timely response to requests for assistance; Lower quality of services, and Lower quality of 4-H program.

The following comments describes the concern committee members feel with the potential changes. "One person can't know each county in a multi-county area on a personal level. It would be difficult for the agent to be completely equitable in the division of his time and interest level." Regarding loss of individual contact, "We would lose the effectiveness of having local OCES staff as an integral part of the local community. It would become less personal."

The purpose of Objective 5 was to describe the perceived effect of clustered staffing on the relationship between OCES and county funding sources.
The majority of the 271 county extension advisory committee members writing comments felt that a negative effect on funding would result with the clustered staffing pattern (n=137). No difference in the funding would be seen with clustered staffing by 63 of the committee members. Questions were raised by 55 committee members without indicating a positive or negative effect of clustered staffing on funding from local sources.

The following comments are representative of those written by committee members. "Loss of a county of full time agents may adversely effect funding if it's perceived by funding sources within the county as a lessening of services to that county". On a positive note, "Support will remain constant if communication is open, media informs the public, commissioners are in on evaluation and program review and success stories". A common concern was "will depend on the balance of staffing".

Implications of the Findings

Highest academic degree. The highest mean score was received by individuals with an educational level of 'other'.
Closer scrutiny of the written explanations of this item indicates that these individuals held a two-year degree from a community college or some type of trade school certificate. Similar mean scores were received by those individuals without a high school diploma. These mean scores suggest that the concepts of clustering and ability of respondents to indicate their attitudes regarding a variety of staffing patterns is not dependent upon any type of exposure to higher education. The percentage of respondents with no high school diploma combined with those holding only a high school diploma or an 'other' educational level, comprise over 50 percent of the respondents answering this item.

Major area of study. The highest mean score was received by those with a major area of study in either natural resources or agriculture. This supports the finding that the majority of those responding were involved in the program support area of agriculture. This finding supports the notion that academic preparation in administration or management was not necessary to indicate one's attitudes toward a variety of staffing patterns for the Ohio CES.
It should be noted that approximately 25% of the respondents indicated either agriculture or natural resources as their major area of study. A similar percentage of the respondents reported no college preparation and received similar mean scores.

Program Support Area. Those county Extension advisory committee members indicating 4-H as their primary support area received the highest and second highest mean scores. This group of committee members comprised about 36 percent of the total group. The program support areas of community and natural resource development and 'other' were also consistently high and included approximately 10 percent of the respondents. These support areas require an interdisciplinary view of non-formal education through the CES and may include committee members from a variety of occupations. This broad view of CES and any previous experience with a variety of staffing configurations may contribute to the high mean scores by these groups.

This group of county Extension advisory committee members reflects a substantially rural segment of Ohio. Of those eleven counties classified by Ohio CES as "urban", one county appeared in the random sample.
This group may have been fairly traditional in its expectation of CES staff. This may also explain the large number of written comments reflecting a concern with the loss of one-on-one attention paid to county residents by CES staff with the proposed staffing patterns.

**Gender.** The female respondents consistently received higher mean scores than the male committee members. However, only one mean score received by the male committee members was below the grand mean for that scale.

**Perceived Level of Knowledge.** Those committee members with a high, very high, or moderate perception of their knowledge level of staffing patterns all received scores above the grand mean. The confidence these committee members feel is reflected in their higher mean scores. This group includes more than 50 percent of the total group.

**Length of Volunteer Service.** The highest mean scores were consistently received by those committee members with more than 20 years of service. This finding would indicate that a longer association with CES and, perhaps, more familiarity with the goals and potential of CES influences the likelihood to score items higher than less experienced committee members.
This is a particularly experienced group of county Extension advisory committee members.

Over 20 percent of the total group holds more than 20 years of experience with CES. The seasoned nature of this group may make them more familiar with CES administrative demands and changes. They would have lived through a series of staffing pattern shifts since the onset of their service in the early 1970s.

**Number of Volunteer Roles Held.** The highest mean score was received by committee members holding three volunteer roles. The group of committee members holding only one role, that of Advisory committee member, was consistently the next highest mean score. This could be attributed to their continuing association with the operations of CES through Advisory committee meetings.

**Intercorrelations of Attitude Mean Scores.** The strongest association of each of the receiving, responding, and valuing mean scores is found with the perceived success of agent specialization. This may be linked to the similarities between agent specialization and the existing staffing pattern.
Agent specialization is perhaps the least disruptive to the county residents based upon their current experience.

County Extension advisory committee members seem to be fairly concerned with their own needs as opposed to the global impact potential of the Ohio CES. This viewpoint may influenced heavily by their limitation of the Ohio CES to only that which they have experienced personally in their given county.

The relationship of the success factors and importance factors to the various attitude dimensions does not shift regardless of the intensity of the attitude dimension. The agent specialization staffing pattern is consistently perceived to be most successful and is most strongly associated with each of the attitude dimensions.

A similar relationship exists with the perceived importance of Extension support educational methods for clustered staffing as it relates to each of the attitude dimensions. The perceived importance of Extension support methods for clustered staffing is the most strongly associated with each of the attitude scales followed, consistently, by perceived importance of Extension support methods for multi-county staffing and agent specialization.
A possible explanation for this relationship is the lack of experience which committee members have with this staffing pattern. The committee members associate the perceived importance of Extension support methods with this untried staffing pattern, in order to achieve the highest possible success level. The perceived importance of Extension support methods seems to less critical to the success of the remaining staffing patterns, and, thus, less strongly associated.

Hierarchical Analysis of Attitude Mean Scores and Selected Variables. The antecedent characteristic, agent specialization success, made significant contributions to explaining variance in each of the three dependent variables. As the perceived level of success of conducting various components of the Extension program under the multi-county agent staffing pattern was increased, the attitude measures of receiving and responding were also increased.

The perception held by county Extension advisory committee members is that agent specialization has the highest likelihood of success. This antecedent characteristic, consistently explains the highest proportion of variance in each of the attitude dimensions.
County Extension advisory members are most likely to support and work toward the implementation of agent specialization as a staffing pattern based upon the Fishbein theory of attitude as a potential predictor of behavior.

Recommendation for Application of Findings

The following recommendations are offered concerning implementation of the clustered staffing pattern within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service:

1. The attitude scores of the county Extension advisory committee members suggest that they would be receptive and should receive more information regarding the clustered staffing pattern concept. However, it should be noted that their preference is the agent specialization staffing pattern. An extensive information campaign involving county Extension advisory committee members should be conducted. A variety of techniques should be used including face-to-face meetings with OCES administration. The written comments called for committee study and further information to address the concerns of altering the existing staffing pattern.
2. County Extension advisory committee members should be informed of the status and progress of pilot clusters, if any, to be established within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Of special interest to the committee members, would be the status of funding from local sources and the client satisfaction level.

3. The major categories of concerns, including personnel, funding, and perceived loss of program quality, 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. The professional staff can have a great influence upon the receptive nature of county Extension advisory committee members toward any impending change. The audiences of professional staff at all levels, county Extension advisory committee members, and county commissioners must be the primary focus of information regarding the philosophical and logistical features of any staffing pattern change.

4. Committee members have requested further information regarding the formation of clusters, the equity of funding for the cluster, and the equity of staff time allocated to specific counties within the cluster.
These concerns need to be addressed in a consistent and practical manner. The underlying tone of many of the written comments was that of distrust. Equity is a major concern; no county wants to pay the price of financing OCES for another more powerful or less financially stable county. 5. Concerns expressed regarding the potential for a negative effect on local funding sources expressed by clustered staffing were often referenced by the fact that less contact by professional staff would be noticed by county commissioners. A study should be conducted directly with the county commissioners of Ohio. At this point, the strength of this feeling is conveyed by committee members not the actual commissioners who will rule on the funding decisions.

**Need for Further Study**

Prior to the implementation of clustered staffing in the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, further research and evaluation is needed. The evaluations from staff, clientele, county Extension advisory committee members and county commissioners in those locations where pilot clusters have formed should be reviewed.
The questionnaire utilized in this study (Appendix B) would benefit from the conduct of item analysis. The ordering of the items in the success of individual components of the Extension program and the perceived importance of methods to support Extension education should be studied.

Methods to study the attitude formation of committee members and other Extension supporters toward a variety of staffing patterns would be useful. The methods of conducting qualitative analysis on this information is needed.
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Appendix A

Description and Definition of Clustering
DEFINITION AND DESCRIPTION OF CLUSTERING

A definition of clustering for Ohio might be as follows:
Two or more counties with staff members from each county
working together in conducting the Extension programming
efforts. Each agent will have charge of 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 serves as a resource and teacher
in his/her specialty area(s) for all counties within the
cluster. A county chair is located in each county, with a
program coordinator identified for the cluster to facilitate
programming efforts, particularly Issues Programming.

Clustering is a vehicle to maintain or increase the
present staffing levels of county personnel in Ohio. It
also is a system to increase the level of expertise to
clientele within a limited number of Extension faculty.
Clustering is a process for increasing interdisciplinary
programming efforts 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 the areas as leadership, program planning, teaching methodology, and evaluation. Once specialty areas are selected and agreed to by Extension Administration, agents will 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 will change somewhat in order to provide more training programs to agents in their selected specialty areas and in developing teaching materials for agents to utilize in their county and cluster work.

The clustering concept is counties working together to conduct quality programs that are needed by the Extension clientele. Clustering brings a number of new opportunities for programming. Staffing, funding, and administrative issues need additional discussion as the clustering concept is implemented in Ohio.

**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, and 4-H) in each county. The Multi-county Agent is generally assisted by an Extension Associate and/or Program Assistant who coordinate activities in the county in which they are permanently located.

**DEFINITION OF CONVENTIONAL STAFFING**

The Conventional Staffing Pattern 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 only from State and District Specialists.
Appendix B

Mailed Questionnaire
ATTITUDES OF LOCAL DECISION MAKERS REGARDING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING PATTERN IN OHIO

A State-Wide Study Local Decision Makers

Winter 1990
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 response will be greatly appreciated because the purpose of this study is to determine the attitudes and perceptions of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service local decision makers toward the concept of clustered staffing. Your questionnaire will be reviewed and analyzed by Graduate Students and your 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.
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 be responsible 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 by 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 available 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 are based upon competence developed through academic course work, in-service training, 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 multicounty 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 responsibilities 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 responsibilities in their assigned counties, multi-county agents would also develop an area or areas of specialization. Agents would develop their competencies to the point where they could teach in their area(s) of expertise both within their assigned counties and in other counties where invitations were extended.
SECTIONS 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:

Clustering is a new concept.

This response indicates that the respondent Strongly Agrees with the statement.
1. I would discuss the concept of clustering with another commissioner.

2. I would discuss the clustering concept with another commissioner who has lived in a clustered county.

3. I would discuss the concept of clustering with the OCES county chair in my county.

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 request assistance from a CES county agent with cluster responsibilities.

7. I would request assistance from an agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" that is located in another county in the cluster.
8. I would request assistance from an agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" and located in another county in the cluster, only because it is endorsed by OCES Administration.

9. I would request assistance from an agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" and located in another county in the cluster, only because of their expertise.

10. I would encourage the Agents in my county to serve in a "Cluster specialist" role.

11. As a commissioner, I would continue funding the CES at the current level if agents in my county to spend 10% of their time in a "Cluster specialist" role.

12. As a commissioner, I would continue funding the CES at the current level if agents in my county to spend 25% of their time in a "Cluster specialist" role.

13. I would encourage other counties to support the adoption of "Cluster specialists".
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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</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 success in supervising work of volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF SUCCESS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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 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.
LEVELS OF SUCCESS ----

1. Level of success in providing information clientele can use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS ****

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. Level of success in conducting educational programs that meet the needs of more affluent 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

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

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
LEVELS OF SUCCESS —  'N  VL  L  S  G  VG'

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

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 success in conducting programs cooperatively with other agencies and organizations

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

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

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 success in developing issue response teams to address emerging needs of 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
17. Level of success in developing comprehensive programs which focus on issues that affect financial success in agriculture

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

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

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

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

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING

20. Level of success in developing comprehensive programs which aid in preparing youth for responsibility

AGENT SPECIALIZATION
MULTI-COUNTY AGENT STAFFING
CLUSTERED STAFFING
| No Very Little Little Some Great Very Great |
|------------------|--------|--------|------|------|--------|
| (N) (VL) (L) (S) (G) (VG) |
| 0 1 2 3 4 5 |

**LEVELS OF SUCCESS ——**

21. Level of success in developing comprehensive programs 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 CES 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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 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>LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of importance of an Extension office in every county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of importance of a county chair in every county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of importance of a program coordinator for issues programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of importance of a toll-free WATS line for incoming calls from clientele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENT SPECIALIZATION</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>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Very Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(VL)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(VG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>VL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Levels</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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Levels</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>

7. Level of importance of Extension Associates with subject matter or program specialization areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Levels</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>

8. Level of importance of program assistants as activity coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Levels</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>
### Levels of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>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 Importance:**

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

- **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

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

- **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

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
<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 IMPORTANCE**

13. Level of importance of printed Extension publications

<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 importance of computer information sharing services for 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>

15. Level of importance of video-taped educational programs

<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 importance of satellite programs

<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>
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 were 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. What benefits, if any, do you see as an outcome of the clustered staffing pattern?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
SECTION V

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

1. What is the highest academic degree you have obtained?
   A. DID NOT COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL
   B. HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA OR EQUIVALENT
   C. BACHELOR'S DEGREE
   D. MASTER'S DEGREE
   E. EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST
   F. DOCTORAL DEGREE
   G. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) ___________________________

2. 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) ___________________________
   H. DID NOT ATTEND COLLEGE
3. 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)_____________________

4. What is your gender?

A. FEMALE  
B. MALE

5. 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

6. Write the number of total years in which you have volunteered your time and support to Extension. (Include volunteer service in other states). Indicate the number of years as of January 1, 1990.

____ YEARS

7. Check [ ] all the volunteer roles that you have held with CES programs.

____ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER, COUNTY  
____ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER, DISTRICT  
____ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER, STATE  
____ EXTENSION GROUP LEADER OR OFFICER

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 JANUARY 20, 1990 TO:

Margaret Severinson Godke
Room 4, Agriculture Administration Building
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1099
Appendix C

Panel of Experts in Extension Administration
ECOP Personnel and Organizational Development
Standing Committee

Cheryl Bielema, Extension Adviser, Home Economics
University of Illinois Cooperative Extension Service
Pittsfield, Illinois

Patricia Calvert, Deputy Director
Extension Service - United States Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Ken Denmark, Staff Development Specialist
Texas Agricultural Extension Service
College Station, Texas

Nancy Cole Huber
Arizona Cooperative Extension Service
Tucson, Arizona

Ronald E. Leal, Orange County Associate Director
Cornell Cooperative Extension Service
Middletown, New York

Denver T. Loupe, Vice Chancellor and Director
Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Ann Sheelan, Assistant Director
Rutgers Cooperative Extension Service
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Christopher Smith, Kitsap County Director
Washington Cooperative Extension Service
Port Orchard, Washington
TO: Selected Panel of Experts

Cheryl Biselma, Illinois  Ronald E. Leal, New York
Patricia Culvert, USDA  Denver Loupe, Louisiana
Ken Denman, Texas  Ann Sheehan, New Jersey
Nancy Cole Huber, Arizona  Christopher Smith, Washington

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 sample will be used to study the attitudes of local decision makers, advisory committee members and county commissioners, toward the conventional, multi-county, and clustered staffing patterns with emphasis placed upon clustering. The title of the dissertation is "Attitudes of Local Decision Makers 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
Appendix D

Questionnaire Reviewed by the Panel of Experts
ATTITUDES OF LOCAL DECISION MAKERS
REGARDING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING PATTERN IN OHIO

BY: Margaret Severinson Godke

ADVISER: Keith L. Smith

The Ohio State University

Autumn, 1989
DEFINITION AND DESCRIPTION OF CLUSTERING

A definition of clustering for Ohio might be as follows:

Two or more counties with staff members from each county working together in conducting the Extension programming efforts. Each agent will have charge of 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 serves as a resource and teacher in his/her specialty area(s) for all counties within the cluster. A county chair is located in each county, with a program coordinator identified for the cluster to facilitate programming efforts, particularly Issues Programming.

Clustering is a vehicle to maintain or increase the present staffing levels of county personnel in Ohio. It also is a system to increase the level of expertise to clientele within a limited number of Extension faculty. Clustering is a process for increasing interdisciplinary programming efforts 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 the areas as leadership, program planning, teaching methodology, and evaluation.

Once specialty areas are selected and agreed to by Extension Administration, agents will 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 will change somewhat in order to provide more training programs to agents in their selected specialty areas and in developing teaching materials for agents to utilize in their county and cluster work.

The clustering concept is counties working together to conduct quality programs that are needed by the Extension clientele. Clustering brings a number of new opportunities for programming. Staffing, funding, and administrative issues need additional discussion as the clustering concept is implemented in Ohio.

DEFINITION OF MULTICOUNTY STAFFING

The Multicounty 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 Multicounty Agent is generally assisted by an Extension Associate and/or Program Assistant who coordinate activities in the county in which they are permanently located.

DEFINITION OF CONVENTIONAL STAFFING

The Conventional Staffing Pattern 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.
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 space below each item.

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.

Appropriate? Clear?

1. I would discuss the concept of clustering with a fellow committee member/Extension supporter or commissioner.
   YES NO YES NO

2. I would discuss the clustering concept with who a fellow committee member/Extension supporter or commissioner has lived in a clustered counties.
   YES NO YES NO

3. I would discuss the concept of clustering with the OCES chair in my county.
   YES NO YES NO

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. Appropriate? Clear?

6. I would request the services of a CES County Agent with cluster responsibilities. Yes No Yes No

7. I would request assistance from an Agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" as located in another county in the cluster. Yes No Yes No

8. I would encourage the Agents in my county to serve in a "Cluster specialist" role. Yes No Yes No

9. I would observe a similar level of expertise from the county agent serving as a "Cluster specialist" as was previously experienced. Yes No Yes No

10A. As a committee member/Extension supporter, I would recommend agents in my county to spend 10% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role. Yes No Yes No

10B. As a commissioner, I would recommend agents in my county to spend 10% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role. Yes No Yes No

11A. As a committee member/Extension supporter, I would recommend agents in my county to spend 25% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role. Yes No Yes No

11B. As a commissioner, I would recommend agents in my county to spend 10% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role. Yes No Yes No
12A. As a committee member/Extension supporter, I would recommend agents in my county to spend 50\% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

\[ \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \quad \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \]

12B. As a commissioner, I would recommend agents in my county to spend 10\% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

\[ \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \quad \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \]

13A. As a committee member/Extension supporter, I would recommend agents in my county to spend more than 50\% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

\[ \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \quad \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \]

13B. As a commissioner, I would recommend agents in my county to spend more than 50\% of their time working in a "Cluster specialist" role.  

\[ \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \quad \text{YES} \quad \text{NO} \]

\[ \text{SECTION II} \]

\[ \text{INSTRUCTIONS:} \] The items found in this section pertain to various components of the Extension program which may or may not be successfully conducted under the current conventional 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 multicounty 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 MULTICOUNTY AGENT STAFFING; and POTENTIAL SUCCESS OF EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

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

\[ \text{EXAMPLE:} \] Supervise work of volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONAL STAFFING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTICOUNTY AGENT STAFFING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTERED STAFFING</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></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 multicounty agent staffing; and C) the potential success of OCES would also be "great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

14. Conduct needs assessment to determine program direction YES NO YES NO

15. Provide useful information YES NO YES NO

16. Provide accurate information YES NO YES NO

17. Provide up-to-date information YES NO YES NO

18. Provide clientele with research based recommendations YES NO YES NO

19. Provide quality programs to a wide variety of clientele YES NO YES NO

20. In general, provide a high level of subject matter expertise at the county level YES NO YES NO

21. Respond to emerging needs of clientele YES NO YES NO

22. Conduct in-depth program evaluations YES NO YES NO

23. Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of affluent adults YES NO YES NO

24. Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of youth from affluent families YES NO YES NO

25. Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of lower income adults YES NO YES NO
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>26. Conduct educational programs that meet the needs of youth from lower income families</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appropriate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clear?</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27. Communicate effectively with clientele of various educational levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28. Involve advisory committees in the program planning process</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29. Conduct programs cooperatively with other agencies and organizations</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30. Maintain program flexibility to promptly address emerging needs of clientele</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31. Develop issue response teams to address emerging needs of clientele</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32. Develop comprehensive programs which focus on issues that affect financial success in agriculture</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33. Develop comprehensive programs which focus on issues related to rural revitalization</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34. Develop comprehensive educational programs which focus on issues related to family well-being</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35. Develop comprehensive educational programs which aid in preparing youth for responsibilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36. Develop comprehensive program which focus on issues related to water quality</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES NO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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, multicounty, 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 the multicounty 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 MULTICOUNTY AGENT STAFFING, and IMPORTANCE TO EXTENSION WHEN UTILIZING THE CLUSTERED STAFFING METHOD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE: Support Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONVENTIONAL STAFFING</th>
<th>0 1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTICOUNTY 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 under the conventional staffing method is "very great"; B) the importance of Support Staff under the multicounty agent staffing is "very great"; and C) the importance of Support Staff would remain "very great" if the clustered staffing method was utilized.

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?
YES NO YES NO

39. County Office in every county

Appropriate? Clear?
YES NO YES NO

40. County Chair in every county

Appropriate? Clear?
YES NO YES NO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Program Coordinator for issues Programming</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Toll-Free Wares Line</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Agents with subject matter/program specialization areas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Extension Associates with subject matter/program specialization areas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>More in-depth in-service training programs to support 'agent specialization'</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Extension Advisory Boards or Committees in every county</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Increase in travel funds</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Improved filing systems</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Improved communication between the State/District Administration and the County Staff</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Printed Extension publications</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Computer information sharing services for clientele</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV

INSTRUCTIONS: In Section IV respondents will be asked to provide a written response to each of the
following items. 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.

APPROPRIATE? CLEAR?

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. What benefits, if any, do you see as an outcome of the
   clustered staffing pattern?
   YES NO YES NO

SECTION V

INSTRUCTIONS: In section V, respondents will be asked to circle the letter which corresponds to the most
appropriate response for each of the following demographic items. 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. What is the highest academic degree you have obtained?
   (Circle One)
   A. DID NOT COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL
   B. HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA OR EQUIVALENT
   C. BACHELOR'S DEGREE
   D. MASTER'S DEGREE
   E. EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST
   F. DOCTORAL DEGREE
   G. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)__________________________ YES NO YES NO
2. What was the major area of study in your highest academic degree? (Circle One)

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. 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)___________________________

4. How many total years have you volunteered your time and support to Extension? (Include volunteer service in other states) Indicate number of years as of July 1, 1989.

______YEARS

5. Check [ ] all the volunteer roles that you have held with CES programs.

______ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER, COUNTY
______ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER, DISTRICT
______ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER, STATE
______ EXTENSION GROUP LEADER OR OFFICER

YES NO YES NO
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

Note: 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 result of the clustered staffing pattern?

- A. INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF
- B. DECREASE IN THE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF
- C. PROFESSIONAL STAFF NUMBERS STAY THE SAME

9. A program coordinator will be used in the clustered staffing pattern.

- A. YES
- B. NO

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO LIST ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU MAY HAVE ON THE BACK SIDE OF THIS PAGE

Please return the completed survey to Keith Smith before leaving the meeting on September 6, 1989.
Appendix E

Questionnaire Cover Letter
January 12, 1990

Dear Extension Advisory Committee Member,

Your support and guidance of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service efforts has been never failing. Because of that interest and concern for the OCES of the future, we are asking you to serve in another important role.

Your county's Extension Advisory Committee was randomly drawn to participate in the study, "Attitudes of Local Decision Makers Toward the Clustered Staffing Pattern in Ohio". The future of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service will be influenced by your completion of this survey.

Your county CES chair is supportive of your participation in this study. Please take no more than 20 minutes to complete the enclosed survey. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your use. Please complete the survey and return it by January 20.

The input from important decision makers, like yourself, is greatly appreciated. The comments and suggestions which you make will be invaluable to a successful study.

Thank you for your cooperation in helping to move OCES into the 1990s.

Sincerely yours,

Bobby D. Moser, Director
Cooperative Extension Service

Keith L. Smith, Associate Director
Cooperative Extension Service

BDM/KLS:msg
Appendix F

Respondent Concerns Regarding the Implementation of Clustering in Ohio
Respondent Concerns Regarding the Implementation of Clustering in Ohio (n=282)

1. That counties clustered would have similar background and need so that an agent would be serving clientele in the correct manner.

2. Access to local community.

3. Our county revolves around the OCES. Our agents are very busy. Clustering would only result in agents being able to spend less time meeting the county's demands.

4. No concerns at present time.

5. That government money be saved.

6. My concerns would be using clustering with youth programs.

7. Burnout of agent in trying to cover too much area.

8. If everyone would accept it.

9. Being able to provide the amount of time needed in each county.

10. We will limit personal touch. Programs may not always be relevant to local needs. Programming will take more planning when one person is shared.

11. Things that work in one county might not work for another county.

12. The staff may have more knowledge of alternatives but would they really have the time to teach or guide people since they would be spreading themselves thinner so to say.

13. That county traditions as far as youth programs would greatly be affected and decrease youth participation.

14. Adequate service to residents.

15. Time of extension personnel to give to individual problems.
16. That specific needs of an area would get attention instead of a gunshot approach.

17. Counties working together.

18. I'm against it.

19. Training or preparing youth for responsibilities.

20. The flexibility of the agents could be limited.

21. If a county office with secretary is maintained I don't think any very serious concern should arise and suggestions and concerns would be directed to the proper people.

22. Need an extension office in every county and a chairperson.

23. The county people would get a person with more expertise on the subject matter, hopefully.

24. I am afraid that the agents will end up not being able to serve our county as well as they could.

25. I would lose the personal touch or contact I now enjoy. It would take some time to build my trust and respect in a new system.

26. Not being able to get answers when needed.

27. Staffing could become watered down; travel too much.

28. There would be no full time agent.

29. Maintaining good relationships with the agents.

30. Not being able to contact the agent for the area of my concern. News being late or delayed.

31. Smoothness of transition.

32. Acceptance

33. None.
34. I feel that the people in the county who use Extension Service are used to going into the county office and talking to a particular agent and a new face may deter them.

35. Agent burnout.

36. Agent travel time that could be spent at county level.

37. Agents would lose the personal contact, 1 on 1, with local people. Perhaps not in reality, but the concept and thought would be there. Are you saying we are getting fewer thus the economic priority to clustering.

38. They would not be readily available.

39. Funding.

40. Local agent would spend less time in their county.

41. The agents would not have enough time to spend in the counties.

42. Receiving information quickly.

43. Getting a quick answer to a problem.

44. Unequal sharing of time.

45. Lose the personal touch with the individual people in your local county. Each county has its own individual needs and "people".

46. Loss of services in my home county; loss of expertise of my agent because of sharing.

47. Having people in the group that would be able to contribute without sacrificing their own interests.

48. Our agents would not be in the office very day. I call them almost daily. In the clustering they are not there when I need them.

49. There would be too many "ivory tower" decisions without real practical applications.

50. Spending too much time on the road.
51. We will have to let some extension agents go, so that we can bring in the specialist we need. Will the state committee have enough "guts" to do it?

52. People are going to think the extension agents it too hard to reach (or too costly) and won't take the time to contact them.

53. Loss of county identity.

54. Individual extension agents are already stretched too far. Let them serve the county they are in and prevent burn out overburdening them by administration. Loss of contact with community needs.

55. I do not feel that clustering would benefit our county. We have and some experience with it and it has not been to our benefit.

56. That all the individual who need help would be helped.

57. I'm concerned that staff numbers be high enough to adequately serve their clientele, and that travel allowances be high enough to adequately cover their area.

58. Will the people from several counties be able to work together personality wise? Will there be conflicts?

59. Adjoining counties equally sharing their knowledge and or expertise.

60. Time available for agents to focus on local issues.

61. I feel an unshared agent could serve our county better. They are busy enough already without them splitting their time with someone else.

62. The time and energy needed would not an agent be tugged from too many places.

63. The info each individual has as a specialist would not be shared equally with other counties.

64. Lack of contacts and county support.

65. Agents spread too thin.
66. Will a producer be able to get an answer timely.
67. Getting away from local input.
68. That service to clientele will suffer.
69. Enough attention to each individual county.
70. Spreading staff too thin in some areas or too far apart.
71. That there would be adequate support staff to serve the public.
72. Would not have the personal everyday contact we have at the county level.
72. Loosing contact with agent if out of county.
73. Clientele would not be able to obtain answers to questions and solutions to problems in a timely manner.
74. Extension agent would not have time to get own county's things done.
75. That agents would not be spread too thin, including geographically, in numbers of clients and time/subject matter.
76. I don't each county will get the assistance they may need.
77. That the time per county would be limited and the person would be "run" ragged.
78. Not enough personal contact with clientele.
79. My county has been fortunate in that we have always had very good agents in CES. I would be concerned if clustering would overload any personnel to the extent that the quality of their work is lessened.
80. Loss of time, energy and relationships within the cluster to clientele as it is developed within a county.
81. When we need our agent they would be gone and there would be no control as to when they would or wouldn't be available. I see a slip shod organization coming.

82. People not being able to obtain information when they need it.

83. Too much partiality to their own county. I think 3 agent staffing would be better.

84. "Belonging"/"Closeness"/"family" is lost!

85. Loss of 1 on 1 contact with the people that need to be worked with.

86. Personality conflicts among the agents that must work cooperatively.

87. Increased number of night meetings an agent may have to attend because of serving multiple counties.

88. We think the biggest problem with the cluster concept would be in reaching the specialist whether by phone or personally when you have a specific problem.

89. Each county has a need to have a 4-H, Home Ec and Ag agent in order to properly carry out each program area.

90. We would lose the effectiveness of having local OCES staff as an integral part of the local community. It would becomes less personal.

91. Time spent in planning, coordinating, and travel vs. direct delivery of services; office support services.

92. Less personal; lose funding.

93. The agents and there time being spread too thin.

94. Defining distinct duties of each agent without overlapping.

95. Funding by the county will be enough to cover needed expenditures of the clustered staff.

96. Availability of person with the knowledge and expertise to deal with day-to-day concerns.
97. Jeopardizing the current successful counties by removing full time county agents & burning out "people-experienced" agents who won't put up with increased travel demands.

98. Distance between "specialist" and need and availability on a timely basis.

99. People feeling left out.

100. Landowners may not be able to develop a personal, one to one relationship with the agent, therefore the effectiveness of the programs will be reduced.

101. Who would be hired as PA, experienced loss of 2 agents and PA can effect program.

102. One person can't "know" each county in a multi-county area on a personal level. It would be difficult for the agent to be completely equitable in the division of his time and interest level.

103. Lack of personal contacts with agents.

104. Would I be able to be in touch when I needed them.

105. That 4-H be given emphasis and leadership.

106. Don't favor multi-county agents, need agents in "home" county.

107. Less service to clientele because of increased time on the road.

108. Degree of involvement with youth and Homemakers programs.

109. Having specialized agent available to me when I need assistance.

110. Time spent traveling would be an expenditure of effort that could be utilized better serving just one county.

111. Accessibility of agents to the public in the different counties.

112. Spread too thin.
113. Communications

114. Loss of agent for county

115. May not have good and fast service

116. More agents may be clustered in larger counties. Less populated counties would not receive as much financial support.

117. Sell the public that they are not losing a service but saving money and staff with more expertise.

118. Spreading the agents in the cluster too thin. Travel time will limit service time.

119. Spread agents too thin.

120. Loss of personal relationships and assistance.

121. Criteria for organizational plan.

122. Timely service

123. Some agents would have difficulty maintaining current program with additional responsibilities.

124. Like current system.

125. Distance between expert and client is greater; will go to sales staff for closer help.

126. Staff would be spread too thin.

127. Conflict about who determines priority issues.

128. Being able to contact proper agent when needed.

129. Agent spread too thin.

130. Everyone would be served and feel "closeness".

131. Communication and one on one relations.

132. Delay getting needed help.
133. Local financial support would decline due to lessened services.

134. Length of response time to questions.

135. It would play down the specialized county areas and tend to melt together.

136. Make sure our county agent knew and could tell all advisors.

137. Availability of agents.

138. Educating the public - older people have had trouble getting used to sharing agents, now this.

139. Makes it harder to get service when wanted.

140. Loss of county control.

141. Availability of agent when needed.

142. Need to remember the great job of serving needs not get caught up in paper work and policy.

143. Individual counties get the level of service to which they are accustomed.

144. Expertise of agents and human relations skills.

145. Most county agents are already informally doing this; if mandated would an agent have time to function in his duties to clientele.

146. I need a person with great expertise in agronomy available on a day's notice.

147. Will not work in big counties; small counties maybe.

148. Not have one on one contact.

149. Politics don't get involved and that OCES personnel don't use it to climb the ladder instead of helping people.

150. Travel expenses will increase.
151. Less direct contact.
152. Increased travel funds; staff pressures.
153. Agent coverage too broad.
154. Hurt 4-H.
155. Availability to clients.
156. Personnel stretched too thin.
157. Clustering will work if agents are hard workers and dedicated.
158. Hard for agents to reach around to serve all areas.
159. Local control.
160. Make people angry with Extension.
161. Availability of agents.
162. Administrative time and costs would take time away from service.
163. Up-to-date directory so office staff will know which agent should be contacted.
164. Feelings of county residents be heard and considered regarding this proposal.
165. Unaware of each county's needs.
166. Need a chair and office in every county for budget, personnel, and advisory committee.
167. Reduce one on one help.
168. Additional expense due to more personnel.
170. Too much responsibility placed on volunteers since agents are gone.
171. Some of programs will be reduced; issues important to home county will be ignored.

172. Time and expense of travel.

173. Already clustered.

174. Agent is removed from local work excessively.

175. Time to perform functions properly.

176. Less time to devote to county clientele.

177. Coordination and equal access to agent.

178. Dislike "cutting back" on extension.

179. Timely access to agent on problem.

180. Get higher attendance to programs.

181. Agents will be spread too thin.

182. Less one on one relationships.

183. Time to adequately serve clients.

184. Lose contact with fringe areas of county.

185. Must inform public on "how to contact" agents you need.

186. Spread agent too thin.

187. Some counties and citizens will be ignored.

188. Communication between staff; availability of staff.

189. Weaken the best part about Extension, one on one relationships.

190. People will lose contact with agent.

191. Agent will not be aware of county to county differences.

192. Lack of time to meet needs of specialized communities.
193. Available to clientele.

194. Lose one on one contacts.

195. May help with more "on farm" counseling.

196. Lack of agent time to take care of his own county.

197. Access - getting the right staff within the county.

198. How quickly will clustering be accepted?

199. Lose personal contact.

200. Agent willingness to travel to other counties.

201. Lose personal contact.


203. Time out of county.

204. To get the right people in the right place.

205. Cost too high to form cluster.

206. Lack of organization and agent specifically leading the program will hurt 4-H.

207. Equal scheduling of time.

208. Loss of one on one contact.

209. Should not do this to save money only.

210. Communication costs do not become excessive; extensive travel time.

211. Spread too thin.

212. Best agents would spend too much time on road; less qualified agent would be in office.

213. Equal sharing of workload and assistance.

214. Would like a committee to review this option.
215. Equal time share; toll free phone access; faster mail service.

216. Timely response.

217. Support from public and politicians.

218. Time allocation out of county, need to meet own county's needs first.

219. Agent overload with travel and extra meetings.

220. Lose close relationship.

221. Farmers will be reluctant to use another agent.

222. Need supplies for each county in cluster not just one set of slides for 2-3 counties.

223. Access to info; phone costs; extra travel.

224. Loss of time in travel.

225. Long distances in travel.

226. Funding.

227. Agent spread too thin.

228. Agent spread too thin.

229. Agent workload increases and less time for home county.

230. Give it time to work; make agents make it work.

231. Agent time equally divided.

232. Difficult to identify individual needs.

233. Service to clientele.

234. Time for specialist to perform duties in home county.

235. Proper amount of time spent in home county.

236. Help with 4-H and for farmer.
237. Divide agent equally.
238. Availability.
239. Getting the right person for the right job.
240. Poor access to agent.
241. Cluster will be too large.
242. Adequate time spent in home county.
243. Increased travel time causes reduced service.
244. 4-H and CNRD.
245. Access to personnel.
246. Support at local level.
247. Ignoring individual needs.
248. Achieve net gain in access to OCES.
249. Poorer counties would be left out.
250. Funding.
251. Area is too large.
252. Lose personal contact with agents.
253. Distance needs to be as small as possible.
254. Access to agent.
255. Cost justified; travel; communications.
256. Will people use service.
257. Access to agent.
258. Staffing reduced, programs delivered all at lower cost.
259. Access to agent.
260. Combination of agents with expertise not poor knowledge.

261. Strong program counties will have to serve counties with weaker existing programs.

262. Access.

263. Equal division of time; travel.

264. Lose personal contact.

265. Unequal benefits to counties.

266. Adequate staffing level in cluster.

267. Access to agent.

268. Counties within cluster should have similar agricultural activities.

269. Access to agent.

270. Question service to rural, depressed, high unemployment counties.

271. Extension unavailable in our area because of economy.

272. Loss of local input in programs.

273. Create useless, impersonal offices.

274. Travel expense and time with not return.

275. Increased demands on volunteers.

276. Lost of personal contact.

277. Equal division of agent time in cluster.

278. How would knowledge level be maintained with agent turnover.

279. Would 4-H programs be fulfilled.

280. Timely response.
281. Agent spread too thin.

282. Too much travel for volunteers.
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Respondent Concerns Regarding the Relationship Between Extension and Local Funding Sources
Respondent Concerns Regarding the Relationship Between Extension and Local Funding Sources (n=271)

1. Every county wants the funds they spend to be used in their county and they would be sure that each county was receiving benefit in proportion to funds expended.

2. Could drop due to loss of home influence on programs.

3. County would discontinue their support of the extension service.

4. Hopefully a better relationship will be forthcoming. Hopefully there will be no negative effects resulting.

5. Same as they are now - probably an agreeable effect.

6. I believe it will have to be 'sold' to the county commissioners.

7. Positive.

8. I think it would help being in the money that is needed for projects.

9. The relationship may suffer somewhat.

10. We have a good relationship with county commissioners. I believe they will support the program even if changed so long as the quality is not affected.

11. Make it more economical to run.

12. It may be of help to counties with smaller finances.

13. County funding would be questioned because of time spent in other counties programs. May not feel their money is getting equal return within county.


15. It would make it more difficult to obtain funding.

16. I believe there would be a much better knowledge of where the greatest needs would be.
17. County would not be as supportive.

18. None.

19. We need to cut personnel not add more.

20. I don't think much.

21. Very little of the program was explained to the funding sources.

22. If the county is able to finance an Extension program, I don't believe there should be any effects between the two groups.

23. I don't know of any effects.

24. With a good explanation to county commissioners, its should go.

25. I don't think it should an effect on it.

26. If the personal contact is not established funding sources could cut back. However I think county funding sources realize the value of the Extension Service and will support it no mater what.

27. OCES would have to "sell" this idea to our commissioners. I assume funding would be on a % basis.

28. It would hurt funding.

29. No full time agent; no money.

30. Distance will not make the local politicians's fiscal hearts grow fonder!

31. NONE.

32. Being new in working with the Extension office, I don't know what type of relationship exists now apart from rumors.

33. May expect more funding to come from State.

34. If the clustered staffing pattern proves to be more cost efficient, I see no effect, unless the cost of county funding is greatly increased.
35. Little, if work in each county was maintained or replaced by other agents.
36. Is the county getting their money worth?
37. I think it would have a positive effect, the costs would be shared.
38. Funding from local taxes would be hard to administer.
39. Local county money is less all the time.
40. County needs to be kept up to date on what is going to happen to its extension services.
41. None.
42. I feel you would not have as great of support from advisory committee and in the end the county funding would not be made available.
43. A significant decrease in funds.
44. It would either strengthen it or push officials apart.
45. BAD. If they are ours, in our county, we develop a working close relationship. Agents moving between 2 or 3 counties will not have that relationship.
46. More funds would and should come from state funding.
47. We would not have the great support that we have now.
48. No change because the counties have started backing away from Extension, because Extension has not come forward in most counties with programs that are witty in recent years.
49. Unknown.
50. Again, loss if identity with individual people.
51. County funding would become defunct.
52. Would it be very hard for the county commissioners to come to a happy medium as far as wages?
53. Should not be a problem if the counties shared back and forth equally. If unequal in the county economic status, there would be a very big problem. Emphasis on matching up compatible counties.

54. It could have serve adverse effects if the commissioners feel they are being asked to support personnel that have to be shared with other counties.

55. Will funders want to pay for trips outside county? Who is doing the work here while they are at another county?

56. Concern over fair share; funding would be continued.

57. No change.

58. The money would be a big item in our county; I feel you wouldn't get it.

59. I don't see what each farm would do; perhaps the relationship would never develop to enable funders to become aware of needs.

60. Reduce the direct relationship between an local agent and the county commissioners.

61. Reduced funding from county.

62. Could be a problem

63. Travel would have to be increased; depend more on office secretaries to coordinate services.

64. Might be hard to get the good support from them.

65. It may result in a more difficult time in obtaining local funding.

66. A little more distance and not as much feeling of financial responsibility on the county level.

67. Could get better funding that what is now available.

68. It would be more difficult to keep local funding at the present level.
69. County funding would soon be non-existent because the communication would be lost.

70. I believe it will be very difficult to obtain county funding for agents who will be spending time outside the county.

71. Might lead to a decline in individual county support.

72. They won't receive the funding they need to operate in the county good enough.

73. County commissioner may not want to pay for salaries or programs that go out of the county.

74. Funding sources might feel they are not getting full service so would cut funding.

75. Some areas would surely be affected more than others. If the people that control funding sources believe clustering is good, no problem there. Communicate!

76. When people see agents going out of the county they question their own benefits to their county.

77. I think success brings funding. If the program is a success then the relationship will be OK, if not by big bucks.

78. I do not believe the county commissioners are going to support it. We have had good support before. However, I can see their support dropping already.

79. I think it would be bad especially in our county.

80. It would weaken.

81. I feel we would see a cut in funds from our county. This would be seen as a cut in staff.

82. They should be willing to continue funding if they can be convinced this arrangement will be efficient.
83. Commissioners may no be agreeable to providing funding for a person who is going to spend a significant amount of time in other counties. They would have to be convinced it would all even out.

84. In our county we've already had problems with funding and if it required additional assistants for each specialist we're afraid we wouldn't get it.

85. Counties would feel they are not getting their money's worth.

86. If any area is short an agent, it's harder to get county funding in full as they know the need for all agents.

87. I believe that there would be more friction and less cooperation, especially in more rural counties.

88. Will counties fight over what is their "fair share" of cost? How will costs be assigned in a fair manageable way? Will poorer counties suffer? Will richer counties suffer?

89. I don't believe our commissioners would be in favor and they would lower funds.

90. Might cause problems in funding of out of county functions. County funding "escaping" the intended county.

91. Deriving an equitable cost share plan between counties (wealthy vs. financially strapped).

92. There should be no major increase in any one particular county if budget funding is equally shared between counties.

93. It could create some problems, since staff would be working with more than one group of county officials.

94. Great deal if clustered agents weren't based in my county. We have excellent support now because agents are here and available.

95. Would reduce them overall in many counties.
96. Very little.

97. County commissioners may feel they are not getting the "best bang for their buck".

98. Loss to a county of full time agents may adversely effect funding if it's perceived by funding sources within the county as a lessening of services to that county.

99. Would be more difficult to get adequate funding because county commissioners, etc. would be less likely to know the Extension Staff personally.

100. If clustered staffing is used all funds should come from the state.

101. Where would the financial resources come from?

102. Grave problem unless the benefits and economy to the county are greater than seems apparent now.

103. Feel our resources would be decreased. Not only funding but also support.

104. County funding would decrease.

105. Great difficulty in continuing the amount of county funding.

106. That's tough. It would be difficult unless the state paid all salaries and there was always an agent available. Counties to supply funding to state and would receive time from agents in equal amounts.

107. Could create major problems. Some commissioners are more supportive of Extension than others.

108. Hurt the counties that have a reduction in agents service their county. I believe the county commissioners will reduce funding because of reduction in agent service in their county.

109. I think you would lose it.
110. Negative effect -- each county would expect the other counties to supply the money since all county budgets are already stretched. Net result- grudging or zero support.

111. Diminish level of funding.

112. Cost should be less for each county.

113. County funding sources may have to increase to reach a wider area.

114. Commissioners will want to cut funding since there is no office in their county. You will find less county finding and will have receive more from the State.

115. I'm not sure of any but my knowledge of funding sources is limited.

116. You wouldn't see as much funding to the office.

117. County funding sources would be very concerned about Extension time and effort allocations between different governmental areas. Governments would not feel as close a relationship with their Extension Office.

118. Better value of money spent and better quality of service provided.

119. Cheaper for county funding.

120. Counties will not feel "ownership" of Extension. Would effect funding negatively.

121. If counties do not like it, commissioners could cut part of their funding.

122. Reluctant to fund at current levels since money is flowing out of county.

123. Reluctance of commit funds for agents spending time outside the county.

124. None.

125. Strained.
126. County funding would be more difficult.

127. Not sure; the county program we have now is working well.

128. None; as long as it does the job intended.

129. Decline in funding.

130. Close existing relationship between CES and county funding sources would cease.

131. County would be less favorable to increase funding the more distant they become with people.

132. None; county chair must be available to work on funding.

133. In this county I'm afraid it would be in trouble.

134. Divide expenses among all counties concerned.

135. Would be detrimental to county funding. Commissioners need to see staff in action.

136. Conflict over who would do the funding.

137. Support will remain constant if communications is open, media informs the public, commissioners are in on evaluation and program review and success stores.

138. Might harm if county officials do not feel as responsible or could help if total bill is reduced but service is maintained.

139. Might even up the funding.

140. Gain personnel for money spent, will help; negative is county is paying for a person they are losing to other counties.

141. Should benefit the funding process.

142. Sources of money and dividing the expense

143. IF we had expertise in agents and programs in Extension the county funding might be more agreeable.
144. County commissioners will not like funding someone who is 2 counties away.

145. Should not change much unless the Extension staff is not available to correspond with funding sources.

146. Clustered staff would not be as easily recognized by commissioners.

147. Would require good communication.

148. Lower funding by a large margin. Commissioners if agents aren't located in county that they are not working in county.

149. Questionable.

150. Should give the county a feeling of cooperation.

151. Need reciprocal agreements to share workloads and funds with other counties.

152. Communication will be very important.

153. Lose funding.

154. County funding sources will believe they are being shortchanged.

155. Might be harder to get funds.

156. Might ease the financial crunch.

157. Strained.

158. Clustered staff would not be aware of every funding source.

159. Would jeopardize accountability; diffuse support and difficult to establish rapport.

160. Farther the agents are from eh county the less responsibility the Commissioners will feel to Extension

161. Adverse effect.

162. Stressful.
163. Commissioners will feel that another county is receiving more services than their own.

164. Commissioners are not going to want to fund agents not dedicated to their county. County where agent lives will receive most benefit.

165. County funds would not be given as freely.

166. Possible office location.

167. Reduce funding.

168. None.

169. Reduce county funding.

170. Funding and support will be reduced.

171. Wonder if commissioners would support clustered staffing.

172. County sources would be cut.

173. If services are timely, no difference in funding.

174. Could get better staff where county funding sources are weak.

175. Monies would be taken away.

176. Dividing the cost.

177. Not much effect.

178. Might tend to cut funds.

179. If costs are divided equitably no problem.

180. County support may be hard to get.

181. Less funding would be provided if rich and poor counties are paired.

182. Should be explained the money will be saved by different types of staff.
Clustering will drastically reduce county funding, at a
time when the state expects counties to shoulder more of the funding.

Not get the support we now have.

Cut funding and rightfully so.

If commissioners view the county's service is being reduced the local financial support will suffer.

NONE.

Budget, dividing the cost equally.

Will save money without hurting the efforts.

NONE.

If program is effective, funding will not be a problem.

Positive effect on Extension and funding sources.

Not allocate as much money for program not located in their county 100%.

Only problem would be financing the travel.

Not much effect on funding.

Hindrance to local funding since they want to support "local" causes.

May decrease if agent is out of county too much.

Positive effect on overall program.

If approached right, will work out.

Less money and less support because of lower services.

Wouldn't hurt.

Lose personal contact will lose support.

Will depend on balance of staffing.
204. County sources will be less supportive.
205. Might get more funding with cluster.
206. Not be good.
207. Better ease into it.
208. Less personal contact will be bad.
209. Increase our visibility and thus funding.
210. Not like agent spending time in another county.
211. Related to number of contacts an agent can make with clients.
212. Reduce funding if agent works outside county.
213. Little effect.
214. Lower funding.
216. Divide expenses among counties.
217. Our county no problem; neighboring counties will have a problem.
218. Substantially reduce funds because of shared personnel.
219. Reduced level of funding.
220. Could be severe cut with commissioner turnover and previous non/support of Extension.
221. Emphasize the program results to secure funding.
222. Difficult to raise funds for salaries.
223. Relieve strained counties; need commissioners to still feel responsibility to Extension.
224. Same or perhaps an increase.
225. Could be problem with agent spending time in another county.
226. Will counties be willing to change funding for new pattern.

227. Give county more money to work with.

228. Would hurt funding and require more bookkeeping.

229. Funding would be less.

230. Reduced county support with agent in another county.

231. Could question time spent in another county.

232. None, if the county understands that service will be received from another county.

233. Not getting as much individualized attention as they are used to.

234. Would help county funding sources.

235. Reduction of efforts.

236. Reluctant to fund program that helps another county at our expense.

237. Potentially no negative effects if good reactions exist.

238. No support by county officials.

239. Great negative effect.

240. May receives less money.

241. Less money if local people have less contact with agent.

242. None if agent sharing is equal.

243. Harder to get.

244. BIG problem on dividing costs.

245. Probably lower.

246. Bad.
247. Reduction of funds.
248. Decrease.
249. Would help.
250. Make them worse.
251. Tight budget counties may find it easier to fund.
252. Division of costs.
253. Reduction in funds because less contact with agent.
254. County would not want to fund another county's project.
255. Less would be available.
256. Will question extra travel and communication costs.
257. Might diminish county funding.
258. Very little.
259. Less supportive of Extension.
260. Funding would be less.
261. Provide less funding that currently.
262. Don't think commissioners will pay out for phantom itinerants.
263. Probably have less interest in the non-county agents.
264. Not like it at all.
265. Doubt they would continue to fund at current level.
266. Drastic ones.
267. None if it doesn't help to reduce costs.
268. Big problem.
269. Hesitant to fund agents working in other counties.
270. Decrease in funding.

271. Increased work load for agents.